

Teachers' Performance in Relation to Job Satisfaction Amidst the Changing Landscape of Education During Pandemic

John Ritchie V. Reyes¹, Myla M. Calderon², Jennibel L. Jacobo³, and Carol B. Amora⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Lumil National High School, Department of Education, Silang, Cavite Province, Philippines

Email: ¹johnritchie.reyes001@deped.gov.ph, ²myla.mendoza003@deped.gov.ph, ³jennibel.lagatic@deped.gov.ph and ⁴carol.amora001@deped.gov.ph

Abstract— The pandemic brought a lot of changes in lives of all people around the world even in the field of education. This became a subject of discussions whether people were able to cope and were still satisfied with what they were doing personally and professionally; and teachers were not exempted to this aspect. The research study aimed to determine the level and correlation of teachers' job satisfaction and performance during the new set-up of education. The result of the study is intended to be shared to school administration to help them in crafting localized programs and intervention that could lift the teachers' morale, spirit, work ethics, and performance. The researchers used quantitative research design particularly the correlative design. The teachers answered a survey regarding their job satisfaction that would be correlated to their annual performance rating. It was found out that the teachers were "satisfied" in their job in terms of compensation and benefits, leadership of administrators, social relationship, work environment based on overall mean score. However, there were still undecided and dissatisfied based on the frequency and percentage. They also had the same level of job satisfaction when they were grouped according to their demographic profile namely gender, age group, teaching position, years in service, highest educational attainment and grade level taught. Furthermore, this revealed that teachers' job satisfaction and performance had very weak positive correlation.

Keywords— education, job satisfaction, performance, pandemic.

INTRODUCTION

The Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic brought extraordinary challenges to mankind thus affecting the world's education system, including the educators. Teachers became particularly challenged when they suddenly had to experience remote teaching due to school closures (Hilger et al., 2021).

This drastic change affected the teachers both positively and negatively. Teachers with caretaking responsibilities such as department heads and coordinators, and more experienced teachers became more vulnerable to the crisis brought by the pandemic as they experienced a smaller or no decrease in job demands while their job resources and support system diminished (Hilger et al., 2021).

According to Herman et al. (2021), teachers are reported to have lower levels of work-related stress after the pandemic has begun compared to their stress levels before the pandemic. This was in the beginning of 2020; however, throughout school year 2020 – 2021, job demands of teachers have increased and they are reportedly have been working more than usual. The increase in job demands is slightly more noticeable for more experienced teachers and surprisingly for female teachers. Several researches have emphasized the

increased demands of the teaching profession during the global pandemic (Dora, 2022).

Self-efficacy is known to be a key factor of successful teaching (Szabo, 2022). Herman et al. (2021) suggested that the competence and efficacy of teachers in managing student behavior and in engaging them in learning also helps the teachers adapt to the stressors of the pandemic.

Though it is evidently a challenge for teachers to switch the mode of learning from face to face to remote learning, several studies show that the decrease in job demands of teachers has mutual relations with the decrease in in fatigue and psychosomatic complaints.

On the other hand, decrease in job resources which resulted to less support system teachers get at work including work relationships, coaching and mentoring, and advancement opportunities correlated with the decrease in teachers' job satisfaction (Hilger et al., 2021). Most of these studies were conducted in other parts of the world and the researchers wanted to gauge the levels of teachers' job satisfaction and performance in the Philippines.

Job Satisfaction as described by Oco (2022) is the amount of pleasure or contentment associated with a job.

It was put simply as the designation of how happy a worker is with his job". In this trying time of pandemic which has not been completely declared to be over, teachers still struggle to work differently due to the challenges that emerged in the environment brought about by the sudden shift in teaching modalities. Szabo et al.'s (2022) research findings indicated that job satisfaction and self-efficacy had significant relationship with positive correlation.

Thus, the research study aimed to determine the level and correlation of a high school faculty's job satisfaction and performance during the new set-up of education.

The result of the study was intended to be shared to school administration to help them in crafting localized programs and intervention that could lift the teachers' morale, spirit, work ethics, and performance.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The researcher used an adapted survey questionnaire to measure the level of job satisfaction of the teachers. This was based on the survey questionnaire of Keith Davis and Lera Fay Cotiangco as cited in the study of Oco (2022).

The researchers contacted Mr. Oco to give them an approval to utilize the tool and he willing permitted them to do so.

