**Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, Work Commitment, and School Performance among Basic Education Public Schools: A Structural Equation Modeling**

**ABSTRACT**

Poor school performance remains a significant challenge for educators. This study aimed to determine the structural model of school performance by examining dimensions of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and work commitment of teachers. It employed a quantitative research design, utilizing descriptive-correlational and multiple theory-based structural equation modeling (SEM) to examine the relationship between exogenous and endogenous variables. The study revealed that all predictive variables comprised a combined degree of 54.8% influence on the criterion variable. As indicated by CMIN/DF (1.192), P-VALUE (0.307), NFI (0.996), TLI (0.997), CFI (0.999), GFI (0.996), RMSEA (0.022), and P-CLOSE (0.779), the best-fit model confirms the Social Exchange Theory. The results suggest that other variables not covered in this study may be explored to determine the 45.2% variance, which could provide deeper insights into the dynamics of school performance.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Poor school performance is a pressing and persistent concern for educators nationwide (Mosoge et al., 2018). Various studies have shown that schools with low-performance struggle to provide quality education, stressing their deficiency in educational outcomes (García-Jiménez et al., 2023). Moreover, underperforming schools indicate an insistent challenge to the educational system within basic academic institutions (Hoffman et al., 2020).

In South Africa, various studies revealed that non-affluent schools exhibit poor performance compared to wealthy schools despite increased educational expenditure (Adebayo et al., 2020). Moreover, in the United States, academic struggles among many Mexican-descent and other Hispanic groups are a widespread, well-documented, and persistent issue (Matute-Bianchi, 2022). Further, in developing nations like India and Indonesia, international testing results (e.g., PISA, 2022; TIMSS, 2022) indicate low school performance (Irnidayanti & Fadhilah, 2023; OECD, 2023); similarly, a notable percentage of schools in the Philippines have poor school performance, with public schools performing worse than private schools (Bernardo et al., 2022; Philippine Statistics Authority, 2018). A survey found that the Davao region ranks third in the Philippines for dropout rates, with 12.2%, surpassing the national average of 10% and negatively impacting overall school performance (Alipio, 2020; Rimando, 2016).

Consequently, poor school performance affects various aspects of learners' lives and societal outcomes. Schools with low-performance outcomes encounter challenges that contribute to decreased teacher job satisfaction and diminished dedication to their work (Luna-Colombo & Ávila-Rosales, 2022; Admiraal, 2022). Conversely, the quality of school performance influences teacher job satisfaction, commitment, and task performance by providing better resources, support systems, and professional growth opportunities (Rana et al., 2023; Yolanda & Said, 2022).

Numerous studies have investigated the interrelationship between school performance and factors such as perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and teachers' work commitment across different contexts. However, there is still a lack of comprehensive empirical research specifically focused on Region XI utilizing structural equation modeling (SEM). Moreover, the researcher did not find a study that examines all four variables within a single investigation, as most related studies focus on only two variables. The lack of scientific data on school performance in Region XI underscores this study's pressing need and significance to address the existing gap in literature and knowledge.

**1.1 Theoretical Framework**

This study was anchored on the Social Exchange Theory by Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005). The theory suggests that individuals form relationships based on the principle of reciprocity. Employees who perceive higher levels of organizational support are more likely to reciprocate with increased job satisfaction, more substantial work commitment, and, consequently, better performance in their roles (Yusuf, 2023).

**1.3 Statement of the Problem**

This study aimed to investigate the structural model of school performance by examining dimensions of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and work commitment of teachers in basic education public schools in the Davao Region. Specifically, this study was intended:

 1. To determine the levels of perceived organizational support in terms of career support, psychological support, personal support, and security support; job satisfaction of teachers in terms of environmental satisfaction, conscientious satisfaction, and volitional satisfaction; work commitment of teachers in terms of affective commitment; normative commitment; and continuous commitment; and school performance in terms of school leadership, management and operations; basic education services; learning environments; human resource management and development; and parent’s involvement and community partnership.

 2. To determine the significance of the correlation between perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, work commitment, and school performance.

 3. To determine the significance of the individual and combined degree of influence of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, work commitment on school performance.

 4. To identify the best-fit model based on the result that explains the school performance among basic education public schools.

