Vol. 34 · October 2018
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v34i1.630

Print ISSN 2012-3981
Online ISSN 2244-0445

Teachers Performance in Relation to Pupils Academic Achievement in Kabankalan City

MARJON C. MALACAPAY
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9564-1286
mcmalacapay@gmail.com
Central Philippines State University (CPSU)-Sipalay Campus
Sipalay City, Negros Occidental, Philippines

Originality: 100% • Grammar Check: 100% • Plagiarism: 0%

ABSTRACT

Teacher's performance in relation to pupils' academic achievement is a quantitative type of research that utilized the descriptive-correlational design. The study aimed to determine the relationship between teachers' performance in terms of teaching-learning process, pupils' outcome, community involvement, and professional growth to their pupils' academic achievement. The researcher distributed a two-part survey questionnaire to the teachers (n=117) covering their demographic profile, and the four performance indicators, while only the second part was distributed to the observers/raters. The researcher then utilized descriptive and inferential statistics for data analysis. Young female teachers, mostly Teacher-I, between a 1-5 year in service, receiving six to ten thousand Pesos (P6,000-10,000) monthly net income and had 21-30 accumulated training hours dominated the population. Also, findings showed that teachers performed very satisfactory, but pupils only performed satisfactorily in terms of academics. Moreover, the teaching-learning process and pupils' outcome have significant relationships on teachers' length of service. A significant difference

was only found in rural and urban teachers' community involvement. Lastly, a significant relationship on pupils' academic achievement was only found on teachers' community involvement. Therefore, among the performance indicators, teachers' community involvement solely affects pupils' academic performance but they least prioritize it.

Keywords — Basic education, teachers' performance, academic achievement, descriptive-correlational, Kabankalan City, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Performance Evaluation measures the progress of employees based on job responsibilities. This is done to provide solutions for career advancement (Sawchuk, 2015). In the academe, the best way to do this is to look at teachers' on-the-job performance since effective teachers produce better performing students (Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley 2007, Cheruvalath, 2012; Education, 2018). In the study conducted by UNICEF on Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA), they found out that teachers' quality is low (Martin, 2018). In Lebanon, 50 percent of teachers are not qualified (Buckland, 2004) and in Nigeria, Ijov, Hemen, Austin, and Akinyemi (2016) they recommended that schools should employ competent and qualified teachers.

In the 2017 PISA result, a triennial international survey which evaluates education systems worldwide revealed that Thailand and Indonesia's educational system continue to remain in the bottom while Singapore is in the lead (Sheng, 2017). Thai students' low rank was due to Thai teachers' higher-order thinking questioning struggle and poor command of the English language. Indonesian students, on the other hand, had a high number of low performers due to teachers' absenteeism (Sheany, 2017) while Singapore's lead was due to the country's initiative known as C2015 which focuses on student's disposition development, confidence level, self-directed, and active citizen (Ministry of Education Singapore, 2008a).

In the Philippines, numerous studies on teacher's performance were conducted. A 2015 study of Punongbayan, & Bauyon (2015) as an example, assessed the instructional performance of one State University in the Philippines. Findings showed that teachers performed very good as perceived by themselves but only satisfactory according to their students. The study focused on tertiary teachers only, and students and teachers themselves were the raters. If noticed,

this does not involve external raters such as parents. The researcher believed that it is a must to conduct a study that correlates teachers' performance and pupil's academic achievement because according to Mangiante (2011), teachers make a difference in students' academic growth.

FRAMEWORK

The study is in line to the Social Learning Theory of Bandura (1977) which states that children learn as they observe other people. In school, teachers are considered models from whom pupils learn.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study determined the relationship between teachers' performance and pupils' academic achievement. Specifically, it described teachers': (1) demographic profile as to age, sex, length of service, position, net income and training/ seminars attended; (2) level of teachers' performance when grouped according to teaching-learning process, pupils' outcome, community involvement, and professional growth and development; (3) level of pupils' academic achievement; (4) significant relationship between performance and demographic profile of teacher-respondents; (5) significant difference between teachers' performance when categorize into rural and urban schools, and public and private schools; and (6) significant relationship between teachers' performance and pupils' academic achievement.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This quantitative type of research utilized the descriptive-correlational design and employed the survey method to obtain information.