The survey questionnaire was composed of two parts. Part 1 asked for teachers' demographic profile such as gender, age, teaching position, years in service, highest educational status, and grade level taught.

Part 2 was comprised of four (4) subparts with ten (10) statements each in which the teachers will self-assess their job satisfaction level. The four subparts were compensation and benefits, leadership of administrators, social relationship, and work environment.

Table 1 shows the scale and the descriptor to be used in survey questionnaire assessing the teachers' job satisfaction level.

Table 1: Scale and Descriptor for Teachers' Self-assessment of their Job Satisfaction Level

Scale	Descriptor
5	Strongly Satisfied
4	Satisfied
3	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
2	Dissatisfied
1	Strongly Dissatisfied

Table 2 shows the scale and the interpretation for teachers' job satisfaction level.

Table 2: Scale and Interpretation for Teachers' Job Satisfaction Level

Scale	Interoperation
4.20 – 5.00	Strongly Satisfied
3.40 – 4.19	Satisfied
2.60 – 3.39	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
1.80 – 2.59	Dissatisfied
1.00 – 1.79	Strongly Dissatisfied

The researchers asked the school heads' permission to conduct the study. After being approved, they sent a letter to each teacher requesting them to respond to their survey questionnaire and let their IPCRF rating to be used also for this study.

The Department of Education introduced the PPST or the Professional Standards for Teachers pursuant to DepEd Order No. 42, series of 2017. It has undergone several developments including the alignment of RPMS and PPST. This led to the development of the RPMS Manual for Teachers and School Heads. The RPMS Tools include performance appraisals forms such as the IPCRF.

Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form or IPCRF for Teachers are utilized to rate teachers' performance which uses the rating scale based on the Civil Service Commission Memorandum Circular No. 06, series of 2012. Teachers were rated according to adjectival ratings: Outstanding, Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and Poor. IPCRF are said to provide a venue for agreement on standards of performance and behavior which lead to professional and personal growth in the organization.

The collected data were recorded, tabulated, and treated using the appropriate statistical treatments.

Table 3 shows the range and the adjectival rating for Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form or IPCRF based on DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015.

Table 3: Range and Adjectival Rating for Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form

Scale	Descriptor
4.500 – 5.000	Outstanding
3.500 – 4.499	Very Satisfactory
2.500 – 3.499	Satisfactory
1.500 – 2.499	Unsatisfactory
Below 1.499	Poor

Ethical Issue

The researchers made sure to adhere to different ethical considerations to uphold scientific integrity. Ethical conditions such as informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, potential of harm, and

communication of results were strictly followed. Informed consent was already approved by the heads and as return, the researchers were encouraged to share the accurate result to be used as basis for crafting programs at school. The participants were also provided with detailed consent letter for them to understand the purpose of the study, how the data gathered would be treated, and how their participation was valuable. As the school authorities encouraged research culture, 100% of the teachers as participants willingly participated. Still, the researchers made it clear that they might choose to partake in or out of the study anytime. In designing this research, the researchers considered its needed methodology and instruments to have a bare minimum to no potential harm to a person's social and psychological aspects; making sure that there were no

shameful and stigmatizing questions in the survey questionnaire. As much as the researchers wanted to maintain anonymity through data pseudonymization, the design of this study required to link participants personal information to other variable to generate appropriate and precise results to answer the research questions. To compensate this unavoidable ethical issue, the researchers pledged to keep the data with utmost confidentiality and would only be used the information with the stated purpose of this research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 4 shows the frequency and the percentage of teachers according to their job satisfaction level in terms of the four dimensions.

Table 4: Frequency and Percentage of Teachers based on their Job Satisfaction Level

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	Strongly Satisfied		Satisfied		Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Compensation and Benefits	9	20.00%	24	53.33%	12	26.67%	0	0.00%
Leadership of Administrators	4	8.89%	29	64.44%	7	15.56%	5	11.11%
Social Relationship	23	51.11%	20	44.44%	2	4.44%	0	0.00%
Work Environment	9	20.00%	30	66.67%	6	13.33%	0	0.00%

