



STATUS AND CHALLENGES OF RANKED SECONDARY TEACHER APPLICANTS BASED ON HERZBERG'S MOTIVATION THEORY AS PRECEDENCE TO EMPLOYMENT IN DEP ED SCHOOLS DIVISION OFFICE OF LAGUNA

Keizel Camille Mhardie P. Salvador

Master in Public Administration, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Sta. Cruz, Laguna, Philippines

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra17014>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra17014

ABSTRACT

The study investigates the status and challenges perceived by ranked secondary teacher applicants based on Herzberg's Motivation Theory as precedence to employment in the Department of Education, Schools Division Office of Laguna that affects their organizational commitment. In addition, this study aims to provide valuable insights that can inform the improvement on recruitment, selection, and placement of personnel. Descriptive research was the method used in the study; it is conducted among the 100 selected respondents who are secondary teacher applicants from the three consecutive ranking periods; the data was gathered using a self-administered survey and were analyzed with the use of statistical instruments such as mean, standard deviation, and Pearson *r* correlation. Result shows that the demographic profile of ranked secondary teacher applicants has no significant relationship with organizational commitment except for educational attainment. Furthermore, the study concludes that the issues and challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents, motivation factors, and hygiene factors of ranked secondary teacher applicants are significantly correlated with organizational commitment. Thus, it is recommended that the HRMPSB may reconsider the recalibration of score in ranking for Teacher I where in applicants who have previously undergone evaluation process will not be required to go through it again but only update their points if they wish so. The Personnel Unit may also establish a database of RQA applicants including the times they applied, and history volunteer works that may be use as consideration in their deployment. Addressing human resource distribution in DepEd and DBM should provide requisite support for increasing Plantilla positions.

KEYWORDS: *Teacher Applicant, Human Resource Management, Recruitment Process, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation-Hygiene, Organizational Commitment*

INTRODUCTION

Public school teachers are vital and invaluable to our society because they are the one responsible for shaping the minds and values of the young generations. They are considered as one of the noblest professions. Teachers are a vital component of the foundation that develops a child's abilities and thinking. The quality of teachers largely depends on the procedure of recruitment and selection during their hiring process. The journey of an aspiring teacher does not end after finishing a four-year degree program and passing the Licensure Exam for Teachers (LET). They need to undergo recruitment and selection process to be part of the Registry of Qualified Applicants (RQA) which will be the basis of deployment. However, after the intricate process of recruitment, having a spot in the RQA still does not assure them to get a teaching item in DepEd (DO 007, s.2023).

Having this scenario, this study seeks to find out the status and challenges in DepEd Schools Division of Laguna as perceived by the ranked teacher applicants that are on the shelf even after applying more than one time based on Herzberg's Two-Factor

Theory of Motivation-Hygiene and how it affects their organizational commitment. This study was anchored on Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which examines aspects that inspire professionals to complete high-quality work (Herzberg, 1968).

MATERIALS AND METHOD

Descriptive research was the method used in the researcher's study. It deals with gathering of data, putting theories to the test, and responding to inquiries about the current state of the research subject. Another characteristic of descriptive research is that data is gathered through observation, questionnaires, interviews, or direct questioning of those in the scenario (Kabir, 2016).

The study is conducted among the 100 selected respondents who are secondary teacher applicants from the three consecutive ranking periods (SY 2020-2021, SY 2021-2022 and SY 2023-2024). Purposive sampling is the method used by the researcher in the study. It is a type of sampling technique that chooses units



based on the qualities required in the sample (Nikolopoulou, 2022).

The researcher uses a self-administered questionnaire as the main tool for data gathering. Correlation matrix was done to test the causal relationship between Status and Challenges, Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, demographic profile, and the organizational commitment of on the shelf secondary teacher applicants in DepEd Schools Division Office of Laguna using Pearson r.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Age

The demographic profile of the respondents according to age shows that there are 23 respondents under 20-29 years old, which is 23%. 69 respondents fall under 30-39 years old, which is 69%. 8 respondents are under 40-49 years old, which is 8%. While there are no respondents or 0% under 50 years old and above.

Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Gender

In terms of gender, majority are female with 79 respondents or 79%. 20 respondents or 20% are male. While there is 1 respondent or 1% under prefer not to say.

Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Civil Status

In accordance with civil status, results show that the majority are single with 70 respondents which is 70% while 29 respondents or 29% are married. 1 respondent, which is 1% is widowed no respondents or 0% fall under separated and prefer not to say.

Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Educational Attainment

In terms of educational attainment, the result shows that the majority of the sample finished a bachelor's degree which is 58 respondents or 58%. 37 respondents are with units in master's degree which is 37%. Respondents with master's degree have a frequency of 5 or 5% while there are no respondents or 0% with units in doctorate degree and doctorate degree.

Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Subject Specialization

The demographic profile of the respondents in terms of subject specialization shows that there are 22 respondents or 22% under Araling Panlipunan, 8 respondents under English which is 8%. For Filipino, there are 12 respondents or 12%. MAPEH has 9 respondents or 9%. Mathematics has 13 respondents or 13%. Science has 14 respondents or 14% and TLE has 21 respondents or 21% while Values Education has the least which is 1 respondent or 1%.

Table 1. Level of Issues and Challenges in Terms of Recruitment Process

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. The qualification standard for Teacher I in terms of education, eligibility, experience, and training is fair.	3.17	0.88	Challenging
2. The assessment process of teacher applicants' competencies through demonstration teaching is vital in the recruitment process.	3.57	0.71	Highly Challenging
3. The conduct of interviews assessing teacher applicants' potential, characteristics or traits and fitness is vital in the recruitment process.	3.49	0.69	Highly Challenging
4. Open and transparent ranking of teachers are important in the recruitment process.	3.66	0.76	Highly Challenging
5. The one (1) school year validity of the Registry of Qualified Applicants (RQA) is enough time to deploy the applicants in the registry.	2.28	0.98	Less Challenging
Overall for Recruitment Process	3.23	0.58	Challenging

Note. N=100. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly challenging, 2.50–3.24=Challenging, 1.75–2.49=Less challenging, 1.00–1.74=Not challenging.

Table 1 presents the Level of Issues and Challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents in terms of Recruitment Process. From the statements, "Open and transparent ranking of teachers are important in the recruitment process." gets the highest mean score of 3.66, SD=0.76 and was remarked as "Highly Challenging". Conversely, "The one (1) school year validity of the Registry of Qualified Applicants (RQA) is enough time to

deploy the applicants in the registry." received the lowest mean score of 2.28, SD=0.98 and was remarked as "Less Challenging". Overall, the Level of Issues and Challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents in Terms of Recruitment Process attained a weighted mean score of 3.23, SD=0.58 and was remarked as Challenging among the respondents.

**Table 2. Level of Issues and Challenges in Terms of Organizational Culture**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. DepEd upholds equal employment opportunity policy.	2.95	0.95	Challenging
2. There is no discrimination in the selection of employees.	3.12	0.81	Challenging
3. DepEd prohibits nepotic appointments or those made in favor of a relative of the appointing or recommending authority.	2.96	0.88	Challenging
4. DepEd demonstrates an ethical system of moral principles during the recruitment process.	3.29	0.76	Highly Challenging
5. DepEd does not tolerate “padrino system”, a common Filipino culture where in someone in a position will intervene, support, or do favors for someone else because they are relative of friends.	2.76	0.89	Challenging
Overall for Organizational Culture	3.02	0.72	Challenging

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly challenging, 2.50–3.24=Challenging, 1.75–2.49=Less challenging, 1.00–1.74=Not challenging.

Table 2 shows the Level of Issues and Challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents in terms of Organizational Culture. From the statements, “DepEd demonstrates an ethical system of moral principles during the recruitment process.” gets the highest mean score of 3.29, $SD=0.76$ and was remarked as “Highly Challenging”. While “DepEd does not tolerate “padrino system”, a common Filipino culture where in someone in a position will

intervene, support, or do favors for someone else because they are relative of friends.” received the lowest mean score of 2.76, $SD=0.89$ and was remarked as “Challenging”. Overall, the level of Issues and Challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents in terms of Organizational Culture gathered a weighted mean score of 3.02, $SD=0.72$ and was Challenging among the respondents.