Participants

The 117 teachers specifically 36 came from rural, 59 from urban, and 22 from private schools identified handling grades 4 to 6 pupils became respondents. They rated themselves, by 5 peers, 5 pupils, 5 parents, and 1 school head. A total of 1,640 perceptions were gathered. Schools including the school heads, teachers, pupils, and parents who refused to answer were not forced due to ethical

consideration. Rather, the researcher decided not to count them on the number of respondents.

Instrumentation

The researcher utilized a 20-item self-made survey questionnaire patterned from the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) and Competency-based Performance Assessment Test (CB-PAST) of the Department of Education and utilized the progress report card (Form 137) as the basis of pupils' academic achievement.

It also adopted the IPCRF rating scale and interpretation (4.500-5.000 – Outstanding, 3.500-4.499- Very Satisfactory, 2.500-3.499- Satisfactory, 1.500-2.499- Unsatisfactory, and below 1.499- Poor), and the grade bracketing and interpretations from pupils' report card 75 to 79 (Fairly Satisfactory), 80 to 84 (Satisfactory), 85 to 89 (Very Satisfactory), and 90 to 100(Outstanding).

The survey questionnaire was written in English and developed into a Likert-type questionnaire. It was composed of 2 parts: Demographic profile and teachers' performance indicators. The demographic profile includes the participant's name, school, type of school, age, sex, length of service, position, net income, relevant training/seminars attended, and the general average of pupils on the subject/s handled. The performance indicators were categorized into the teaching-learning process, the pupil's outcome, community involvement, and professional growth.

Validity and Reliability of the Research Instruments

The survey instrument scored excellent (4.74) after criterion validity and very high (0.99) coefficient after administering reliability tests.

Data Gathering Procedure

The two-month data gathering started by sending letters to the Division Superintendent, private school administrators, district supervisors, and principals of Kabankalan City and last to the respondents.

Data Analyses Procedure

The data gathered were analyzed using frequency distribution and percentages for teachers' demographic profile, mean for pupil's academic achievement, and Pearson-product moment correlation and t-test for significant relationships and difference between variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of Elementary Teachers

Table 1. Age Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Frequency Counts and Percentage

Age	Rural		Urban		Private		Total	
(in years)	F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%
21-30	12	29	16	38	14	33	42	36
31-40	17	42	15	38	8	20	40	34
41-50	5	23	17	77	0	0	22	19
51-60	1	8	11	92	0	0	12	10
61 & above	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	1
Total	35		60		22		117	100

It shows that 36% of the respondents ages between 21 to 30 (R= 29%, U= 38%, P= 33%), 34% ages 31 to 40 (R=42%, U= 38%, P= 20%), 19% ages 41 to 50 (R= 23%, U= 17%, P= 0%), 10% ages 51 to 60 (R= 8%, U= 92%, P= 0%), and only 1% ages 61 years and above (R= 0%, U= 100%, P= 0%).

Table 2. Sex Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Frequency Counts and Percentage

Sex	Rural		Urban		Private		Total	
	F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%
Male	8	30	10	37	9	33	27	23
Female	27	30	50	56	13	14	90	77
Total	35		60		22		117	100

It shows that 77% (R=30%, U= 56%, P= 14%) of teachers, mostly from urban schools, were female while 23% (R=30%, U= 37%, P= 33%) were male teachers.