The table shows that more than 73% of the teachers were either strongly satisfied or satisfied with the compensation and benefits that they were receiving from the government while the rest of them were undecided about this matter. While more than 75% of them responded that they were strongly satisfied or satisfied how the school administrators led them and 15.56% were neutral with their perception. However, it is noticeable that 5 out of 45 or 11.11% of the teachers were dissatisfied regarding the leadership of the administrators. Furthermore, they seemed to be happy with their relationship with their colleagues as more than 95% of them answered that they were under the categories of strongly satisfied or satisfied and just less than 5% were in between. Lastly, at least 86% of the

teaching staff were contented with their work environment while the rest were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. In terms of frequency and percentage, it is remarkable that most of them were satisfied in all dimensions of job satisfaction and half of them were strongly satisfied in terms of social relation. The results also indicate that most of them did not feel any dissatisfaction despite of the changes that they have encountered during the new normal in Philippine education. Nevertheless, there were still torn between being satisfied and dissatisfied in four aspects and some were dissatisfied in administrators' leadership.

Table 5 shows the teachers' job satisfaction survey mean scores in terms of the four dimensions

Table 5: Teachers' Job Satisfaction Survey Mean Scores and Interpretation

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Compensation and Benefits	3.73	0.56	Satisfied
Leadership of Administrators	3.65	0.63	Satisfied
Social Relationship	4.19	0.5	Satisfied
Work Environment	3.8	0.51	Satisfied

The table shows that the teachers are satisfied in all dimensions of job satisfaction as the compensation and benefits got a mean score of 3.73, the leadership of

administrators had 3.65, the social relationship got 4.19, and work environment 3.81. Teachers' social relationship had the highest mean score while leadership

of administrators had the lowest. It is also worth noting that teachers had the most disperse responses in leadership of administrators as it got a standard deviation of 0.63, slightly higher compared to other aspects.

Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage of teachers based on their job performance according to IPCRF.

Table 6: Frequency and Percentage of Teachers based on their Job Performance

Teaching Position	Outstanding	
	F	%
Master Teacher I	3	6.67%
Teacher III	14	31.11%
Teacher II	16	35.56%
Teacher I	12	26.67%
Total	45	100.00%

The table presents that all of the teachers regardless of position were classified as "Outstanding" according to the rating that they got in IPCRF for the school year 2021 - 2022. This implies that in spite of the rapid changes and bulk of works that they encountered on the aforementioned period, they still worked very efficiently.

Table 7 shows the teachers' job performance mean scores based on IPCRF.

Table 7: Teachers' Job Performance Mean Scores and Interpretation

Teaching Position	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Master Teacher I	4.917	0.02	Outstanding
Teacher III	4.818	0.08	Outstanding
Teacher II	4.756	0.09	Outstanding
Teacher I	4.725	0.08	Outstanding
Total	4.778	0.10	Outstanding

The table shows that each teaching position got a mean score that is categorized as "Outstanding" in IPCRF (S.Y. 2021 - 2022). The Master Teacher I earned the highest mean score of 4.917. This is followed by Teacher III ($x = 4.818$), Teacher II ($x = 4.756$), and Teacher I (4.725), respectively.

This results also tell that the IPCRF ratings gotten by the master teachers were very closed to each other as they got a standard deviation of 0,02.

Their ratings were from 4.900 to 4.950. Overall, the teachers performed well in this school year as they got a composite of 4.778.

Table 8 shows the results of the test of significance difference between the mean scores of job satisfaction of teachers based on gender.

Table 8: Results of t-Test of Independents Means of the Teachers' Job Satisfaction based on Gender

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	Male		Female		p-value ($\alpha = 0.05$)	Decision
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Compensation and Benefits	3.89	0.35	3.66	0.60	0.12	fail to reject the H_0
Leadership of Administrators	3.87	0.50	3.52	0.66	0.21	fail to reject the H_0
Social Relationship	4.32	0.44	4.15	0.52	0.37	fail to reject the H_0
Work Environment	3.80	0.56	3.80	0.52	0.99	fail to reject the H_0

The table shows that compensation and benefit got a p-value of 0.12, leadership of administrators got 0.21, social relationship got 0.37, and work environment got 0.99. All of these are greater than the alpha which is 0.05; thus, the null hypotheses are failed to reject. There is no significant difference between the male teachers' and female teachers' job satisfaction in terms of any

dimensions. This means that both genders had the same level of job satisfaction during the school year 2021 - 2022.

Table 9 shows the results of the test of significance difference among the mean scores of job satisfaction of teachers when they are grouped according to age group.

