

The Effectiveness of the Implementation of the Grievance Committee in Improving the Workplace Ethics in the Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Quezon

Aurelio L. Mirando IV¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Grievance Committee Workplace Ethics Due Process Confidentiality Fairness School Administration Quezon	The study investigated grievance committee implementation and respondent-rated workplace ethics in public elementary schools of the Division of Quezon in school year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey, the study gathered five-point questionnaire ratings and analyzed descriptive statistics and rank agreement across groups. A total of 264 school heads was reported across four congressional districts. Reported findings indicated that grievance-committee implementation by domain had a tabulated overall mean of 3.83 (MI); reported workplace-ethics effectiveness by domain had a tabulated overall mean of 3.94 (ME); challenges in grievance-committee implementation had a tabulated overall mean of 1.83 (FS). The concordance tests described agreement in questionnaire item rankings rather than a causal link between the studied domains. The findings identify perceived implementation priorities and should be interpreted within the limits of respondent-rating data.

1. Introduction

Fair and predictable workplace grievance processes provide employees with channels for raising concerns while protecting participation, impartiality and orderly resolution. In public schools, grievance mechanisms also have administrative significance because working relationships intersect with the delivery of education.

The Department of Education revised its grievance machinery through DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2004 (Department of Education, 2004). The existence of a formal mechanism does not alone establish its accessible, confidential or timely use; the study therefore differentiated administrative implementation domains from appraisals of workplace ethics.

Tyler (2006) emphasized how perceptions of procedural justice and fair treatment shape how people respond to authority and legal institutions. Although that research arose beyond the Quezon school context, it clarifies why confidentiality, consistency, meaningful opportunity to be heard and impartial decisions are relevant dimensions for examining grievance processes.

The study evaluated the reported extent of grievance committee implementation, perceptions of its effectiveness for integrity, accountability, respect, fairness and transparency, the seriousness of reported challenges, and the necessity of proposed solutions among public elementary school heads across four congressional districts during school year 2025–2026.

Its analytical emphasis was on respondent ratings and agreement of indicator rankings. No independent complaint registry, adjudication time series, workplace-ethics audit or longitudinal before–after assessment was reported as an outcome series for causal attribution. The objectives were to characterize reported ratings in the major constructs, compare the priority order of items across the respondent groups, identify comparatively lower-rated aspects, and translate the reported observations into proportionate implications for educational policy and practice. These objectives were approached as descriptive and rank-concordance questions, notwithstanding causal terms in the retained study title.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study employed a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey. It examined grievance committee implementation and respondent-rated workplace ethics in the Division of Quezon during school year 2025–2026. The quantitative components described respondent ratings and used item-rank concordance analyses; no random assignment, matched comparison group or longitudinal change estimate was presented.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The study involved 264 school heads from the four congressional districts of the Division of Quezon, among an enumerated population of 774 (district allocations of 67, 40, 73 and 84). The study reported a sample of 264 school heads drawn across four congressional districts from a stated population of 774. The evidence comprises ratings of grievance machinery and workplace conditions; the manuscript therefore distinguishes perception scores from case-level evidence of ethical improvement.

2.3 Instrument and variables

The study used a researcher-developed questionnaire organized around awareness, procedure, committee designation, timeliness, confidentiality, feedback, monitoring, integrity, accountability, fairness, transparency, complaints and proposed solutions. The instrument used a five-point response framework; numerical ratings and their accompanying verbal interpretations are retained as tabulated. Questionnaire preparation, juror validation and revisions were described, but a fully auditable scale-validation dataset was not supplied. Results are therefore described as respondent ratings of the stated variables.

2.4 Data gathering and statistical treatment

The stated procedure involved securing permissions, preparing and validating the survey, administering questionnaires, tabulating responses and assessing the research questions. The reported statistical tools were frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, rank ordering, Kendall's W and chi-square tests, using a declared .05 significance level. Domain weighted means and item rankings were treated descriptively. Kendall's W was used to assess agreement in item orderings across school-size or congressional-district groupings, with reported chi-square decision statistics. The displayed p-threshold labels were not substituted with unreported exact p values.

