RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 10, Page 671-675 | Article No. 74
DOI: 10.4898/jenerv2i10.a74
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

The Job Satisfaction and the Teaching Performance of the Public Elementary School Teachers in Buenavista District II, Division of Quezon

Mitos F. Marcaida[1]

[1]School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: October 2026

Keywords:
Teacher Job Satisfaction
Self-Reported Teaching Performance
Working Conditions
Collaboration
Compensation
Kendall Concordance

ABSTRACT

The study described job satisfaction and self-reported teaching-performance indicators among 108 public elementary teachers in eleven schools of Buenavista District II, Division of Quezon, during school year 2025–2026. A descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey used complete enumeration, a 110-item questionnaire, weighted means, Kendall's W, and chi-square tests of three school zones' indicator rankings. Collegial relationships were the highest satisfaction domain (3.85); salary, benefits, and compensation were lowest (2.58); the detailed narrative gives an overall satisfaction mean of 3.39. Professional collaboration and engagement led teaching-performance ratings (3.85), and work commitment and productivity was lowest (3.46). Three of five satisfaction domains, but none of five performance domains, had significant reported rank concordance at .05. The analysis compares zone rankings within domains; it does not test an individual-level association between satisfaction and independently measured performance. The results point to compensation and resources as priorities for local inquiry while limiting claims about performance effects.

1. Introduction

Teacher satisfaction reflects experiences of supervision, resources, compensation, relationships, and recognition. These aspects may vary even when an overall scale score suggests general satisfaction. Toropova et al. (2021) showed that working conditions and teacher characteristics are relevant to satisfaction in a separately measured setting. The present study concerns public elementary teachers in Buenavista District II and profiles these aspects alongside appraisals of teaching practices.

The title places satisfaction and performance together, but the reported inferential analysis asks a narrower question: whether three school zones similarly rank indicators within each satisfaction and performance domain. This is not an estimate of the association between each teacher's satisfaction score and an independently assessed teaching-performance score. The distinction matters when moving from descriptive priorities to policy recommendations. A favorable classroom-practice rating cannot show that job satisfaction improved instruction.

The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (Department of Education [DepEd], 2017) provide a frame for considering professional practice, while Hargreaves and O'Connor (2018) emphasize purposeful collaboration. Neither reference supplies missing performance observations in Buenavista. The study's questions addressed the extent of satisfaction, zone rank agreement, the extent of reported teaching performance, zone rank agreement for that second set, and policy responses.

2. Methods

2.1 Design, respondents, and setting

The study identified a descriptive–evaluative–correlational design. It completely enumerated 108 public elementary teachers in eleven schools, organized into three zones in Buenavista District II for school year 2025–2026. The respondent table lists 42 in Zone 1, 35 in Zone 2, and 31 in Zone 3. The school counts are three, four, and four, respectively. All teachers were included according to the methods; an invitation or nonresponse record and individual characteristics were not provided.

Zone differences can reflect combinations of staffing, resources, and school context. The zones are clusters of schools rather than random treatment groups. The analysis did not present teacher-level satisfaction paired with an independent observation or rating of teaching, so the design's correlational label should not be read as a demonstrated satisfaction–performance relationship.

2.2 Questionnaire and procedure

The researcher-made instrument contained 110 items: 56 concerning five job-satisfaction domains (12, 12, 11, 11, and 10) and 54 concerning five teaching-performance domains (12, 10, 11, 10, and 11). Five response categories produced weighted means. On the satisfaction scale, 3.50–4.49 was Much Satisfied and 2.50–3.49 Satisfied; on the performance scale, the analogous categories were Much Evident and Evident. Domain labels and scale bands were maintained when presenting the reported means.

Expert validation, item analysis, and Cronbach's alpha were described. The methods say each item correlation was at least 0.50 and that alpha met a 0.70 threshold; they do not give a computed alpha more precise than the threshold, pilot size, item-level matrix, or domain-specific estimates. Questionnaires were administered and tabulated, but exact dates, response handling, and any independent verification of practice were not specified. The study proposes recommendations, not an evaluated intervention.