Table 3. Length of Service Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Frequency Counts and Percentage

Length of Service (in years)	Rural		Urban		Private		Total	
	F	%	f	%	F	%	F	%
1-5	16	36	13	29	15	35	44	38
6-10	7	32	9	41	6	27	22	19
11-15	4	25	11	69	1	6	16	14
16-20	4	31	9	69	0	0	13	11
21-25	2	18	9	82	0	0	11	9
26-30	2	29	5	71	0	0	7	6
31 & above	1	25	4	75	0	0	5	3
Total	35		60		22		117	100

It shows that 38% (R= 36%, U= 29%, P= 35%) of teachers are 1-5 years in service, 19% (R= 32%, U= 41%, P= 27%) are 6-10 years, 14% are 11-15 years, 11% (R= 31%, U= 69%, P= 0%) are 16-20 years, 9% (R= 18%, U= 82%, P= 0%) are 21-25 years, 6% (R= 29%, U= 71%, P= 7%) are 26-30 years and 3% (R= 25%, U= 75%, P= 0%) are 31 years and above in service.

Table 4. Position Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Frequency Counts and Percentage

Position	Rural		Urban		Private		Total	
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Teacher I	30	38	28	35	22	27	80	68
Teacher II	1	11	8	72	0	0	9	8
Teacher III	1	7	14	93	0	0	15	13
Master Teacher I	3	27	8	73	0	0	11	9
Master Teacher II	0	0	2	100	0	0	2	2
Total	35		60		22		117	100

It shows that 68% (R=38%, U= 35%, P= 27%) are Teacher I, 13% (R=7%, U= 93%, P= 0%) are Teacher III, 9% (R= 27%, U= 73%, P= 0%) are Master Teacher I, 8% (R= 11%, U= 72%, P= 0%) are Teacher II, and 2% (R= 0%, U= 100%, P= 0%) are Master Teacher II.

Table 5. Net Income Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Frequency Counts and Percentage

Net Income	Rural		Urban		Private		Total	
(in thousands)	f	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1-5	3	23	9	69	1	8	13	10
6-10	6	18	15	45	12	37	33	28
11-15	9	31	12	41	8	28	29	25
16-20	13	45	15	52	1	3	29	25
21-25	4	40	6	60	0	0	10	9
26-30	0	0	2	100	0	0	2	2
31-35	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	1
Total	35		60		22		117	100

It shows that 28% (R= 18%, U= 45%, P= 37%) of teachers have a 6-10 thousand pesos monthly net income, 25% (R= 31%, U= 41%, P= 28%) has an 11-15 thousand pesos, 25% (R= 45%, U= 52%, P= 3%) has a 16-20 thousand pesos, 9% (R= 40%, U= 60%, P= 0%) has a 21-25 thousand pesos, 2% (R= 0%, U= 100%, P= 0%) has a 26-30 thousand pesos, and 1% (R= 0%, U= 100%, P= 0%) of them has a monthly net income of 31-35 thousand pesos.

Table 6. Training Hours Distribution of Elementary Teachers in Frequency Counts and Percentage

Training	Rural		Urban		Private		Total	
Hours	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%
1-10	0	0	12	63	7	37	19	16
11-20	10	36	9	32	9	32	28	24
21-30	5	17	20	66	5	17	30	25
31-40	5	42	6	50	1	8	12	10
41-50	7	54	6	46	0	0	13	11
51-60	5	60	4	40	0	0	9	9
61 & above	3	50	3	50	0	0	6	5
Total	35		60		22		117	100

It shows that 25% (R= 17%, U= 66%, P= 17%) of them spent an accumulated 21-30 hours training, 24% (R= 36%, U= 32%, P= 32%) spent 11-20 hours, 16% (R= 0%, U= 63%, P= 37%) spent 1-10 hours, 11% (R= 54%, U= 46%, P= 0%) spent 41-50 hours, 9% (R= 60%, U= 40%, P= 0%) spent 51-60 hours training, and 5% (R= 50%, U= 50%, P= 0%) spent an accumulated 61 and above hours of training.

