



## **Sustaining Stakeholders' Performance and Commitment in the Workplace**

**Santiago B. Hubahib Jr.**

Koyuk Malimuit School, Bering Strait School District, Koyuk, Alaska, USA.

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8143-9857>

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11082525>

### **Abstract**

This study explores on sustaining the development of performance and commitment of the education stakeholders as regards to their experiences in the workplace. The study uses a descriptive-correlational research design with the use of questionnaires and interviews. Quantitative and qualitative data are analyzed and interpreted to answer specific problems. The findings of the study revealed that the level of performance concerning personal factors of perceived competence, work ethics, and job attitude had no significant relationship with the level of commitment. However, job satisfaction was the only factor that had a significant relationship with the level of commitment. The level of performance of the respondents concerning personal factors of perceived competence, work ethics, and job attitude was very high and outstanding but the level of satisfaction of the respondents was in the level of moderately satisfied. The level of commitment of the respondents was only average. The level of performance concerning personal factors of perceived competence, work ethics, and job attitude had no significant relationship with the level of commitment. However, job satisfaction was the only factor that had a significant relationship with the level of commitment.

**Keywords:** Level of performance, perceived competence, work ethics, job attitude, job satisfaction, Level of commitment

### **Introduction:**

Many kinds of research always associate that performance and commitment are related. A school with high performance would be given the justification due to the good performance of the people who were involved in running the organization. It has been widely believed that high commitment among the education stakeholders would give and produce quality performance and produce quality students in the process of delivery of instruction.

The results of the Programme of International for Students Assessment (PISA) 2018 divulged the poor state of quality of education the Philippines. Out of 79 countries who participated in the program, the Philippines was at the bottom in Reading and second to the last in Mathematics and Science. With this, the Department of Education (DepEd) made a call to push for reforms in the four key areas, and the engagement of education stakeholders must be supported and collaborated with their battlecry Sulong Edukalidad. The issue of performance and commitment were the two significant factors on our government that could make policy and programs to achieve the challenge to Sulong Edukalidad.

The researcher intended to find out what were the best practices these schools had which could be duplicated by other non-performing schools. Best practices would become the benchmark for other education leaders so that they could learn and adapt based on this study and what else and how else should be done to sustain the development of performance and commitment of education stakeholders to serve the DepEd organization better. The commitment of all education stakeholders produced an efficient performance to achieve good quality education. This was supported by John Maxwell (1999) who said without commitment desire, influence and prospects might be lost. Thus, this study to sustain the development of performance and commitment among education stakeholders would become the cornerstone to achieve the goals of SBM and Sulong Edukalidad.

### **Literature Review:**

Understanding the dynamics of workplace experiences, particularly in professions like teaching, is crucial for enhancing organizational commitment and performance. This review synthesizes key findings from various studies to illuminate the factors influencing organizational commitment and performance, particularly focusing on teachers and education stakeholders. The literature highlights the complexities inherent in professional development, workplace culture, and the role of organizational systems in shaping individual commitment and performance.

### **Professional Development and Workplace Context:**

Research suggests that expertise in teaching is not acquired through linear progression but rather through varied experiences across different career phases (Hepper & Hepper, 2008). Teachers navigate complex moral, ethical, and instrumental challenges, which shape their professional development trajectories. Fransson and Frelin (2016)



propose a framework encompassing personal, teaching, school, system, and professional development factors to understand and categorize the drivers of teacher commitment.

Spirituality in the workplace positively impacts organizational commitment (Djafri & Noordin, 2017), while workplace culture influences institutional functioning and individual behavior (Modu, Asawo, & Gabriel, 2017). These studies emphasize the significance of organizational climate and cultural factors in fostering commitment and performance among employees.

Personal characteristics such as perceived competence and work ethics significantly influence organizational commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Job attitudes, particularly job satisfaction, play a crucial role in shaping individuals' commitment to their organizations (Spector, 1997). The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment remains a subject of debate, with some studies suggesting a high correlation (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) and others finding no evidence of a direct relationship (Testa, 2001).

#### **Affective Commitment and Job Performance:**

Affective commitment, characterized by emotional attachment and loyalty, influences job performance (Balassiano & Salles, 2012). Certain characteristics, attitudes, and relationships contribute to higher levels of organizational commitment, which in turn affect job performance (Starnes & Truho, 2010).