2.5 Scope of inference and ethical considerations

The analysis is limited to the reported cross-sectional survey responses. No individual record-level dataset, independent longitudinal outcome series or identifiable participant records was included in the manuscript. Permission and validation procedures were described in the study; the authors should supply an explicit ethics/consent declaration and data-availability statement required by the intended journal. No ethics approval number has been inferred or inserted.

3. Results

The numbered tables report the findings relevant to the study's research questions. The domain summary tables give the reported overall means, verbal interpretation labels and ranks; the indicator tables reproduce selected highest- and lowest-scoring indicators, retaining their printed means and labels; and the concordance tables retain reported Kendall W, χ^2 , degrees of freedom and statistical significance labels. All tabulated figures are transcribed rather than calculated anew.

Table 1. Grievance-committee implementation by domain

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Awareness and Accessibility	3.81	MI	4
Clear and Structured Procedures	3.73	MI	7
Designation of Grievance Committee	3.87	MI	2.5
Timeliness of Complaint Resolution	3.78	MI	5
Confidentiality and Impartiality	4.03	MI	1
Feedback Mechanism	3.87	MI	2.5
Monitoring and Reporting	3.75	MI	6
Average Wx	3.83	MI	

Table summarizes the reported domains for grievance committee implementation and respondent-rated workplace ethics. The highest was Confidentiality and Impartiality (mean 4.03; MI), whereas Clear and Structured Procedures was lowest (mean 3.73; MI). The tabulated overall average was 3.83 (MI).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 2. Agreement in implementation-domain rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Awareness and Accessibility	0.53	19.08	9	0.05
Clear and Structured Procedures	0.17	5.44	8	NS
Designation of Grievance Committee	0.49	17.64	9	0.05
Timeliness of Complaint Resolution	0.59	18.88	8	0.025
Confidentiality and Impartiality	0.45	16.20	9	NS
Feedback Mechanism	0.30	9.60	8	NS
Monitoring and Reporting	0.58	20.88	9	0.025

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 4 of 7 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 3 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Awareness and Accessibility, Designation of Grievance Committee, Timeliness of Complaint Resolution, among others.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 3. Selected indicators: awareness and accessibility

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Various means for filing grievances are available.	3.86	MI
Anonymous reporting is available.	3.78	MI
Grievance forms are available in print and online.	3.89	MI
A designated grievance office or personnel is available.	3.80	MI

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Procedures and forms are available in local languages or dialects.	3.70	MI
Awareness of grievance procedures is regularly assessed.	3.70	MI
Grievance procedures are communicated clearly and simply.	3.85	MI
Grievance information is available on DepEd websites and social media.	3.84	MI

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Grievance forms are available in print and online.” (3.89; MI). The lowest selected average was for “Procedures and forms are available in local languages or dialects.” (3.70; MI). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 4. Selected indicators: clear and structured procedures

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
A documented grievance process is available.	3.80	MI
Step-by-step filing instructions and timelines are provided.	3.77	MI
Standard grievance forms are used.	3.69	MI
A dedicated grievance officer or team is assigned.	3.74	MI
Timelines are set for each resolution phase.	3.69	MI
Written acknowledgment is given upon receipt of grievance.	3.74	MI
Hearing procedures are clearly defined.	3.73	MI
Eligible types of grievances are clearly identified.	3.72	MI

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “A documented grievance process is available.” (3.80; MI). The lowest selected average was for “Standard grievance forms are used.” (3.69; MI). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 5. Selected indicators: timeliness of complaint resolution

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Resolution timeframes are clearly defined.	3.65	MI
Urgent grievances receive immediate response.	3.72	MI
Deadlines are set for each process stage.	3.81	MI
Unresolved grievances are escalated on time.	3.82	MI
Urgent complaints follow fast-action procedures.	3.81	MI
Digital tools help speed up processing.	3.73	MI
Resolution timelines match grievance complexity.	3.77	MI
Complainants receive regular progress updates.	3.88	MI