2.3 Statistical analysis

Frequencies, percentages, weighted means, and ranks described responses. Kendall's W and chi-square approximations tested

concordance in indicator rankings among the three school zones at .05. The cases in those tests were domain indicators, not 108 teachers. A significant result means a similar ordering of indicators across three aggregated zone profiles; a nonsignificant result is a failure to establish rank agreement and does not prove the profiles differ. The W and χ^2 pairs are retained as printed.

3. Results

3.1 Respondent profile

Table 1. Teacher distribution across zones

Zone	Schools	Teachers	Printed %
Zone 1	3	42	39
Zone 2	4	35	32
Zone 3	4	31	29
Grand total	11	108	100

Note. Counts and rounded percentages follow the respondent table.

Zone 1 contributed the largest share of respondents, yet each zone supplied one aggregate rank order for the concordance analysis. Table 1 does not establish the proportion of teachers who were satisfied within each school, nor does it show whether resource conditions were common across schools in a zone. The different zone sizes therefore have different implications for the descriptive mean and for the three-ranker test.

3.2 Job-satisfaction ratings and rank agreement

Table 2. Summary of job-satisfaction domains

Domain	Overall Wx	Scale category
Quality of Supervision and Support	3.62	Much Satisfied
Working Conditions and Available Resources	3.27	Satisfied
Salary, Benefits, and Compensation	2.58	Satisfied
Relationships and Collaboration with Colleagues	3.85	Much Satisfied
Recognition and Appreciation Received	3.64	Much Satisfied
Overall mean stated in findings narrative	3.39	Satisfied

Note. The five domain means and 3.39 overall mean are reported in the detailed findings. The study abstract and some narrative passages disagree about the category for 3.62–3.64; this table applies the stated 3.50 cut point.

Relationships and collaboration led satisfaction, while compensation trailed far below the other domains. The overall Satisfied category conceals that spread. The lower working-conditions and compensation ratings identify areas for document-based follow-up—workload, teaching resources, and benefits processing—rather than proving a particular grievance occurred at every school. Recognition and supervision were in the Much Satisfied band despite remaining below collegial relationships.

Table 3. Reported concordance of satisfaction-item rankings

Domain	W	χ^2	Printed threshold	Decision at .05
Quality of Supervision and Support	0.45	13.50	$p > .05$	Not significant
Working Conditions and Available Resources	0.88	26.40	$p < .005$	Significant
Salary, Benefits, and Compensation	0.75	20.25	$p < .025$	Significant
Relationships and Collaboration with Colleagues	0.15	4.05	$p > .05$	Not significant
Recognition and Appreciation Received	0.68	16.32	$p < .05$	Significant

Note. W, χ^2, threshold and decisions are as reported in the study's Table 9 and findings. Thresholds are not exact p values.

Three satisfaction domains showed significant concordance in zone rankings, whereas supervision and collegial relationships did not. The stronger agreement on working conditions does not imply good conditions: its mean was only 3.27. Similarly, a low W for collegial relationships does not contradict the domain's high overall rating. The former compares item orderings across zones; the latter describes rating level. The results point to questions about which particular supports differ in emphasis, not a proven difference in satisfaction among individual teachers.

3.3 Reported teaching performance and concordance

Table 4. Summary of teaching-performance domains

Domain	Overall Wx	Scale category
Instructional Effectiveness	3.64	Much Evident
Classroom Management Practices	3.70	Much Evident
Work Commitment and Productivity	3.46	Evident
Professional Collaboration and Engagement	3.85	Much Evident
Job Commitment and Dedication	3.77	Much Evident

Note. Domain means and categories follow the detailed findings and five-point performance scale. These are survey appraisals rather than independent performance measures.