In an era marked by globalization and technological advancement, organizational commitment remains crucial for organizational success (Allen & Meyer, 1997). Leaner organizational structures and remote supervision underscore the importance of securing employee commitment, particularly among temporary workers (Allen & Meyer, 1997). SBM empowers education stakeholders to actively participate in school management, contributing to a more effective learning environment (Myers & Stonehill, 1993). The role of education stakeholders, supported by legislative measures like Republic Act 9155, significantly impacts educational outcomes (Myers & Stonehill, 1993).

#### **The Performance Management System (RPMS):**

The RPMS, mandated by the Department of Education, serves as a tool for monitoring and evaluating personnel performance (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015). It aligns with broader organizational goals of enhancing efficiency and quality in the education sector. International assessments like PISA provide insights into educational quality and performance. The 2018 PISA report revealed shortcomings in the Philippines' education system, particularly in reading and mathematics (PISA Report, 2018). These findings underscore the need for systemic reforms to improve educational outcomes. The Philippines' education system faces challenges in achieving parity with its regional counterparts (World Bank Report). Addressing these challenges requires strategic investments in teacher training, infrastructure, and stakeholder engagement to enhance organizational commitment and performance (World Bank Report).

The review highlights the multidimensional nature of organizational commitment and performance in the workplace, with particular emphasis on the education sector. By understanding the interplay of individual, organizational, and contextual factors, stakeholders can formulate targeted interventions to sustainably enhance commitment and performance across diverse settings.

#### **Methodology:**

##### **Design**

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to accurately describe the situation and explore relationships between variables (Tejero & Catchillar, 2004). Correlational research was chosen to assess the influence of perceived independent variables on the dependent variable of commitment (Calmorin, 2010).

##### **Research Environment**

The study was conducted in selected public schools within the Division of Cebu City, Department of Education. Five top-performing schools, based on criteria including dropout rate, academic performance, fiscal management, and commitment rating, were chosen. These schools were located across different areas in Cebu City, Philippines.

| <b>School</b> | <b>Location</b> | <b>Land Area (sqm)</b> | <b>Teachers</b> | <b>Students</b> |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| A             | Talamban        | 4,000                  | 136             | 4,106           |
| B             | Adlaon          | 2,800                  | 21              | 600             |
| C             | Cambinocot      | 3,000                  | 15              | 500             |
| D             | Talamban        | 10,000                 | 120             | 4,200           |
| E             | Mabolo          | 8,500                  | 128             | 2,800           |

#### **Research Participants**



Participants included school heads, teachers, and non-teaching staff from the five selected public schools. All five school heads and a total of 120 teachers, along with two non-teaching staff per school, participated voluntarily, resulting in a total of 135 participants.

| Participants       | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| School Head        | 5         | 3.70           |
| Teachers           | 120       | 88.89          |
| Non-teaching Staff | 10        | 7.41           |
| Total              | 135       | 100.00         |

### Sampling Technique

Total enumeration was used for selecting school heads, while stratified sampling was employed for teachers, ensuring proportional representation based on school size. Simple random sampling was utilized to select non-teaching staff, providing each individual an equal chance of participation.

### Research Instruments

The study employed a survey questionnaire consisting of Likert scales and an interview guide. The questionnaire included adapted tools for perceived competence, work ethics, job attitude, job satisfaction, and commitment level. Additionally, one-on-one interviews with school heads and focus group discussions with teachers and non-teaching staff were conducted.

### Data Collection

Permissions were obtained from relevant authorities before data collection. Implied consent was sought from participants, ensuring voluntary participation. Questionnaires were distributed, and one-on-one interviews and focus group discussions were conducted to gather qualitative data.

### Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using weighted mean to assess participant performance across variables. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was utilized to examine relationships between independent variables and commitment. Qualitative data underwent thematic analysis to identify opportunities and challenges for improvement.