Table 7. Mean of the performance level of private, rural, and urban teachers

School	Teaching-learning Process (TLP)	Pupils Outcome (PO)	Community Involvement (CI)	Professional Growth (PG)	As a Whole
Private	4.51	4.58	4.36	4.54	4.5
Rural	4.51	4.59	4.65	4.58	4.58
Urban	4.38	4.39	4.3	4.4	4.37
Total	4.44	4.49	4.42	4.48	4.46

Having a grand mean of 4.58, rural school teachers lead by outstandingly performing in four indicators (TLP= 4.51, PO= 4.59, CI= 4.65, PG= 4.58), followed by private school teachers (4.5) with three outstanding performances (TLP= 4.51, PO= 4.58, CI= 4.36, PG= 4.54) except for community (very satisfactory), and last is an urban school which with a 4.37 mean and performed very satisfactorily (TLP= 4.51, PO= 4.58, CI= 4.36, PG= 4.54). Noticeably pupils' outcome was teachers' top priority (PO= 4.49, PG= 4.48, TLP= 4.41, CI= 4.42) while community involvement was their least priority.

Table 8. Mean of Pupils Academic Performance Level

Academic Performance	Mean	Interpretation
Private	2.60	Satisfactory
Rural	2.57	Satisfactory
Urban	2.44	Satisfactory
Grand Mean	2.51	Satisfactory

It shows that pupils perform satisfactorily (2.51) in their academics wherein private school pupils lead at 2.60 means, followed by rural (2.57), and urban pupils (2.44) respectively.

Table 9. The Relationship Between the Teachers' Performance and Age

	Teaching-learning Process	Pupils Outcome	Community Involvement	Professional Growth	As a Whole
Corr. Coef.	0.087	0.136	0.006	0.054	0.068
p-value	0.351	0.144	0.948	0.567	0.468
Decision	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho
Interpretation	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

Legend: ns - Not Significant

Utilizing Pearson-product moment correlation, teachers' performance in teaching-learning process (corr. Coef. = .087, *p*-value = .351*),* pupils' outcome (corr. Coef. = .136, *p*-value = .144), community involvement (corr. Coef. = .006, *p*-value = .948), and professional growth (corr. Coef. = .054, *p*-value = .567) have no significant relationship on age. As a whole, teachers' age and performance has no significant relationship (corr. Coef. = .068, *p*-value = .468).

It implies that age is just a number. Being old or young does not guarantee high performance.

Age effects are small and non-linear, therefore, most likely, an inverted U-shaped relationship exists between age and job performance (Rad, 2014; Hedge & Borman 2012).

Table 10. The Difference Between the Teachers' Performance in Terms of Sex

Performance Indicators	t-test result	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching-learning Process	0.397	0.692	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Pupils Outcome	0.972	0.333	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Community Involvement	1.089	0.278	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Professional Growth	1.026	0.307	Accept Ho	Not Significant
As a Whole	0.959	0.34	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Utilizing the t-test, teachers' performance in teaching-learning process (*t* - test = .397, *p*-value = .692*),* pupils' outcome (*t* - test = .972, *p*-value = .333*)*, community involvement (*t* - test = 1.089, *p*-value = .278*)*, and professional growth (*t* - test = 1.026, *p*-value = .307*)* have no significant difference towards sex. As a whole, teachers' sex and performance has no significant difference (*t* - test = .959, *p*-value = .34*).*

It implies that one's sex is not superior to the other.

The findings of this study also agree with the assertion of Azim, Haque, and Chowdhury (2013) that performance has no meaningful association between genders.