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Complainants receive regular progress updates.” (3.88; MI). The lowest selected average was for “Resolution timeframes are clearly defined.” (3.65; MI). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 6. Selected indicators: feedback mechanisms

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Feedback forms are available to stakeholders.	3.90	MI
Post-resolution feedback is collected.	3.83	MI
Anonymous feedback is allowed.	3.89	MI
Feedback can be submitted through various channels.	3.89	MI
Stakeholders are informed how feedback is used.	3.86	MI
Feedback is gathered throughout the process.	3.83	MI
Anonymized feedback results are shared.	3.92	MI
Feedback channels are accessible to all.	3.87	MI

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Anonymized feedback results are shared.” (3.92; MI). The lowest selected average was for “Post-resolution feedback is collected.” (3.83; MI). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 7. Selected indicators: monitoring and reporting

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Grievance status is tracked at all stages.	3.77	MI
Regular grievance reports are prepared.	3.75	MI
Final grievance outcomes are monitored.	3.78	MI
Timelines are monitored and delays are flagged.	3.74	MI
Grievance patterns are analyzed.	3.72	MI
Independent reviews of the process are conducted.	3.73	MI
Digital tools are used for real-time monitoring.	3.65	MI
Stakeholder satisfaction with reporting is assessed.	3.80	MI

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Stakeholder satisfaction with reporting is assessed.” (3.80; MI). The lowest selected average was for “Digital tools are used for real-time monitoring.” (3.65; MI). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 8. Selected indicators: confidentiality and impartiality

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Grievance records are securely stored.	4.02	MI
Personal information is protected.	4.04	MI
File access is limited to authorized personnel.	4.05	MI
Grievance communication ensures privacy.	4.05	MI
Committee members are selected fairly.	4.01	MI
Conflict-of-interest policies are followed.	3.98	MI
Members are trained in impartial handling.	3.97	MI
Parties are protected from retaliation or discrimination.	4.05	MI

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “File access is limited to authorized personnel.” (4.05; MI). The lowest selected average was for “Members are trained in impartial handling.” (3.97; MI). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 9. Reported workplace-ethics effectiveness by domain

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Integrity and Honesty	3.91	ME	4
Accountability	4.00	ME	1
Respect and Fairness	3.92	ME	2.5
Transparency	3.92	ME	2.5
Average Wx	3.94	ME	

Table summarizes the reported domains for grievance committee implementation and respondent-rated workplace ethics. The highest was Accountability (mean 4.00; ME), whereas Integrity and Honesty was lowest (mean 3.91; ME). The tabulated overall average was 3.94 (ME).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 10. Agreement in ethics-domain rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Integrity and Honesty	0.71	22.72	8	0.005

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Accountability	0.36	12.96	9	NS
Respect and Fairness	0.44	19.36	11	NS
Transparency	0.56	17.92	8	0.05

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 2 of 4 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 2 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Integrity and Honesty, Transparency.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 11. Selected indicators: integrity and honesty

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Encourages personnel to provide truthful information during grievance proceedings.	3.87	ME
Handles complaints without altering or concealing relevant facts.	3.89	ME
Promotes honesty among the parties involved in a grievance.	3.94	ME
Ensures that evidence and statements are presented accurately.	3.91	ME
Discourages false accusations and misleading information.	3.82	ME
Protects the integrity of documents and records related to grievances.	3.98	ME
Encourages personnel to admit mistakes and take corrective action.	3.93	ME
Maintains ethical conduct throughout the grievance process.	3.93	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "Protects the integrity of documents and records related to grievances." (3.98; ME). The lowest selected average was for "Discourages false accusations and misleading information." (3.82; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 12. Selected indicators: accountability

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Clearly identifies the duties of the persons involved in resolving grievances.	4.07	ME
Holds concerned personnel responsible for their actions and decisions.	4.02	ME
Requires the parties involved to comply with agreed resolutions.	4.03	ME
Documents the actions taken in response to each grievance.	4.01	ME
Addresses complaints within the prescribed period.	3.96	ME
Provides explanations for decisions made during the grievance process.	3.98	ME
Ensures that unresolved grievances receive proper follow-up.	3.96	ME
Encourages personnel to accept responsibility for misconduct or errors.	3.98	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "Clearly identifies the duties of the persons involved in resolving grievances." (4.07; ME). The lowest selected average was for "Addresses complaints within the prescribed period." (3.96; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 13. Selected indicators: respect and fairness