### Results:

Table 1: **Summarized Result of the Level of Performance**

| Indicators           | Weighted Mean | SD   | Descriptive Equivalent |
|----------------------|---------------|------|------------------------|
| Perceived Competence | 4.22          | 0.77 | Outstanding            |
| Work Ethics          | 3.75          | 0.46 | Very high              |
| Job Attitude         | 3.53          | 1.20 | Positive               |
| Job Satisfaction     | 3.66          | 1.36 | Moderately satisfied   |

n = 135. 1.00-1.82 – Strongly Disagree (Not Satisfied); 1.83-2.65 – Disagree (Negligible Satisfied);\*

The level of performance of the respondents concerning perceived competence, work ethics, and job attitude was very high and outstanding. However, the level of job satisfaction was only moderately satisfied, indicating dissatisfaction due to various organizational issues.

### Organizational Commitment

The organizational commitment of the respondents was categorized into three components: affective, continuance, and normative commitments. The results for each component are presented below.

**Table 1: Affective Commitment**

| Indicators                                                                   | Weighted Mean | SD   | Descriptive Equivalent |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------|------------------------|
| Would I be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization? | 3.83          | 0.94 | Agree                  |
| Does this organization have a great deal of personal meaning for me?         | 3.77          | 1.07 | Agree                  |
| Do I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it?                | 3.70          | 1.01 | Agree                  |
| Do I think that I could easily become as attached                            | 3.32          | 0.98 | Neutral                |



|                                                                  |      |      |          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|----------|
| to another organization as I am to this one?                     |      |      |          |
| Do I feel as if this organization's problems are my own?         | 3.02 | 1.20 | Neutral  |
| Do I not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization?       | 2.62 | 1.15 | Neutral  |
| Do I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization? | 2.60 | 1.23 | Disagree |
| Do I not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization?      | 2.58 | 1.15 | Disagree |
| Factor Mean                                                      | 3.18 | 1.20 | Average  |

n = 135. 1.00-1.80 – Strongly Disagree (Very Low); 1.81-2.60 – Disagree (Low); 2.61-3.40 – Neutral (Average);\*

The respondents showed an average level of affective commitment, indicating attachment to the organization but not strong emotional connection.

**Table 2: Continuance Commitment**

| Indicators                                                                                      | Weighted Mean | SD   | Descriptive Equivalent |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------|------------------------|
| Right now, is staying with my organization a matter of necessity as much as I desire?           | 3.40          | 1.08 | Neutral                |
| Would it be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to?           | 3.40          | 1.08 | Neutral                |
| Does too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now? | 3.32          | 1.00 | Neutral                |
| Do I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization?                    | 3.28          | 1.04 | Neutral                |
| couldn't it be too costly for me to leave my organization now?                                  | 3.25          | 1.14 | Neutral                |
| Am I not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up?      | 3.00          | 1.27 | Neutral                |
| Factor Mean                                                                                     | 3.27          | 1.11 | Average                |

n = 135. 1.00-1.80 – Strongly Disagree (Very Low); 1.81-2.60 – Disagree (Low); 2.61-3.40 – Neutral (Average);\*

The respondents demonstrated a neutral feeling in terms of continuance commitment, indicating no strong inclination to stay due to necessity.

**Table 3: Normative Commitment**

| Indicators                                                                                                                                                        | Weighted Mean | SD   | Descriptive Equivalent |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------|------------------------|
| I am taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.                                                                                       | 3.79          | 0.93 | Agree                  |
| One of the major reasons I continue to work in this organization is that I believe loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain. | 3.74          | 1.04 | Agree                  |
| I think that people these days move from company to company too often.                                                                                            | 3.47          | 1.08 | Agree                  |



|                                                                                                           |      |      |         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|---------|
| Things were better in the days when people stayed in one organization for most of their careers.          | 3.45 | 0.97 | Agree   |
| If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization. | 2.98 | 1.05 | Neutral |
| I do not think that to be a 'company man' or 'company woman' is sensible anymore.                         | 2.85 | 1.01 | Neutral |
| I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.                           | 2.70 | 1.23 | Neutral |
| Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.                           | 2.68 | 1.16 | Neutral |
| Factor Mean                                                                                               | 3.21 | 1.14 | Average |

n = 135. 1.00-1.80 – Strongly Disagree (Very Low); 1.81-2.60 – Disagree (Low); 2.61-3.40 – Neutral (Average);\*

The respondents showed an average level of normative commitment, indicating a moderate sense of loyalty and obligation to the organization.