**1.4 Hypotheses**

This research study had the following null hypotheses tested at 0.05 level of significance:

 Ho1. There is no significant relationship between perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, work commitment, and school performance.

 Ho2. There is no combined significant influence of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, work commitment on school performance.

 Ho3. There is no best-fit model that explains the school performance among basic education public schools.

1. **METHODOLOGY**

**2.1 Research Design**

This study employed quantitative research design, utilizing descriptive-correlational and multiple theory-based structural equation modeling (SEM) to examine the interrelationships between perceived organizational support (POS), job satisfaction, work commitment, and school performance. This method presented an advanced strategy for examining and evaluating theoretical models.

**2.2 Locale of the Study**

The study was conducted in the Davao Region, situated in the southern part of the Philippines. According to DepEd BEIS (2024), the region has 2,218 public schools and 486 private schools and 1,381,162 enrollees with the total number of teaching personnel position of 43,455 (25,808 in ES; 14, 391 in JHS, and 3,246 in SHS).

**2.3 Sample and Sampling**

The respondents in this study were the public-school teachers from Davao Region. The study used proportionate stratified random sampling to guarantee a balanced representation of respondents from various subgroups within the population. Out of a total population of 43,455, the researcher selected a sample of 400, which was stratified based on the levels of Elementary School (ES), Junior High School (JHS), and Senior High School (SHS) in basic education. The sample sizes for each stratum were 238, 132, and 30, respectively. The sample size for each stratum was allocated based on its proportion in the total population, ensuring that no subgroup was either overrepresented or underrepresented, reflecting the population's diversity while preserving statistical accuracy (Iliyasu & Etikan, 2021).

**2.4 Research Instrument**

The instrument utilized in this study was adapted survey questionnaires that underwent thorough validation by four experts in the field of research. The validation index of the instrument had an average rating of 4.475 or Excellent. These were pilot tested to 40 teachers of Tagugpo National High School and Tagugpo Elementary School. Results shown in testing the reliability and validity of the survey questionnaires were excellent. Additionally, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to evaluate the internal consistency or reliability of the questionnaire items. The results for perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, work commitment, and school performance were 0.955, 0.904, 0.873, and 0.955, respectively. The overall result was 0.968 which was greater than 0.9. It was interpreted as excellent in terms of internal consistency and greater reliability.

**2.5 Data Analysis**

This study utilized several statistical methods such as the *mean*, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r), multiple regression analysis, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to analyze data effectively. Moreover, the data collected was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) software.

1. **RESULTS**

**3.1 Descriptive Levels of Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, Work Commitment, and School Performance**

Presented in table 1 were the data on the levels and standard deviations (SD) of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, work commitment, and school performance among basic education public schools in Region XI.

**Table 1. Descriptive Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Indicators**  | **SD** | **Mean** | **Descriptive Level** |
| Perceived Organizational Support | 1. Career Support
 | 0.63 | 4.13 | High |
| 1. Psychological Support
 | 0.66 | 4.16 | High |
| 1. Personal Support
 | 0.63 | 4.03 | High |
| 1. Security Support
 | 0.61 | 4.02 | High |
| **Overall** | **0.57** | **4.08** | **High** |
| Job Satisfaction | 1. Environmental Satisfaction
 | 0.65 | 4.10 | High |
| 1. Conscientious Satisfaction
 | 0.54 | 4.18 | High |
| 1. Volitional Satisfaction
 | 0.60 | 4.24 | Very High |
| **Overall** | **0.55** | **4.17** | **High** |
| Work Commitment | 1. Affective Commitment
 | 0.73 | 3.95 | High |
| 1. Normative Commitment
 | 0.75 | 3.88 | High |
| 1. Continuous Commitment
 | 0.70 | 4.03 | High |
| **Overall** | **0.65** | **3.95** | **High** |
| School Performance | 1. School Leadership, Management and Operations
 | 0.59 | 4.24 | Very High |
| 1. Basic Education Services
 | 0.59 | 4.25 | Very High |
| 1. Learning Environment
 | 0.57 | 4.32 | Very High |
| 1. Human Resource Management and Development
 | 0.64 | 4.23 | Very High |
|  | 1. Parent’s Involvement and Community Partnership
 | 0.54 | 4.41 | Very High |
| **Overall** | **0.52** | **4.29** | **Very High** |