Table 9: Results of Analysis of Variance of the Teachers' Job Satisfaction based on Age Group

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	Over 55 years old		51 - 55 years old		46 - 50 years old		41 - 45 years old		36 - 40 years old	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Compensation and Benefits	3.98	0.76	4.10	0.49	3.30	0.60	3.54	0.63	3.70	0.68
Leadership of Administrators	3.96	0.05	4.27	0.49	3.03	1.10	3.57	0.74	3.44	0.72
Social Relationship	4.45	0.39	3.87	0.68	4.03	0.51	4.17	0.46	4.37	0.41
Work Environment	4.20	0.45	3.90	0.47	3.63	0.32	3.64	0.45	3.98	0.46

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	31 - 35 years old		25 - 30 years old		Under 25		p-value ($\alpha = 0.05$)	Decision
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Compensation and Benefits	3.63	0.42	3.70	0.40	3.78	0.41	0.57	fail to reject the H_0
Leadership of Administrators	3.53	0.57	3.63	0.37	3.80	0.16	0.08	fail to reject the H_0
Social Relationship	4.20	0.53	4.19	0.59	4.14	0.54	0.67	fail to reject the H_0
Work Environment	3.60	1.00	3.57	0.44	3.78	0.27	0.50	fail to reject the H_0

The table indicates that the p-value of compensation and benefits is 0.57, leadership of administrators is 0.08, social relation is 0.67, and work environment is 0.50. All of these values are greater than 0.05 alpha; therefore, the null hypotheses are accepted. There is no significant difference among the teachers' job satisfaction in the said four aspects in terms of age group. This implies that

all teachers had the same job satisfaction level regardless of their age group.

Table 10 shows the results of the test of significance difference among the mean scores of job satisfaction of teachers when they are classified according to their teaching position.

Table 10: Results of Analysis of Variance of the Teachers' Job Satisfaction based on Teaching Position

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	Master Teacher I		Teacher III		Teacher II		Teacher I		p-value ($\alpha = 0.05$)	Decision
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Compensation and Benefits	4.33	0.78	3.78	0.51	0.65	0.52	3.63	0.59	0.20	fail to reject the H_0
Leadership of Administrators	3.90	0.10	3.80	0.66	3.48	0.84	3.53	0.44	0.54	fail to reject the H_0
Social Relationship	3.77	0.68	4.22	0.50	4.22	0.49	4.22	0.51	0.53	fail to reject the H_0
Work Environment	3.87	0.41	3.87	0.54	3.78	0.57	3.77	0.51	0.93	fail to reject the H_0

The table presents that compensation and benefits, leadership of administrators, social relation, and work environment got the p-values of 0.20, 0.54, 0.53, and 0.93, respectively. These exceed the alpha (0.05); hence, the null hypotheses were failed to reject.

Teacher II, and Teacher I. This means that they had the same level of job satisfaction when they are group according to teaching position.

There is no significant difference among the job satisfaction of the Master Teacher I, Teacher III,

Table 11 shows the results of the test of significance difference among the mean scores of job satisfaction of teachers when they are classified according to their years in service.

Table 11: Results of Analysis of Variance of the Teachers' Job Satisfaction based on Years in Service

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	More than 10 yrs.		4 - 10 years		0 - 3 years		p-value ($\alpha = 0.05$)	Decision
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Compensation and Benefits	3.93	0.57	3.50	0.47	3.72	0.60	0.10	fail to reject the H_0
Leadership of Administrators	3.90	0.63	3.37	0.65	3.61	0.49	> 0.05	fail to reject the H_0
Social Relationship	4.17	0.54	4.13	0.47	4.30	0.51	0.68	fail to reject the H_0
Work Environment	3.93	0.53	3.69	0.48	3.76	0.56	0.40	fail to reject the H_0

The table shows that the p-values of the four dimensions of teachers' job satisfaction range from >0.05 to 0.68 which are more than the value of alpha, 0.05. The null hypotheses are accepted.

years in service categories, they still had statistically equal job satisfaction level.

There is no significant difference among the job satisfaction of the teachers based on their age groups. This tells that even they are grouped in three IPCRF's

Table 12 shows the results of the test of significance difference among the mean scores of job satisfaction of teachers when they are classified according to their educational background.