Table 11. Exhibited the Relationship Between Teachers' Performance and Length of Service

Length of Service	Teaching-learning Process	Pupils Outcome	Community Involvement	Professional Growth	As a Whole
Corr. Coef.	0.239**	0.238**	0.18	0.157	0.206*
p-value	0.01	0.01	0.052	0.091	0.026
Decision	Reject Ho	Reject Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Reject Ho
Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant

Utilizing Pearson-product moment correlation, teachers' performance in teaching-learning process (Corr. Coef. = .239**, *p*-value = .01*)*, and pupils' outcome (Corr. Coef. = .238**, *p*-value = .333*)* reject the hypothesis which shows a significant relationship on their length of service. While performance in community involvement (corr. Coef. = .18, *p*-value = .052*)*, and professional growth (corr. Coef. = .157, *p*-value = .091*)* have no significant relationship. As a whole, teachers' length of service and performance has a significant relationship (corr. Coef. = .206*, *p*-value = .026*)*.

It implies that a seasoned or a new entrant teacher may have an equal teaching performance and productivity.

Wayne and Youngs (2003) also asserted positive effects of experience on teacher's quality as they became more dedicated and devoted to the service. By virtue of their length of time and stay in the teaching service, they acquire more experiences.

Table 12. The Relationship Between Teachers' Performance and Position

Position	Teaching-learning Process	Pupils Outcome	Community Involvement	Professional Growth	As a Whole
Corr. Coef.	0.071	0.134	0.098	0.141	0.148
p-value	0.445	0.149	0.294	0.13	0.112
Decision	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho
Interpretation	Not Significant	Not significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Utilizing the Pearson-product moment correlation, teachers' performance in teaching-learning process (corr. Coef. = .71, *p*-value = .445*),* pupils' outcome (corr. Coef. = .134 *p*-value = .149*)*, community involvement (corr. Coef. = .098, *p*-value = .294*)*, and professional growth (corr. Coef. = .141, *p*-value = .13*)* have no significant relationship towards position. As a whole, teachers' performance and position has no significant relationship (corr. Coef. = .148, *p*-value = .112*).*

It implies that employees' position either high or low does not define their performance productivity.

Job performance only determines the organizational performance rather than job titles (position) which therefore displayed a weak connection (Bakotić, 2016).

Table 13. The relationship between teachers' performance and net income.

Income	Teaching-learning Process	Pupils Outcome	Community Involvement	Professional Growth
Corr. Coef.	0.057	0.013	0.038	0.089
p-value	0.545	0.893	0.682	0.341
Decision	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho

Utilizing Pearson-product moment correlation, teachers' performance on teaching-learning process (corr. Coef. = .057, *p*-value = .545*),* pupils' outcome (corr. Coef. = .013 *p*-value = .893*)*, community involvement (corr. Coef. = .038, *p*-value = .682*)*, and professional growth (corr. Coef. = .089, *p*-value = .341*)* have no significant relationship on their net income. As a whole, with a .048 correlation coefficient and a *p*-value of .605, net income has no significance on teachers' performance.

It implies that teachers net income either high or average does not define their performance productivity.

Quality of work is due to the effect of intrinsic motivation of employees according to Gunawan and Amalia (2015).

Table 14. The Relationship between Teachers' Performance and Training

Training Hours	Teaching-learning Process	Pupils Outcome	Community Involvement	Professional Growth
Corr. Coef.	0.174	0.264**	0.005	0.152
p-value	0.061	0.004	0.961	0.101
Decision	Accept Ho	Reject Ho	Accept Ho	Accept Ho
Interpretation	Not Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

Utilizing the Pearson-product moment correlation, teachers' performance on teaching-learning process (corr. Coef. = .174, *p*-value = .061*),* community involvement (corr. Coef. = .005, *p*-value = .961*)*, and professional growth (corr. Coef. = .152, *p*-value = .101*)* shows no significant relationship on training hours. Hence, a significant relationship between teachers' training hours and pupils' outcome was elucidated (corr. Coef. = .264, *p*-value = .00). As a whole, the length of training hours spent has no significant relationship on teachers' performance (Corr. Coef. = .113, *p*-value = .153).

It implies that teachers who had spent more training hours than others do not guarantee excellent teaching performance.

Teacher's training generally has little influence on productivity only that it adds effectiveness to their teaching (Harris, 2011).