The data in table 1 revealed generally high levels of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, work commitment, and a very high mean score of school performance among basic education public schools. The variable 1, Perceived Organizational Support has an overall mean of 4.08, categorized as High and an overall standard deviation (SD) of 0.57. This indicates that the perceived organizational support is oftentimes experienced or observed by the respondents. In addition, variable 2 shows the levels of job satisfaction among teachers with an overall mean of 4.17 which has a descriptive level of High indicates that the job satisfaction of teachers is oftentimes manifested by the respondents. The overall standard deviation of 0.55 indicates relatively consistent responses across indicators.

Furthermore, variable 3 is the level of work commitment among teachers having an overall mean of 3.95, categorized as High. This indicates that the work commitment of teachers is oftentimes manifested by the respondents. An overall standard deviation of 0.65 shows moderate variability among the responses of the respondents. Finally, variable 4 is the level of school performance across five indicators obtaining an overall mean of 4.29, very high. This indicates that the school performance is always perceived or observed by the respondents. An overall standard deviation of 0.52 suggests low variability and high consistency in the responses.

**3.2 Test of Relationships**

The results on the correlation of the perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, work commitment, and school performance are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Table of Correlation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **School Performance** |
|  |  |
|  | **r** | **p-value** | **Decision on Ho** | **Interpretation** |
| **Perceived Organizational Support** | .641 | .000 | Reject | Significant |
| **Job Satisfaction of Teachers** | .697 | .000 | Reject | Significant |
| **Work Commitment of Teachers** | .606 | .000 | Reject | Significant |

The results show that the significant relationships between school performance towards perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and work commitment exists with a *P*-value of .000 which is less than 0.05 and an overall r-value of 0.641, 0.697, and 0.606; respectively. The strongest correlation is observed between School Performance and Job Satisfaction (r = .697, *P* = .000). Perceived Organizational Support also demonstrates a strong positive relationship with School Performance (r = .641, *P* = .000). Additionally, the Work Commitment exhibits a strong, albeit slightly weaker, relationship with School Performance (r = .606, *P* = .000). Given that the p-values for all relationships are below 0.05, the null hypotheses are rejected, confirming the significant relationships of these variables and School Performance.

**3.3 Test of Combined Influence**

Presented in Table 3 was the regression analysis on combined influence of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and work commitment on school performance.

**Table 3. Table of Degree of Influence**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **School Performance** |
|  |  | UnstandardizedCoefficients | Standardized Coefficients |  |  |
| **Independent Variables** | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig. | Decision on H0 | Interpretation |
| (Constant) | 1.202 | .143 |  | 8.410 | .000 |  |  |
| Perceived Organizational Support | .186 | .050 | .203 | 3.722 | .000 | Reject | Significant |
| Job Satisfaction of Teachers | .420 | .047 | .441 | 9.033 | .000 | Reject | Significant |
| Work Commitment of teachers | .146 | .041 | .181 | 3.576 | .000 | Reject | Significant |

 R = .740; R2 = .548; F-value = 159.784; p-value = 0.000

The results indicate that perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and work commitment significantly influence school performance, with a combined R value of .740. The F-value of 159.784 and a *P*-value of .000 confirm the overall significance of the regression model, and thereby, rejecting the null hypothesis. The R² value of .548 indicates that 54.8% of the variation in school performance can be explained by these three independent variables.

Among the independent variables, job satisfaction has the strongest influence on school performance, with the highest standardized Beta coefficient (β = .441) and a t-value of 9.033. Perceived organizational support has a moderate influence (β = .203, t = 3.722), indicating that organizational support positively contributes to school performance, although to a lesser extent than job satisfaction. Work commitment also has a significant, but slightly weaker, influence (β = .181, t = 3.576), reflecting the important role of teachers' commitment in enhancing performance.