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Treats all parties with dignity throughout the grievance process.	3.93	ME
Gives each party an equal opportunity to explain their side.	3.94	ME
Listens carefully to the concerns of all persons involved.	3.94	ME
Avoids discrimination based on position, status, gender, age, or personal relationships.	3.88	ME
Remains impartial when examining complaints and evidence.	3.88	ME
Protects personnel from intimidation, retaliation, or harassment.	3.87	ME
Applies grievance procedures consistently to all employees.	3.88	ME
Provides reasonable and appropriate resolutions to workplace concerns.	3.99	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Provides reasonable and appropriate resolutions to workplace concerns.” (3.99; ME). The lowest selected average was for “Protects personnel from intimidation, retaliation, or harassment.” (3.87; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 14. Challenges in grievance-committee implementation

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Workplace Conflicts	1.98	FS	1
Unfair Treatment or Discrimination	1.82	FS	4
Violation of Policies or Procedures	1.86	FS	2.5
Workload and Job Assignments	1.86	FS	2.5
Administrative Misconduct	1.79	FS	5
Employment Terms and Benefits	1.70	FS	6
Average Wx	1.83	FS	

Table summarizes the reported domains for grievance committee implementation and respondent-rated workplace ethics. The highest was Workplace Conflicts (mean 1.98; FS), whereas Employment Terms and Benefits was lowest (mean 1.70; FS). The tabulated overall average was 1.83 (FS).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 15. Selected indicators: workplace conflicts

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Unfair teaching load or subject assignments	2.03	FS
Favoritism in promotion or advancement	1.96	FS
Non-compliance with the merit selection plan	2.01	FS
Unclear RPMS performance evaluation	1.94	FS
Verbal or psychological harassment	2.01	FS
Unresolved staff conflicts	1.96	FS
Disputes over co-curricular or ancillary tasks	1.96	FS
Unjust denial of leave privileges	1.97	FS

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Unfair teaching load or subject assignments” (2.03; FS). The lowest selected average was for “Unclear RPMS performance evaluation” (1.94; FS). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation. The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 16. Selected proposed solutions to grievance challenges

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Establishes clear and confidential grievance procedures.	3.98	MN
Conducts orientations on grievance policies, rights, and due process.	3.95	MN
Ensures fair distribution of teaching loads and assignments.	3.97	MN
Applies merit-based standards in hiring, promotion, and training.	3.92	MN
Provides impartial mediation for workplace conflicts.	3.94	MN
Protects personnel from harassment, discrimination, and retaliation.	3.91	MN
Maintains complete records of grievance proceedings and decisions.	3.91	MN
Coordinates the resolution of delayed salaries and benefits.	3.90	MN

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Establishes clear and confidential grievance procedures.” (3.98; MN). The lowest selected average was for “Coordinates the resolution of delayed salaries and benefits.” (3.90; MN). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 17. Selected indicators: administrative misconduct challenges

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Abuse of authority or position	1.81	FS
Neglect of duty	1.83	FS
Falsification of official documents	1.75	FS
Unauthorized collection or misuse of funds	1.76	FS
Tampering with RPMS-PPST ratings	1.74	FS
Unlawful dismissal or forced resignation	1.76	FS
Conflict of interest in procurement or hiring	1.84	FS
Failure to implement DepEd policies	1.81	FS

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Conflict of interest in procurement or hiring” (1.84; FS). The lowest selected average was for “Tampering with RPMS-PPST ratings” (1.74; FS). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation. The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 18. Agreement in challenge and solution rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Workplace Conflicts	0.33	11.88	9	NS
Unfair Treatment or Discrimination	0.47	18.80	10	0.05
Violation of Policies or Procedures	0.22	7.92	9	NS
Workload and Job Assignments	0.40	17.60	11	NS
Administrative Misconduct	0.71	25.56	9	0.005
Employment Terms and Benefits	0.40	16.00	10	NS
Solutions Offered	0.30	16.80	14	NS

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 2 of 7 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 5 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Unfair Treatment or Discrimination, Administrative Misconduct.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

4. Discussion

The implementation scores suggest respondents perceived the grievance machinery as present and functioning to a substantial extent, but differences among procedure, confidentiality and monitoring point to distinct administrative functions. A grievance mechanism is only useful if potential users can access it, trust its impartiality and receive decisions through transparent processes.