Table 12: Results of Analysis of Variance of the Teachers' Job Satisfaction based on Highest Educational Attainment

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	Doc Units		MA Grad		MA Units		Bachelor's		p-value ($\alpha = 0.05$)	Decision
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Compensation and Benefits	3.90	0.99	3.65	0.77	3.66	0.54	4.04	0.51	0.43	fail to reject the H_0
Leadership of Administrators	3.95	0.07	3.78	1.00	3.61	0.44	3.69	0.12	0.86	fail to reject the H_0
Social Relationship	4.45	0.64	4.68	0.17	4.15	0.26	4.04	0.20	0.17	fail to reject the H_0
Work Environment	4.45	0.64	4.00	0.52	3.75	0.50	3.72	0.55	0.26	fail to reject the H_0

The table shows that compensation and benefits' p-value is 0.43, leadership of administrators is 0.86, social relation is 0.17, and work environment is 0.26. All the p-values are greater than 0.05 alpha; therefore, the null hypotheses are failed to reject. There is no significant difference among the teachers' job satisfaction when they are classified according to their highest educational attainment. This implies that whatever educational attainment reached by the teachers, they had the same level of job satisfaction last school year.

Table 13 shows the results of the test of significance difference among the mean scores of job satisfaction of teachers when they are classified according to their grade levels taught in school year 2021 – 2022.

Table 13: Results of Analysis of Variance of the Teachers' Job Satisfaction based on Grade Levels Designation

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	Grade 7		Grade 8		Grade 9		Grade 10	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Compensation and Benefits	3.98	0.42	3.53	0.30	3.14	0.48	4.29	0.63
Leadership of Administrators	4.10	0.49	3.37	0.57	3.38	0.76	3.68	0.51
Social Relationship	4.25	0.67	4.13	0.43	4.30	0.62	4.21	0.41
Work Environment	3.90	0.65	4.67	0.23	3.86	0.47	4.12	0.67

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	Grade 11		Grade 12		p-value ($\alpha = 0.05$)	Decision
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Compensation and Benefits	3.70	0.38	3.70	0.40	< 0.00**	reject the H_0
Leadership of Administrators	3.53	0.78	3.82	0.35	0.18	fail to reject the H_0
Social Relationship	4.09	0.52	4.15	0.41	0.97	fail to reject the H_0
Work Environment	3.67	0.41	3.70	0.41	0.24	fail to reject the H_0

The table presents that leadership of administrators' ($p = 0.18$), social relationship's ($p = 0.97$), and work environment's ($p = 0.24$) p-values exceed the alpha (0.05); thus, the null hypotheses are accepted. There is no significant difference among job satisfaction of teachers based on grade levels in terms of the three aforementioned dimensions.

However, compensation and benefits got a p-value of <0.00** which is less than the 0.05 alpha. The null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant difference among the job satisfaction of the teachers based on grade in terms of this aspect. This tells that they did not have same level of satisfaction in terms of compensation and

benefits when they were group according to the grade level they belonged.

Table 14 shows the results of the test of significance difference between the mean scores of job satisfaction of teachers in terms of compensation and benefits when they are paired according to grade levels.

Table 14. Results of Analysis of Bonferroni Correlation Method for Compensation & Benefits based on Grade Level

Grade Level Pairings	Group 1		Group 2		p-value ($\alpha = 0.003$)	Decision
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Grade 7 Vs. Grade 8	3.98	0.42	3.53	0.30	0.051	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 7 Vs. Grade 9	3.98	0.42	3.14	0.48	0.002**	reject the H_0
Grade 7 Vs. Grade 10	3.98	0.42	4.29	0.63	0.265	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 7 Vs. Grade 11	3.98	0.42	3.70	0.38	0.180	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 7 Vs. Grade 12	3.98	0.42	3.70	0.40	0.244	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 8 Vs. Grade 9	3.53	0.30	3.14	0.48	0.102	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 8 Vs. Grade 10	3.53	0.30	4.29	0.63	0.020	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 8 Vs. Grade 11	3.53	0.30	3.70	0.38	0.389	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 8 Vs. Grade 12	3.53	0.30	3.70	0.40	0.437	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 9 Vs. Grade 10	3.14	0.48	4.29	0.63	0.001**	reject the H_0
Grade 9 Vs. Grade 11	3.14	0.48	3.70	0.38	0.017	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 9 Vs. Grade 12	3.14	0.48	3.70	0.40	0.039	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 10 Vs. Grade 11	4.29	0.63	3.70	0.38	0.033	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 10 Vs. Grade 12	4.29	0.63	3.70	0.40	0.071	fail to reject the H_0
Grade 11 Vs. Grade 12	3.70	0.38	3.70	0.40	1.000	fail to reject the H_0