Table 3. Level of Issues and Challenges in Terms of Plantilla Item

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. The Department of Budget and Management (DBM) has made resources available for the establishment of new teacher items.	2.92	0.87	Challenging
2. Current Plantilla items for teaching personnel is enough to deploy the applicants listed in the RQA	2.41	1.02	Less Challenging
3. Increasing Plantilla positions to rationalized staffing patterns in DepEd attracts teacher applicants to pursue their teaching career.	3.34	0.78	Highly Challenging
4. Plantilla items due to natural vacancies address human resource shortage in DepEd.	3.09	0.68	Challenging
5. Newly created Plantilla items help to aid teacher shortage in DepEd.	3.34	0.76	Highly Challenging
Overall for Plantilla Item	3.02	0.63	Challenging

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly challenging, 2.50–3.24=Challenging, 1.75–2.49=Less challenging, 1.00–1.74=Not challenging.

Table 3 shows the Level of Issues and Challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents in terms of Plantilla items. From the statements, “Increasing Plantilla positions to rationalized staffing patterns in DepEd attracts teacher applicants to pursue their teaching career.” and “Newly created Plantilla items help to aid teacher shortage in DepEd.” yielded the highest mean score, 3.34, $SD=0.78$ and 3.34, $SD=0.76$ respectively and was remarked as

“Highly Challenging”. On the other hand, “Current Plantilla items for teaching personnel is enough to deploy the applicants listed in the RQA.” received the lowest mean score of 2.41, $SD=1.02$ and was remarked “Less Challenging”. Overall, the level of Issues and Challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents in terms of Plantilla items got a weighted mean score of 3.02, $SD=0.63$ and was Challenging among the respondents.

Table 4. Level of Motivation Factors in Terms of Achievement

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Completing a difficult task on time provides a different level of fulfillment to teachers.	3.27	0.81	Highly Motivating
2. Teaching using collaborative practices is more innovative.	3.58	0.75	Highly Motivating
3. Seeing positive results of one’s work keeps teachers motivated.	3.68	0.72	Highly Motivating
4. Teaching quality impacts students' achievement.	3.70	0.72	Highly Motivating
5. Classroom observation is a powerful tool for improving teachers’ strategies and management.	3.42	0.88	Highly Motivating
Overall for Achievement	3.53	0.69	Highly Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.



Table 4 presents the Level of Motivation Factors in terms of Achievement. From the statement, “Teaching quality impacts students' achievement.” yielded the highest mean score of 3.70, $SD=0.72$ and was remarked as “Highly Motivating”. Conversely, “Completing a difficult task on time provides a different level of

fulfillment to teachers.” received the lowest mean score of 3.27, $SD=0.81$ and was remarked “Highly Motivating”. Overall, the level of Motivation Factors in terms of Achievement attained a got mean score of 3.53, $SD=0.69$ and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 5. Level of Motivation Factors in Terms of Recognition

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. DepEd has a well-defined system of performance incentives that encourage teachers to do well.	3.16	0.76	Motivating
2. Rewards and recognition are the primary motivators for teachers.	3.23	0.79	Motivating
3. Rewards and recognitions given to teachers are relevant compared to the work they do.	3.19	0.84	Motivating
4. Rewards and recognitions are significant in shaping teachers' behavior and commitment to work.	3.31	0.81	Highly Motivating
5. DepEd has a good established way of giving incentives and recognitions to motivate its teachers.	3.15	0.74	Motivating
Overall for Recognition	3.21	0.66	Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.

Table 5 shows the Level of Motivation Factors in terms of Recognition. From the statement, “Rewards and recognitions are significant in shaping teachers' behavior and commitment to work.” got the highest mean score of 3.31, $SD=0.81$ and was remarked as “Highly Motivating”. While “DepEd has a good

established way of giving incentives and recognitions to motivate its teachers.” received the lowest mean score of 3.15, $SD=0.74$ and was remarked “Motivating”. Overall, the level of Motivation Factors in terms of Recognition gathered a weighted mean score of 3.21, $SD=0.66$ and was “Motivating” among the respondents.