Table 7.4: Summarized Data on Organizational Commitment

| Indicators             | Weighted Mean | SD   | Descriptive Equivalent |
|------------------------|---------------|------|------------------------|
| Continuance Commitment | 3.27          | 1.20 | Average                |
| Normative Commitment   | 3.21          | 1.11 | Average                |
| Affective Commitment   | 3.18          | 1.14 | Average                |
| Grand Mean             | 3.22          | 1.12 | Average                |

n = 135. 1.00-1.80 – Very Low; 1.81-2.60 – Low; 2.61-3.40 – Average;\*

The respondents demonstrated an average level of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization, with a grand mean of 3.22.

**Table 4: Correlation between Level of Performance and Level of Commitment**

| Variables                                   | r-value | p-value | Decision          |
|---------------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------------|
| Level of Performance (Perceived Competence) | 0.056   | 0.689   | Fail to Reject Ho |
| Level of Performance (Work Ethics)          | 0.079   | 0.573   | Fail to Reject Ho |
| Level of Performance (Job Attitude)         | 0.180   | 0.196   | Fail to Reject Ho |
| Level of Performance (Job Satisfaction)     | 0.446   | 0.001   | Reject Ho         |

Significant if p-value <  $\alpha$  (0.05)

The level of job satisfaction was significantly related to the level of commitment. Other factors such as perceived competence, work ethics, and job attitude were not significantly correlated with commitment.

### Discussion:

The study evaluated the level of performance among respondents based on several indicators, including perceived competence, work ethics, job attitude, and job satisfaction. The results indicated that the respondents generally performed well, with perceived competence rated as outstanding, work ethics as very high, and job attitude as positive. However, job satisfaction was only moderately satisfied, suggesting some areas of dissatisfaction among the respondents.

The organizational commitment of the respondents was assessed in terms of affective, continuance, and normative commitments. Affective commitment refers to an emotional attachment to the organization, continuance



commitment relates to perceived costs associated with leaving the organization, and normative commitment pertains to a sense of moral obligation to remain with the organization.

The respondents showed an average level of affective commitment, indicating attachment to the organization but not strong emotional connection. Despite feeling a personal calling to their work and valuing the organization, they did not exhibit a strong sense of belonging or emotional attachment.

Continuance commitment was also at an average level, suggesting that respondents did not feel a strong necessity to stay with the organization. While they acknowledged the potential costs of leaving, such as disruption in their lives, they did not feel deeply compelled to remain.

Normative commitment, which reflects a sense of moral obligation to remain with the organization, was also rated as average. Respondents believed in the value of loyalty but did not strongly adhere to the notion of lifelong commitment to one organization.

The study examined the correlation between the level of performance (including perceived competence, work ethics, job attitude, and job satisfaction) and organizational commitment. The results indicated that only job satisfaction was significantly related to commitment. This suggests that while respondents may perform well in certain aspects of their job, their commitment to the organization is primarily influenced by their level of job satisfaction.

Overall, the findings suggest that while the respondents demonstrated high levels of perceived competence, work ethics, and positive job attitude, their organizational commitment was only average. This could be attributed to several factors, including dissatisfaction with certain aspects of their job, such as communication, salary, recognition, and promotion opportunities.

The discrepancy between high performance and average commitment may indicate that other factors beyond job performance influence organizational commitment. For example, the study identified issues such as fairness in promotion and training, transparency in financial matters, absence of recognition, and financial literacy as challenges that affect commitment levels among the respondents.

Additionally, the study highlighted the role of motivation in shaping commitment levels. Respondents with low motivation may experience reduced job satisfaction and, consequently, lower levels of organizational commitment. The findings underscore the importance of addressing organizational issues and promoting a supportive work environment to enhance employee satisfaction and commitment.

Furthermore, the study identified opportunities such as strong religious beliefs, localization laws, and the school environment and culture as factors that contribute positively to commitment levels. Leveraging these opportunities and addressing challenges effectively could lead to improved organizational commitment and overall employee well-being.

The study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing organizational commitment among respondents. By addressing challenges and capitalizing on opportunities, organizations can foster a more committed workforce, ultimately leading to increased productivity and organizational success.

## **Conclusion:**

The study delved into the relationship between the level of performance and organizational commitment among respondents within an educational setting. Through a meticulous examination of various indicators such as perceived competence, work ethics, job attitude, and job satisfaction, coupled with an assessment of affective, continuance, and normative commitments, several significant findings emerged.