Professional collaboration again led the domains, paralleling the satisfaction profile. Work commitment and productivity was the only domain below the Much Evident cut point. This descriptive coincidence does not establish that satisfaction caused collaboration or productivity. The questionnaire may capture overlapping attitudes across its two parts, and the reported analysis does not pair individual scores or adjust for workload and school context. A practical review could separately score lesson artifacts, feedback, and planned work.

Table 5. Reported concordance of teaching-performance item rankings

Domain	W	χ^2	Printed threshold
Instructional Effectiveness	0.16	4.80	p > .05
Classroom Management Practices	0.64	15.36	p > .05
Work Commitment and Productivity	0.26	7.02	p > .05
Professional Collaboration and Engagement	0.34	8.16	p > .05
Job Commitment and Dedication	0.23	6.21	p > .05

Note. All five decisions were reported as nonsignificant at .05 in Table 16. The χ^2 calculations rely on indicator ranks by three zones. None of the performance-domain rankings reached the study's .05 agreement threshold. Even classroom management, with W = 0.64, was reported nonsignificant under its item count. The table does not indicate that the teachers' classroom management was poor, or that the zones' performance levels differed statistically. It says only that consistent ordering of the indicators was not established. The raw ranks and tie treatment would show which practices were emphasized differently.

3.4 Selected priorities from detailed findings

Table 6. Selected survey indicators illustrating lower-rated areas

Statement or indicator	Reported Wx	Scale category
Lessons are explained clearly to learners	3.98	Much Evident
Lesson concepts are related to real-life situations	3.27	Evident
Teaching practices are continuously improved	3.44	Evident
Work Commitment and Productivity domain	3.46	Evident

Note. The first three item means and classifications follow the detailed Instructional Effectiveness findings; the final domain mean is from Table 15.

The item-level gap within instructional effectiveness is important: clarity of explanation was rated more favorably than relating content to everyday situations or continuous improvement. A teacher can deliver a clear explanation yet have less opportunity to adapt tasks, connect examples to pupil experience, and revisit practice. These ratings cannot establish how often those acts occurred; lesson observations and pupil work would be needed to check their quality.

3.5 Item-level contrasts for working conditions and recognition

Table 7. Selected working-condition and resource indicators

Statement in findings	Overall Wx	Scale category
The classroom is safe, clean, and conducive to learning	3.60	Much Satisfied
The school maintains classroom facilities	3.24	Satisfied
Teaching materials are available when needed	3.17	Satisfied
I have access to functional equipment	3.15	Satisfied
I have access to digital or multimedia resources	3.04	Satisfied
The number of students in my class is manageable	2.95	Satisfied

Note. Selected item means and categories follow the detailed working-conditions narrative and stated scale. Wording is shortened only where needed for width.

The classroom environment item rated Much Satisfied, while resource availability and manageable class size remained in the Satisfied band. The distinction matters for deciding what a "working conditions" response might mean. A teacher may value cleanliness and safety but still have insufficient materials or face a demanding number of pupils. The survey does not measure actual room size, number of students, or the functionality of equipment, so no specific resource deficit can be declared from these ratings alone. This item pattern offers a more concrete route for investigation than the broad 3.27 domain mean. School heads could compare class rosters with the intended staffing and room capacity, inventory commonly used materials, and invite teachers to identify which equipment interrupts instruction. If these checks confirm a need, any intervention should document both delivery and whether teachers could use the resource. The present cross-sectional appraisal provides a priority signal, not a before-and-after evaluation of school conditions.

Table 8. Selected recognition and appreciation indicators

Statement in findings	Overall Wx	Scale category
I receive appreciation for my work	3.90	Much Satisfied
Recognition motivates me to perform better	3.73	Much Satisfied
My efforts are recognized by the school head	3.72	Much Satisfied
My achievements are acknowledged	3.71	Much Satisfied
I am satisfied with the recognition I receive	3.35	Satisfied

Note. Means and categories follow the detailed recognition findings. These items ask about related but different experiences.