**3.4 Best Fit model on School Performance among Basic Education Public Schools**

The goodness-of-fit indices result for the generated structural model is presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. Test of Best Fit Model on School Performance** **among Basic Education Public Schools**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | MODEL |  |  |  |
| INDEX | CRITERION | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | **Model 5** |
| CMIN/DF | <5 | 7.979 | 4.441 | 4.442 | 4.639 | **1.192** |
| P-VALUE | >0.05 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | **0.307** |
| NFI | >0.95 | 0.881 | 0.951 | 0.953 | 0.947 | **0.996** |
| TLI | >0.95 | 0.870 | 0.950 | 0.950 | 0.945 | **0.997** |
| CFI | >0.95 | 0.894 | 0.961 | 0.963 | 0.957 | **0.999** |
| GFI | >0.95 | 0.841 | 0.912 | 0.924 | 0.909 | **0.996** |
| RMSEA | <0.05 | 0.132 | 0.093 | 0.093 | 0.095 | **0.022** |
| P-CLOSE | >0.05 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | **0.779** |

Illustrated in Table 4 were the derived values of the goodness-of-fit model indices. Models 1 to 4 fall short from several criteria in model fitting. Model 5 exhibits the best overall fit. Its mean CMIN/DF is 1.192, satisfying the acceptable threshold of less than 5, indicating an excellent fit. The *P*-value of 0.307 surpasses the required >0.05 level, reinforcing the adequacy of the model. Furthermore, the goodness-of-fit indices—NFI (0.996), TLI (0.997), CFI (0.999), and GFI (0.996)—all exceed the criterion of >0.95. The RMSEA of 0.022 and P-CLOSE of 0.779 also meet their respective thresholds (<0.05 and >0.05), confirming that Model 5 outperforms the others in terms of both absolute and incremental fit measures. Overall, Model 5 is the most robust choice, indicating its suitability for analyzing school performance effectively.

* + 1. **Structural Model to Explain School Performance**

**Figure 1. Best Fit Model Showing the Interrelationships between Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, and Work Commitment and their Causal Relationships on School Performance.**

Work Commitment has a positive and significant effect on school Performance (Beta = 0.255, *P* = 0.037), and job satisfaction has a strong positive effect on school performance (Beta = 0.629, *P* < 0.001). However, perceived organizational support does not significantly affect school performance (Beta = -0.046, *P* = 0.787). Among the latent variables, career satisfaction (CS) and security support (SS) have high standardized weights (Beta = 0.865 and Beta = 0.855, respectively), indicating their strong relationship with perceived organizational support. Furthermore, affective commitment (AC) and continuous commitment (CC) show strong positive effects on work commitment (Beta = 0.942 and Beta = 0.677, respectively). These results highlight that while job satisfaction and work commitment significantly influence school performance, perceived organizational support does not have a direct significant impact in this case. However, its indirect effects through satisfaction and commitment underscore its importance within the broader organizational context.

1. **DISCUSSIONS**

**4.1 Descriptive Levels of Predictive and Criterion Variables**

High levels of perceived organizational support indicate that schools are effectively providing career, psychological, personal, and security-related support. Such findings align with the study which claims that employees who perceive high organizational support experience greater job satisfaction, higher engagement, and improved well-being (Eisenberger et al., 2020). On the contrary, when teachers feel unsupported, it can lead to various negative consequences, including burnout, decreased job satisfaction, and diminished innovative work behavior (Sari et al., 2023).

The study also indicates a strong perception of job satisfaction among teachers. The overall high level of job satisfaction reflects a balanced and positive perception of the teaching profession among educators. Findings on the study of Locke, (2016) noted that job satisfaction is a key predictor of employee performance and retention as teachers experiencing high levels of satisfaction are more likely to stay committed to their roles, exhibit higher productivity, and contribute positively to student outcomes. Conversely, several studies proved that job dissatisfaction is a leading cause of teacher attrition, with many educators leaving the profession due to unmet needs and lack of support which adversely affects their teaching quality and student performance (McJames et al., 2023).