Since there was significant difference among the teachers' satisfaction level in terms of compensation and benefits based on grade levels, the researchers used the Bonferroni Correlation Method. The table shows the p-value of each pair of grade levels that were compared. It was found out that Grade 7 and Grade 9 got a p-value of 0.002, and Grade 9 and Grade 10 got a p-value of 0.001. Both of these are lower than the alpha of 0.05. The null hypotheses for these pairs are rejected. There is significant difference on the level of satisfaction in terms of compensation and benefits between Grades 7 & 9 teachers, and between Grades 9 & 10 teachers. Only these two pairs showed the difference in level of satisfaction in the said dimension but the rest of the pairs did not.

Table 15 shows the results of the test of the test of relationship between the mean scores of job satisfaction of teachers and their performance based on IPCRF rating.

Table 15: Results of Test of Relationship of Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Job Performance

Job Satisfaction's Dimensions	p-value ($\alpha = 0.05$)	r-value	Interpretation
Compensation and Benefits	0.33	0.15	Very Weak Positive Correlation
Leadership of Administrators	0.52	0.10	Very Weak Positive Correlation
Social Relationship	0.89	0.02	Very Weak Positive Correlation
Work Environment	0.30	0.16	Very Weak Positive Correlation

The table shows that the p-value of compensation and benefits is 0.033, leadership of administrators is 0.52, social relationship is 0.98, and work environment is 0.30. All these exceed the value of alpha which is 0.05; thus, the null hypotheses are accepted. There is no significant relationship between each dimension of teachers' job satisfaction and their performance. Their r-values range from 0.02 to 0.16 which are all interpreted as very weak positive correlation. These indicate that there is not enough proof that the job performance of participating teachers was affected by their job satisfaction in the school year 2021 - 2022.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The objective of this study is to determine the job satisfaction level of all teachers of a certain high school for the school year 2021 - 2022. The said variable is subdivided into four dimensions namely compensation and benefits, leadership of administrators, social relationship, and work environment (Oco, 2022). Each component was intended to correlate with teachers' job performance measured through the IPCRF ratings given by the superiors at the end of said school year. This study was done to know the status of the teachers amidst the left and right school tasks and alterations of educational policy and guidelines brought by pandemic. These are the conclusions formulated based on the findings of the study.

It was found out that majority of the teachers were satisfied with their current situation and perception in terms of the four aforementioned aspects of job satisfaction. Most of them are very happy with their relationship with their co-workers. However, it is noticeable that around a quarter out of 45 teachers were still reluctant whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with compensation and benefits that they are receiving from the government. Moreover, there were several teachers who were also neither satisfied nor dissatisfied in the three other dimension. In addition, some teachers were dissatisfied on how the school administrators led and managed the institution.

On the other hand, despite of heavy workloads and abrupt modifications of instructions every now and then,

all the teachers performed well in the last school year based on the IPCRF rating that they got.

The job satisfaction of the teachers was further analyzed by comparing the data based on their demographic profile. The researchers learned that teachers' job satisfaction levels are the same in the four dimensions when they are grouped according to their gender, age group, teaching position, years in service, and highest educational attainment. But they showed significant difference in compensation and benefits when they were classified according to grade levels taught. It was found out that Grades 7 & 9 did not have the same level of satisfaction in terms of this aspect, as well with Grades 9 & 10. Nevertheless, the teachers still had the same level of job satisfaction in other three components based on grade levels taught.

Lastly, it is concluded in this study that there was not enough evidence that participating teachers' job satisfaction had significant relationship with their job performance because it was also revealed that these two variables had very weak positive correlation. It is in contrast to the result in the study of Szabo et al in 2022 that showed that the two variables had significant positive correlation. Nevertheless, the results of this study affirm the claim that teachers still do their job efficiently despite of any hurdle that they are facing (Szabo et al, 2022).

Based on the results of the study, the researchers came up with these recommendations.

On this basis, future research should consider expanding the variables to gather more comprehensive details on job satisfaction and performance. In addition, this study could also be done in different settings beyond the time of the pandemic. This could also be used in larger and more diverse populations.