The general experience of appreciation was rated more favorably than satisfaction with the recognition received. A person can acknowledge that recognition occurs and still find its form, fairness, or frequency less satisfying. The survey does not reveal whether particular schools differ in recognition practices or whether teachers prefer private feedback, formal awards, or career support. It would be inappropriate to assume a single recognition program will address the gap. Role-specific interviews could identify what teachers actually value.

Tables 7 and 8 help distinguish material and social supports. The satisfaction score for collegial relationships was highest, while several resource items were weaker. This does not mean collaboration compensates for missing resources. It suggests separate routes

for policy design: operational checks of materials and class size, and conversation with teachers about recognition and feedback. Neither route was implemented or evaluated as part of the reported study.

4. Discussion

The satisfaction profile reflects a marked separation between social and material dimensions. Collegial relationships were high, while salary, benefits, and compensation had the lowest mean. Toropova et al. (2021) argue from empirical data that school working conditions matter for job satisfaction; the present local means identify candidate conditions for inquiry without estimating the size of any causal effect. Administrative data on compensation timeliness and classroom resources would help distinguish perception from delivery problems.

The teaching-performance domains are respondent appraisals. They neither establish a professional-standard rating under the PPST (DepEd, 2017) nor provide evidence that pupils learned more. The favorable collaboration rating suggests a potential channel for professional learning, and Hargreaves and O'Connor (2018) distinguish purposeful collaboration from simple collegiality. A follow-up could document shared planning and observe how jointly developed lessons change, while protecting the distinction between a teacher's attitude and instructional quality.

The inferential results answer questions about rank agreement within domains. Significant concordance for working conditions, compensation, and recognition means the zones ranked component items similarly; it does not compare satisfaction means between zones. Nonsignificant performance concordance does not mean every zone differs or that instructional effectiveness is absent. Individual-level analysis, with within-school clustering considered, would be required to assess an association between satisfaction and teaching practice.

Policy responses suggested in the study include teacher welfare, supervision, recognition, development, and collaboration. The evidence most directly prioritizes compensation and conditions for closer review. Before a program is adopted, administrators can examine payroll and benefits records, resource inventories, and teacher feedback by school, then define outcomes to monitor. A teacher-development initiative should specify the practice to be improved and collect a baseline and a follow-up lesson artifact. The present ranking exercise did not evaluate any of these proposed remedies.

Limitations include the single-district setting, self-report for both sets of constructs, absent paired score analysis, and no independently observed teaching or learner outcomes. The alpha statement lacks a full numerical estimate and reproducible item data. Descriptive category labels for some means conflict across the study abstract and detailed narrative, although the numerical means are stable. It is therefore premature to attribute performance to satisfaction or generalize to other districts. The study offers a local map of perceived needs and of zone ranking concordance.

If the purpose is to test the title's implied relationship, a future analysis would require paired teacher-level measures. Satisfaction domains could be scored with a validated instrument, and instructional practice could be assessed by observers who do not know teachers' satisfaction responses. The analysis would report association estimates and uncertainty, account for school clustering, and avoid inferring causation from a cross-sectional correlation. A longitudinal design might also record changes in working conditions before changes in teacher outcomes, although confounding would still require attention.

The mean categories can obscure heterogeneity. The 3.39 overall satisfaction score and 3.85 collegial mean should be accompanied by response distributions and school-level ranges. A handful of very low compensation ratings may produce a different policy implication from a broad pattern of moderate ratings, yet both could yield the same average. The current aggregate results do not permit that distinction. Collecting the distribution and documenting nonresponse would make the descriptive profile more useful for administrators and teachers alike.

The five satisfaction domains represent different aspects of work rather than interchangeable indicators of one experience. Professional growth and instructional autonomy were relatively favorable, while recognition was lowest at 2.58. Teachers may value opportunities to teach and develop while feeling that contributions are not acknowledged, but the survey does not show which recognition arrangements were available or whether the same teachers rated these domains differently. Item distributions, teacher interviews, and descriptions of recognition practices would explain the descriptive result without attributing it to an unobserved management decision.