The results further showed that the level of work commitment among teachers. The high levels of work commitment of teachers shows that teachers exhibit a balanced commitment across affective, normative, and continuous dimensions. Consistently, the study by Mowday (2018) highlighted that committed employees are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of effort and align their goals with those of the organization. However, a study argues that teachers with low commitment are less likely to prepare effectively for classes or adopt new teaching methods, which can hinder student learning experiences (Salinas-Aguirre et al., 2023). A decline in teacher commitment can foster a negative classroom atmosphere, impacting students' motivation and engagement (Nurlaeli, 2017)

Finally, the study indicates an overall very high level of school performance among basic education public schools. The result on school performance is often attributed to strong leadership, adequate resources, and a supportive environment that fosters both teacher and student success (Day et al., 2016). Research emphasizes that such partnerships contribute to improved student performance and help build a more cohesive and supportive school culture (Medina et al., 2020). Notably, schools with well-managed human resources are more likely to retain experienced teachers, which contributes to long-term educational improvements (Darling-Hammond, 2016).

**4.2 Relationships Between Predictive and Criterion Variables**

The significant positive relationship between perceived organizational support (POS), job satisfaction, work commitment, and school performance indicate the importance of support structures, higher teacher satisfaction, and dedication in achieving high institutional performance. Studies have shown that supportive work environments positively correlate teacher self-efficacy, which in turn enhances their ability to deliver quality education (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017). Also, Klassen and Kim (2017) found that teachers with high job satisfaction exhibit greater self-efficacy and are more likely to adopt innovative teaching practices, both of which enhance school performance. Prioritizing teacher well-being and commitment, schools can ensure that their educational goals are met effectively, benefiting both educators and learners (Mendez, 2024).

**4.3 Degree of Influence of Predictive Variables on Criterion Variable**

The overall regression analysis demonstrates that POS, job satisfaction, and work commitment collectively influence school performance. Research by Fullan (2016) highlights the interconnectedness of teacher support, satisfaction, and commitment in creating high-performing educational systems. Correspondingly, Khare & Stewart (2024) posits that by fostering these attributes, schools can ensure a positive and sustainable impact on institutional performance, benefiting both educators and learners alike. Eisenberger et al., (2020) underscore that organizational support mitigates burnout and enhances employee motivation, resulting in improved outcomes. Moreover, Day et al. (2016) noted that schools with highly committed teachers experience lower turnover rates and higher levels of collaboration, which are essential for maintaining educational quality.

**4.4 Best Fit Model on School Performance**

The results from the best-fit model highlight a positive exchange dynamic that can lead to enhanced school performance outcomes, as committed and satisfied teachers are motivated to exert greater effort, engage in professional development, and create positive learning environments that promote student achievement (Eisenberger et al., 2020; Meyer et al., 2017). More so, the finding aligns with Social Exchange Theory (SET) which emphasizes the give-and-take relationships between individuals and their organizations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Schools that invest in creating supportive environments and satisfaction not only enhance teacher well-being but also boost student success (Qadeer et al., 2024).

1. **CONCLUSION**

The study identified a best fit model illustrating the reciprocal relationships of perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and work commitment with the school performance. This best-fit model confirms the Social Exchange Theory. This theory underscores the reciprocal relationship between factors and outcomes. This framework provides a strategic foundation for educational leaders to design policies and interventions that promote collaboration and long-term organizational success.

1. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the study's findings, it is recommended that educational policymakers and school administrators should prioritize initiatives that enhance teacher job satisfaction, as it has the strongest influence on school performance. This can include promoting autonomy, providing recognition, and ensuring fair workload distribution. Schools should also focus on building robust parent and community partnerships to sustain high performance (SDG 11). Moreover, future researchers are encouraged to explore longitudinal studies that could examine the long-term effects of organizational support, satisfaction, and commitment to school performance. Further, other variables not covered in this study may be explored to determine the 45.2% variance which could provide deeper insights into the dynamics of school performance.
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**Appendix**