It was evident that respondents demonstrated commendable levels of perceived competence, work ethics, and positive job attitude, indicating their dedication and proficiency in their roles. However, despite these strengths, the level of organizational commitment was found to be only average. This suggests a misalignment between performance and commitment, highlighting the presence of underlying factors influencing organizational allegiance beyond job-related competencies.

The correlation analysis unveiled that job satisfaction was the sole significant determinant of organizational commitment among the respondents. Dissatisfaction with certain aspects of their job, such as communication, salary, recognition, and promotion opportunities, emerged as primary concerns that impacted their commitment levels. This underscores the pivotal role of employee satisfaction in fostering organizational allegiance.

Moreover, the study identified various challenges hindering commitment, including unfairness in promotion and training, lack of transparency in financial matters, absence of recognition, and financial literacy issues. Conversely,



opportunities such as strong religious beliefs, localization laws, and the positive school environment and culture were identified as factors conducive to fostering commitment.

The findings underscore the multifaceted nature of organizational commitment and the complex interplay of factors influencing it. By addressing challenges and leveraging opportunities, organizations can cultivate a more committed and engaged workforce. This necessitates implementing strategies to enhance job satisfaction, foster transparency and fairness, and promote a supportive work environment. Ultimately, cultivating organizational commitment is essential for fostering employee well-being, driving productivity, and achieving organizational success in the educational context and beyond.

## References:

- Ahmad, H., K., & Shah, I. A. (2010). *Relationship between job satisfaction, job performance attitude towards work, and organizational commitment*. EuropeEuropeanJournal of Social Sciences.
- Andriotis, N. (2017). *The dos and don ts of managing people: How to mend broken morals*. Retrieved from <https://www.efrontlearning.com/blog/2017/03/causes-of-demotivation-employee dissatisfaction.html>
- Allen, N. & Meyer, J. (1990). *The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization*. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 118.
- Ashton, M. (2018). *Individual differences and personality* (ch.9). Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Black, H., et. al (2018). *Attachment Theory*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318150229 Attachment theory at work A review and directions for future research](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318150229_Attachment_theory_at_work_A_review_and_directions_for_future_research)
- Bullock, R. (2013). *Job performance (what it is, what it's not)*. Seattle: Scontrino-Powell.
- Caught, K. & Shadur. (2000). the measurement artifact in the organizational commitment questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*, 87
- Chavez, F. (2012). Organizational commitment as influenced by leadership behavior of administrators, job satisfaction, and burnout of teachers: a structural equation modeling. *Research Gate*. Retrieved from <file:///C:/Users/DepEd/Downloads/chavez1.pdf> , 777-788.
- Chen, C.J., & Lee, C.C. (2013). *The relationship between employee commitment and job attitude and its effect on service quality in the tourism industry*, vol. 3 (2). China:Scientific Research Publishing.
- Cilerdzic, V., Dragic, M., & Radosavljevic, Z. (2017). *Employee organizational commitment*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320252136 Employee org](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320252136_Employee_org)
- Cordero, T. (2018). *PHL education system underperforms in the east Asia pacific-WB report*. Philippines: GMA News.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research*. St Leonards NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- Day, C. & Go, Q. (2007). Variations in the conditions for teacher's professional learning and development: sustaining commitment and effectiveness over a career. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(4):423-443. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03054980701450746>.
- Denscombe, M. (1998). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Denzin, NK. (1978). *Sociological Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Denzin, N. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Englewood Cliffs New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Department of Education and Training (2005). Retrieved March 15, 2005, from <http://www.eddept.wa.edu.au/promotions/index/jobDescriptions.htm>.
- Djafri, F. & Noordin, K. (2017). The impact of workplace spirituality on organizational commitment: A case study of Takaful agents in Malaysia. *Humanomics* 33(3):384-396. [Dx.doi.org/10.1108/H-02-2017-0018](https://doi.org/10.1108/H-02-2017-0018).