The five performance-domain means range from 3.46 to 3.85. The study did not pair an individual teacher's satisfaction score with that teacher's performance score in the reported analysis. Thus two sets of summaries cannot establish that greater satisfaction predicts better performance. A district association would require linked observations for each participant, a stated model, an estimate with uncertainty, and attention to school clustering and other influences. Self-reported performance should also be checked against a defined classroom-observation criterion before it is interpreted as demonstrated teaching quality.

The significance tests concern agreement in the ordering of questionnaire statements among three zones. High W means zones tended to order statements similarly; it does not measure a satisfaction–performance relationship. Treating statements as test cases differs from using 108 teachers as independent analytic units. A small p threshold must be weighed against rounding, tied ranks, and only three profiles. Unrounded means, each zone ranking, and the exact handling of ties would make the calculation verifiable and its scope clear.

Table 7 separates favorable classroom safety and cleanliness from lower ratings for material access and manageable class size. The questionnaire cannot tell whether resources were unavailable, unsuitable, or inconvenient at the time of rating. An inventory, class roster, and lesson observation could identify the concrete constraint. If a need is confirmed, an intervention could assess whether functional resources reached classrooms and whether teachers used them. A later satisfaction score alone would not establish that a change improved instruction.

Descriptive labels near 3.62 and 3.64 conflict with the stated classification bands and require reconciliation. The empirical conclusion remains limited: teachers reported heterogeneous satisfaction and generally favorable performance appraisals, with concordant zone-level item rankings. The cross-sectional design, shared response method, and absence of learner or observed instruction measures constrain explanations of why. Toropova et al. (2021) offer a framework for working conditions, but their findings cannot supply a causal explanation for these local ratings.

Recognition is also a multidimensional administrative question. Formal awards, feedback from a head, peer acknowledgement, and opportunities to contribute expertise may not be experienced in the same way. The instrument's domain mean cannot identify which of these arrangements was absent or unsatisfactory. Before acting on the 2.58 rating, a school could ask teachers to describe particular episodes and compare the stated recognition policy with its implementation. Such inquiry should avoid assuming that recognition is necessarily the most important determinant of performance merely because its satisfaction mean is the lowest. The study did not estimate relative predictors of performance.

A further measurement issue is the proximity of several domain means to verbal-category cut points. A score of 3.62 or 3.64 may acquire a different label if the analyst uses a different scoring key, although the underlying numerical ordering remains. The methods should publish the five response anchors, closed interval boundaries, and rule for rounding item and domain means. If scores were first averaged across teachers and then across indicators, that procedure should be distinguished from averaging all responses at once. Equal weighting of statements and unequal zone sizes may yield different summaries. The study does not provide the unrounded data needed to resolve these choices.

The zone analysis would be more informative if it placed the observed means and their variability beside the rank tests. Nearly identical ranks can coexist with different levels, and similar levels can mask different rank orders. A teacher-level model could estimate the association of a clearly measured satisfaction construct with independently observed teaching practice while accounting for zone and school. Even then, the cross-sectional timing would leave direction uncertain: favorable conditions might support practice, teachers who perceive success might report higher satisfaction, or both might reflect another circumstance. The present study warrants locally focused inquiry, not an attribution of teaching performance to job satisfaction.

5. Conclusion

The study reported overall job satisfaction as Satisfied (3.39), with collegial relationships highest (3.85) and compensation lowest (2.58). Four of five teaching-performance domains were rated Much Evident, while work commitment and productivity was Evident (3.46). Three satisfaction domains and no performance domains showed significant zone rank concordance. These findings support targeted review of compensation, resources, and professional support, but the data do not establish a satisfaction–performance association or a causal improvement in teaching.

References

[1] Department of Education. (2017). DO 42, s. 2017: National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers-2/

[2] Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all. Corwin.

[3] Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. Educational Review, 73(1), 71–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247