**Survey Questionnaire**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**PART 1. Perceived Organizational Support (POS)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Indicator and Statements** |
| **Perceived Organizational Support**1. **Career Support**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization tries to make my job as interesting as possible.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. My supervisors are proud that I am a part of the organization.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization is willing to help me when I need a special favor.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization strongly considers my goals and values.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization wishes to give me the best possible job I am qualified for.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization values my contribution to its well-being.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization cares about my opinions.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization would understand if I could not finish a task on time.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization would grant a reasonable request to change my working conditions.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Psychological Support**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. The organization would understand my long absence due to my illness.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization would consider and understand my absence because of a personal issue.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization takes complaints seriously and complies with the legal obligations for due process.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization thought that my value to the school would be further cemented with even a slight improvement in my performance.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Personal Support**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. If given the opportunity, the organization would take advantage of me.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization is interested in giving me the compensation I'm worth.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization shows concern for me.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization would recognize me if I did the best job possible.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization cares more about making a profit and looking into my welfare.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization highly regards my best interest when making decisions that affect me.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization appreciates any extra effort from me.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization provides me with an opportunity to move up the ranks.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Security Support**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. The organization feels that anyone could perform my job as well as I do.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If I were laid off, the organization would prefer to hire me back rather than someone new.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization feels there is enough to be gained in employing me for the rest of my career.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If the organization found a more efficient way to do my job, they would recommend me for advanced training.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The organization feels that hiring me is an asset to the school.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

**PART 2. Job Satisfaction**

|  |
| --- |
| **Indicator and Statements** |
| 1. **Environmental Satisfaction**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. the school heads handle/manage the teachers very well.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the school heads are competent in making decisions.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the policies are put into practice.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the school heads praise the teachers for doing a good job
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teacher's salaries are equal to the amount of work.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the job provides for my steady employment.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers were given the chance for advancement.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the working conditions are commendable.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the workers get along with each other.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Conscientious Satisfaction**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. the teachers’ work demands a lot of concentration.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers are given chance to do different things from time to time.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers are given chance to work alone on the job.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers are given chance to be “somebody” in the community.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers are given the chance to do something that makes use of their abilities.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers are given the chance to do things for other people.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers are given the chance to tell their colleagues what to do.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers have the chance to do things that do not go against
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Volitional Satisfaction**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. the teachers have the chance to do their methods of doing the job.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers have the freedom to use their own judgment.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers are happy with their work and show in them personally.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. the teachers experience a feeling of accomplishment in doing their job.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

**PART 3. Work Commitment**

|  |
| --- |
| **Indicator and Statements** |
| 1. **Affective Commitment**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. I would be pleased to spend the rest of my career.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. I do feel like a 'part of the family.'
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. I do feel 'emotionally attached'.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Normative Commitment**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. One of the primary reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe loyalty is important and, therefore, feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Continuous Commitment**

*In this school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. It would be hard to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. It would be too costly for me to leave my organization now.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Currently, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
 |  |  |  |  |  |

**PART 4. School Performance**

|  |
| --- |
| **Indicator and Statements** |
| 1. **School Leadership, Management, and Operations**

*The school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Plans and organizes activities according to the needs of the students.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Shows excellence in management and operations.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Provides systems and processes essential to the smooth day-to-day running of the school.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Ensures that the school meets its aims and objectives by delivering the School Development Plan and strategically and effectively using resources.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Fosters both a positive and motivating culture for staff and a high-quality learner experience.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Basic Education Services**

*The school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Provides instruction and training in a wide variety of subjects.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Supports students' learning with the aid of modern modalities.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Provides education that is suitable for all kinds of learners.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Addresses the gaps between the school and the community by providing basic education with skills, knowledge, and values to become caring, self-reliant, productive, and patriotic citizens.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Establishes and provides instructions and training for a variety of subjects/courses.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Learning Environment (New Normal)**

*The school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Operates and can follow protocols implemented by the government.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adapts to the new normal and is capable of implementing new learning modalities.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Manages virtual classroom behavior.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Sustains education by supporting the students' needs despite the new normal.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Assesses student learning amidst the rapid shift of evaluation and teaching process.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Human Resource Management and Development**

*The school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Attracts and develops positive motivation to achieve the school's mission.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Empower the whole school organization to achieve common goals.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Integrates training and career development to improve school effectiveness.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Utilizes programs to improve teachers' skills and develop more abilities.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Provides developmental programs to increase school heads, teachers, and students' performance growth.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Parent's Involvement and Community Partnership**

*The school…* | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| 1. Encourages the parents and communities to participate actively in every activity and program.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents and the community are involved in identifying issues and problems and locating solutions for it.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents and the community help the school with project accomplishments.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents and the community plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate school programs and activities.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Schools, parents, families, and communities are open to working together to enhance school programs.
 |  |  |  |  |  |