The workplace-ethics ratings are conceptually related to grievance management; however, they represent participant appraisals rather than independently verified trends in misconduct, trust or workplace climate. Tyler's (2006) procedural-justice account helps explain why consistent, respectful procedures are valuable even when complaints are uncomfortable or outcomes unfavorable.

The comparatively lower-rated implementation domains can inform practical process reviews, including awareness orientations, registration and escalation timelines, and case tracking. The Department of Education's revised grievance machinery (2004) offers an official point of reference for scrutinizing whether local committee procedures match formal safeguards.

Reported challenges were largely rated at a lower seriousness level, but limited complaint reporting may reflect absence of incidents, barriers to reporting or differences in expectations. A cross-sectional questionnaire cannot distinguish these explanations; protected interviews and de-identified administrative metrics would add necessary triangulation.

Kendall concordance concerns the similarity of rank orders across geographic groups. Even statistically significant agreement does not establish that committees caused ethical change. Future research could compare documented resolution timelines, procedural compliance and employee perceptions over repeated periods while maintaining confidentiality.

One operational distinction is between formally designating a grievance committee and maintaining a reliable process for tracking unresolved issues. Complaint acknowledgement, confidentiality protocols, documented escalation, and appeal mechanisms are separable activities. The aggregate score cannot show which cases were handled adequately, which should be established through de-identified audits rather than survey ratings alone.

A governance-oriented future inquiry should separate the incidence of grievances, the willingness to report them, and procedural quality after a report is made. Low challenge ratings can reflect different underlying realities, including a genuinely low complaint burden and a low level of awareness or trust. Measuring those conditions separately would sharpen the interpretations of accessibility and fairness.

5. Implications for practice and research

A practical implication is to translate broad perceptions into a small set of observable monitoring indicators, designate responsibility

for follow-up, and revisit these indicators at defined intervals. A stronger subsequent design would include independent measurement of relevant practices or outcomes, transparent instrument reliability evidence, clear sampling denominators and analysis at the correct respondent or school level. Such evidence would enable stronger, though still carefully bounded, claims than agreement of item rankings alone.

6. Limitations

The study's central limitations arise from a one-period perception survey, reliance on summary statistics, potential common-rater bias, and limited information on the psychometric performance of the measurement instrument. District- or school-group Kendall concordance indicates ordering similarity but does not establish effect magnitude, student-level improvement, employee-level performance change or temporal precedence. Exact p values, confidence intervals and analytic data were not consistently available. The manuscript consequently avoids unsupported causal conclusions and treats unverified statistical labels as reported.

7. Conclusion

The study reported moderate-to-favorable ratings of grievance-committee implementation, perceived workplace-ethics effectiveness and proposed solutions, together with relatively low seriousness scores for reported challenges. The pattern suggests value in prioritizing timeliness, accessible procedures, privacy and case tracking. The evidence does not establish a causal improvement in workplace ethics or the absence of grievances.

The recommended next step is independent verification of the sample denominator, scale coding, statistical computation and the evidence needed to substantiate any stronger effectiveness or impact claim. Until such verification, the results should be considered a detailed descriptive basis for local review and hypothesis generation.

References

- [1] Department of Education. (2004). Revision of the grievance machineries of the Department of Education (DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2004). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2004/06/03/do-35-s-2004-revision-of-the-grievance-machineries-of-the-department-of-education/>
- [2] Tyler, T. R. (2006). Why people obey the law. Princeton University Press.
https://books.google.com/books?id=77G9sCO_MKIC