- Fessler, R. (1995). Dynamics of teacher career stages. In T. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices* (pp.171-192), New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fontana, A. & Frey, J. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.) (pp.645-672). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Fransson, G., & Frelin, A. (2016). Highly committed teachers: What makes them tick? A study of sustained commitment. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and practice*. 22(8), 896–912. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1201469>.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hepper P. & Hepper, M. (2008). The gender role conflict literature: fruits of sustained commitment. *The Counseling Psychologist* 36(3):455-461. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000007310865>
- Hessler, R. (1992). *Social research methods*. St Paul Minnesota: West Publishing Company.
- Huberman, M. (1995). Professional careers and professional development. In T.
- Guskey & Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices* (pp.193-224), New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kaela Weaver (2011). *Work attitudes and job motivation at home*. Retrieved from <https://wikispaces.psu.edu/display/PSYCH484/Fall+2011-Team+3+Case+Study-+Work+and+Organizational+Commitment>
- Kalleberg, A., & Marsden, P. (1993). *Organizational commitment and job performance in u.s. labor force*. Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.
- Kell, H., & Motowidlo, S. (2012). *Handbook of psychology, vol. 12: Industrial -and organizational psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). India: Wiley.
- Kouadio, A. & Emery, Y. (2017). *Workplace commitment as an exchange of commitments: exploring public managers' practices to secure employees' commitment*. Research Gate. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/DepEd/Downloads/Article Emery-KouadioEGPA2017 V15.pdf](file:///C:/Users/DepEd/Downloads/Article%20Emery-KouadioEGPA2017%20V15.pdf).
- Maslow, A. (1943). *Maslow's hierarchy of needs*. Retrieved from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maslow's\\_hierarchy\\_of\\_needs](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maslow's_hierarchy_of_needs)
- Mathieu, J. & Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents correlate, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.
- Mathison, S. (1998). Why triangulate? *Educational Research*, 17(2), 13-17.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations, *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, pp. 61-98. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/105348229190011Z>.
- Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). California: Sage.
- Minichiello, V. Aroni, R. Timewell, E. & Alexander, L. (1995). *In-depth interviewing* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). Melbourne: Longman.
- Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D & Ecob, R. (1989). *School matters*. Somerset England: Open Books.
- Myers, D., & Stonehill, R. (1993). *School-based management*. United States: Office of Research.
- Patton, MQ. (1999). "Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis." *HSR: Health Services Research*. 34 (5) Part II. pp. 1189-1208.





Patton, MQ. (2001). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods (2nd Edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Punch, K. (1998). *Introduction to social research*. London: Sage.

Reed, S. & Marienau, C. (2008). Maintaining a steady fire: Sustaining adults' commitment to community-based learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 118, 97-107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ace.299>. Retrieved from [http:// onlinelibrary.wiley.com](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com).

Fatima, A., Fernandes, A., & Sanyal, N. (2016). *Personal effectiveness, organizational culture, and work-related stress among teachers*, vol. 4. (2). Retrieved from <https://research-advances.org/index.php/IJEMS/article/view/404>

Scott, S. (2019). *Motivation & productivity in the workplace*. Retrieved from <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/motivation-productivity-workplace-10692.html>

Simonson, A., et.al. (2017). Exploring the relationship between work ethic and organizational commitment. *International Research Journal of Human Resources and Social Sciences* Vol. 4, Issue 1, Impact Factor- 5.414. Retrieved from <file:///C:/Users/DepEd/Downloads/ExploringWorkEthicandOrganizationalCommitment-Final.pdf>.

Spradley, J. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Stake, R. (2000). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks California: Sage.

Starnes, B. J. & Trujo. (2007). Trust, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and the volunteer's psychological contract. *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration*, 24(5), 26-30.

Steger, M. (2016). *Creating meaning and purpose at work*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310598648\\_Creating\\_Meaning\\_and\\_Purpose\\_at\\_Work](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310598648_Creating_Meaning_and_Purpose_at_Work)

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research*. California: Sage.

Taylor, S. & Bogdan, R. (1984). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Tan, S. K. (2013). *Herzberg's two-factor theory on work motivation: Does it work for today's environment?*. India: Global Institute for Research and Education.

Werner, O. & Schoepfle, G. (1987). *Systematic Fieldwork* (Vol. 1). Newbury Park: Sage.

Wengrzyn, R. (n.d.). *Types of attitudes in the workplace: Cognitive, affective & behavioral components*. Retrieved from <https://study.com/academy/lesson/types-of-attitudes-in-the-workplace-cognitive-affective-behavioral-components.html>