Table 15. The Performance Difference between Rural and Urban Public-School Teachers

Teachers' Performance Indicators	Test Result	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching-learning Process	1.099	0.337	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Pupils' Outcome	2.164	0.12	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Community Involvement	4.32	0.016	Reject Ho	Significant
Professional Growth	1.575	0.212	Accept Ho	Not Significant
As a Whole	2.351	0.1	Accept Ho	Not Significant

The result on the table shows that teaching-learning process (*t*-test = 1.099, *p*-value = .337*),* pupils' outcome (*t*-test = 2.164, *p*-value = .120*),* and professional growth (*t*-test = 1.575, *p*-value = .212*)* showed no significant difference but had a significant difference in terms of community involvement (*t*-test = 4.320, *p*-value = .016*)*. As a whole, evidently, with a 2.351 *t*-test result and a *p*-value of .100, research showed that urban teacher has no significant difference on rural school teachers.

It implies that the topographical assignment does not influence one's performance.

In the study of Mahmood, Nudrat, and Asdaque (2011) entitled Comparative Analysis on Job Performance and Satisfaction of Secondary School Teachers in Urban and Rural Schools; they also found no significant difference between school locations and performance.

Table 16. The Difference Between The Teachers' Performance as to Public and Private Schools.

Teachers' Performance Indicators	Test Result	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching-learning Process	0.724	0.47	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Pupils' Outcome	0.976	0.331	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Community Involvement	0.48	0.632	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Professional Growth	0.565	0.566	Accept Ho	Not Significant
As a Whole	0.441	0.66	Accept Ho	Not Significant

The result on the table shows the teaching-learning process (*t*-test = .724, *p*-value = .470*),* pupils' outcome (*t*-test = .976, *p*-value = .331*),* community involvement (*t*-test = .480, *p*-value = .632*)* and professional growth (*t*-test = .575, *p*-value = .566*)* showed no significant difference. This further implied that as a whole, evidently, with a 0.441 *t*-test result and a *p*-value of .660, research showed no significant difference between the performance of teachers in public or private schools.

It implies that a state (public) school teacher or private school teacher are the same in terms of teaching performance is the concern.

The result is in contrast to the findings of Bassey, Bisong, Isangedighi, and Ubi (2011) that teachers in private schools are superior to their counterparts in public schools in teaching as well as in formative and summative evaluation.

Table 17. The Relationship between Teachers' Performance and Pupils' Academic Achievement.

Teachers' Performance	Corr. Coef.	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Teaching-learning process	0.11	0.236	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Pupils Outcome	0.146	0.116	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Community Involvement	0.205*	0.026	Reject Ho	Significant
Professional Growth	0.139	0.134	Accept Ho	Not Significant
As a Whole	0.156	0.094	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Table shows the relationship between teachers' performance and pupils' academic achievement through Pearson-product moment correlation. The result on the teaching-learning process (Corr. Coef. = .11, *p*-value = .236*),* pupils' outcome (Corr. Coef. = .146, *p*-value = .116*),* and professional growth (Corr. Coef. = .139, *p*-value = .134) showed no significant relationship, but showed a significant relationship between teacher's community involvement (Corr. Coef. = .205, *p*-value = .026*)* on pupils' academic achievement. Furthermore, accepting the hypothesis, as a whole, having a 0.156 correlation coefficient and a 0.094 *p*-value, no significant relationship was found between the performance of teachers and pupils' academic achievement.

It implies that the overall performance of a teacher may not directly show on their pupils' academic achievement.

Buddin and Zamarro (2010) also asserted that teachers are important determinants of student's achievement, but there was no direct connection between the traditionally assumed measures of teacher effectiveness and student achievement over time.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, teachers' age is just a number, one's sex is not superior to the other, seasoned and new entrants may have the same performance level, small net income does not associate low performance, and long training hours may not guarantee a performing teacher. Furthermore, teachers' topographical assignment does not make one better than the other or vice-versa. It also does not make any difference towards instructional delivery, assessment pedagogy, and continuous professional development. Teachers from rural, urban, and private schools only differ, and most of them overlooked the important contribution of community involvement and even became their least priority based on the result of this study, it is the only performance indicator that certainly affects the performance of the pupils.

TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH

The result of this study may be translated by school administrators into an action plan regarding strengthening their policy towards a teacher-community relationship. It may also be used as the basis of crafting a strategic plan by capacitating/enhancing teachers' community involvement.

LITERATURE CITED

Azim, M. T., Haque, M. M., & Chowdhury, R. A. (2013). Gender, marital status and job satisfaction an empirical study. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, *2*(2), 488. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/8gXDv7

Bakotić, D. (2016). Relationship between job satisfaction and organisational performance. *Economic research-Ekonomska istraživanja*, *29*(1), 118-130. Retrieve from https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2016.1163946

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Oxford, England: Prentice-Hall.

Bassey, P. U., Bisong, N., Isangedighi, A. J., & Ubi, I. O. (2011). Job Performance Effectiveness: A Comparison of Teachers in Public and Private Schools in Cross River State–Nigeria. *Lwati: A Journal of Contemporary Research*, *8*(2). Retrieved from https://goo.gl/uh3qjG

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school. Washington, DC: Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/ehELvP

Buckland, P. (2004). *Reshaping the future: Education and post-conflict reconstruction*. The World Bank. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/WyYZ1q

Buddin, R., & Zamarro, G. (2010). What Teacher Characteristics Affect Student Achievement? Retrieved from https://goo.gl/ayRq2z

Cheruvalath, R. (2012). Academic failure of first-year engineering and technological students in India and assessment of motivation factors–a case study. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(3), 283-297. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.669192

Education, R. (2012). Teachers matter: Understanding teachers' impact on student achievement. *Santa Monica, CA: Author*. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/8tRhHx

Gunawan, H., & Amalia, R. (2015). Wages and Employees Performance: The Quality of Work Life as Moderator. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/1h4bP4

Harris, D. N., & Sass, T. R. (2011). Teacher training, teacher quality and student achievement. *Journal of public economics*, *95*(7-8), 798-812. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.11.009

Hedge, J. W., & Borman, W. C. (Eds.). (2012). *The Oxford handbook of work and aging*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/vxC56k

Ijov, M. T., Hemen, M. T., Austin, A. O., & Akinyemi, M. A. (2016). Human resource management and teachers' job performance in secondary schools in North West senatorial district of Benue State, Nigeria. *Journal of Teacher Perspective*, *10*(2). Retrieved from https://goo.gl/owF6YW

Mahmood, A., Nudrat, S., & Asdaque, M. M. (2011). Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers: A comparative analysis of gender, urban and rural schools. *Asian Social Science*, *7*(8), 203. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/JXuSZF

Mangiante, E. M. S. (2011). Teachers matter: Measures of teacher effectiveness in low-income minority schools. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *23*(1), 41-63. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-010-9107-x

Martin, J. Putting the spotlight on teacher performance. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/4JucAy

Punongbayan, E. J., & Bauyon, S. M. (2015). Instructional Performance of Teacher Education Faculty Members in One State University in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *3*(5). Retrieved from https://goo.gl/AkPywy

Sawchuk, S. (2015). Teacher evaluation: An issue overview. *Education Week*, *35*(3), 1-6. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/8ek9tf

Sheany (2017). Investing in Teachers Crucial to Improve Education in Indonesia: World Bank. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/NhfFse

Sheng, L. J. (2017). PISA results: The challenging road forward for weaker ASEAN countries. The HEAD Foundation. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/V2w9YG

Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational research*, *73*(1), 89-122. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543073001089

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W. Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement. Issues & Answers. REL 2007-No. 033. *Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest (NJ1)*. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/2o4HQk