In addition, this study revealed that the majority of teachers were satisfied considering the four dimensions of job satisfaction. This appeals to maintain and increase the progressive awareness of an organization of the importance of necessary compensation and benefits, the best possible leadership of administrators, inclusive and

meaningful social relationships, and a conducive work environment for employees regardless of their title, gender, and educational background. The resiliency of the teachers in any situation should not be romanticized as heroism and noble. The development and advancement of the system of the Department of Education should always consider the well-being and welfare of its teachers.

At the school level, the researchers recommend that the school may devise an annual or quarterly feedback mechanism that can measure or determine the teachers' status physically, emotionally, socially, professionally, spiritually, and others. In this way, the school can make intervention programs that can address the teachers' concerns and conditions. Thus, schools may help teachers to work efficiently and enthusiastically.

Lastly, it was concluded that there was not enough evidence that the teachers' job satisfaction had a significant relationship with their job performance as the data revealed that these two variables had a very weak positive correlation. On this basis, future research could consider other methodologies like interviews and focus group discussions (FGD) to have more comprehensive data on teachers' perceptions regarding their job satisfaction and performance. A mixed method could also give in-depth knowledge of this topic.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers would like to extend their deepest gratitude to all the people who helped in fulfilling this study.

- To the school heads who permitted them to conduct the study in the school.
- To all the teachers who did not hesitate to participate in the study.
- To Mr. Richard Oco for his guidance, generosity, and words of encouragement.
- To school district's panelist who gave constructive advice to improve the paper.
- To researchers' families and friends who provides them love and support all throughout their journey.

And most especially, to Almighty God who gives all the provision, wisdom, encouragement, strength, and endless opportunities.

REFERENCES

[1] Adeka, G., Mede, E. (2022 February). The Relationship between Wellbeing and Job Satisfaction of Instructors in English Programs.

ERIC.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?q=teachers+job+satisfaction+global+pandemic&id=EJ1339137>

- [2] Cherry, K. (2022, June 5). What is a correlational study?. Verywell Mind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/correlational-research-2795774>
- [3] Crossman, A. (2022, August 27). Understanding purposive sampling. ThoughtCo. <https://www.thoughtco.com/purposive-sampling-3026727>
- [4] Department of Education (2015, February 6). DO 2, S. 2015 – Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of the results-based performance management system (RPMS) in the Department of Education. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/02/06/do-2-s-2015-guidelines-on-the-establishment-and-implementation-of-the-results-based-performance-managementsystem-rpms-in-the-department-of-education/>
- [5] Dora, G. (2022 January – February). Teachers' Working Hours during the COVID-19 Pandemic. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=teachers+performance+global+pandemic&id=EJ1328554>
- [6] Fabula, K. (2022, March 31). How to make conceptual framework (with examples and templates). FilipiKnow. <https://filipiknow.net/conceptual-framework-example/#b-using-the-input-process-output-ipo-model>
- [7] Fransworth, B. (2019, July 11). Qualitative vs quantitative research – What is the difference?. Imotion. <https://imotions.com/blog/qualitative-vs-quantitative-research/>
- [8] Herman, K. (2021, November). Individual and School Predictors of Teacher Stress, Coping, and Wellness during the COVID-19 Pandemic. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=teachers+job+satisfaction+global+pandemic&id=EJ1316222>
- [9] Hilger, K., Scheibe, S., Frenzel, A., Keller, M. (2021 November). Exceptional Circumstances: Changes in Teachers' Work Characteristics and Well-Being during COVID-19 Lockdown. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=teachers+job+satisfaction+global+pandemic&id=EJ1316225>
- [10] Oco, R. (2022). Level of job satisfaction of public high school teachers: A survey. International Journal of Research Publications, 95. DOI: 10.47119/IJRP100951220222888

- [11] Streefkerk, R. (2022, July 15). Qualitative vs. quantitative research | Differences, examples & methods.
- [12] Surbhi, S. (2018, November 19). Difference between qualitative and quantitative research. Key Differences. <https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-qualitative-and-quantitative-research.html>
- [13] Szabo, E., Korodi, K., Szel, E., Jagodics, B. (2022). Facing the Inevitable: The Effects of Coronavirus Disease Pandemic and Online Teaching on Teachers' Self-Efficacy, Workload and Job Satisfaction. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=teachers+job+satisfaction+global+pandemic&id=EJ1329535>
- [14] Torofova, A., Myrbeg, E., Johansson, S. (2019, March 13). Teacher job satisfaction: the importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. Taylor & Francis Online. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247J>. Clerk Maxwell, A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism, 3rd ed., vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1892, pp.68–73.