Table 6. Level of Motivation Factors in Terms of The Work Itself

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Assigning duties and tasks consider teachers' interests and capabilities, thus creating competence-based trust in the teachers.	3.33	0.77	Highly Motivating
2. Teachers play a very important role in society.	3.73	0.68	Highly Motivating
3. Teaching provides an opportunity to serve others.	3.68	0.72	Highly Motivating
4. Being a public school teacher is an interesting job.	3.53	0.72	Highly Motivating
5. Educating pupils to be lifelong students bears some relation to a better comprehension of how teaching affects learning.	3.70	0.69	Highly Motivating
Overall for The Work Itself	3.59	0.65	Highly Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.

Table 6 shows the Level of Motivation Factors in terms of The Work Itself. From the statement, “Teachers play a very important role in society.” gathered the highest mean score of 3.73, $SD=0.68$ and was remarked as “Highly Motivating”. While “Assigning duties and tasks consider teachers' interests and capabilities, thus

creating competence-based trust in the teachers.” received the lowest mean score of 3.33, $SD=0.77$ and was remarked “Highly Motivating”. Overall, the level of Motivation Factors in terms of The Work Itself got a weighted mean score of 3.59, $SD=0.65$ and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 7. Level of Motivation Factors in Terms of Responsibility

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Teachers attend multiple trainings and seminars in a given year.	3.43	0.69	Highly Motivating
2. Teachers exchange information and expertise among teachers and others.	3.59	0.68	Highly Motivating
3. Teachers are accountable for students' performance.	3.29	0.74	Highly Motivating
4. Teachers find ways to have knowledge in light of recent advances.	3.55	0.69	Highly Motivating
5. Teacher shall continue studying to strengthen his competence, advance in his career, and increase his efficiency.	3.47	0.72	Highly Motivating
Overall for Responsibility	3.47	0.63	Highly Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.



Table 7 presents the Level of Motivation Factors in terms of Responsibility. From the statement, “Teachers exchange information and expertise among teachers and others.” got the highest mean score of 3.59, SD=0.68 and was remarked as “Highly Motivating”. Conversely, “Teachers are accountable for

students' performance.” received the lowest mean score of 3.29, SD=0.74 and was remarked “Highly Motivating”. Overall, the level of Motivation Factors in terms of Responsibility gathered a weighted mean score of 3.47, SD=0.63 and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 8. Level of Motivation Factors in Terms of Advancement

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. I do appreciate the way teachers are promoted.	3.30	0.78	Highly Motivating
2. The way promotions are given to teachers motivates me to work hard so that I can be hired.	3.42	0.73	Highly Motivating
3. DepEd has a good established way of promotion to motivate its teachers.	3.22	0.75	Motivating
4. Teachers must constantly adjust to the changes in the existing educational system to satisfy the needs and wants of students in the global market.	3.52	0.70	Highly Motivating
5. Improving teacher quality is a vital thing to student fulfillment.	3.51	0.73	Highly Motivating
Overall for Advancement	3.39	0.66	Highly Motivating

Note. N=100. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.

Table 8 shows the Level of Motivation Factors in terms of Advancement. From the statement, “Teachers must constantly adjust to the changes in the existing educational system to satisfy the needs and wants of students in the global market.” yielded the highest mean score of 3.52, SD=0.70 and was remarked as “Highly Motivating”. While “DepEd has a good established way

of promotion to motivate its teachers.” received the lowest mean score of 3.22, SD=0.75 and was remarked “Motivating”. Overall, the level of Motivation Factors in terms of Advancement attained a weighted mean score of 3.39, SD=0.66 and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 9. Level of Motivation Factors in Terms of Growth

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Teaching provides opportunities for continuous learning.	3.58	0.71	Highly Motivating
2. Teaching will provide me with opportunities to grow professionally.	3.62	0.72	Highly Motivating
3. Teaching provides an opportunity to serve others.	3.63	0.72	Highly Motivating
4. DepEd prioritizes strengthening training and professional development of teachers.	3.48	0.66	Highly Motivating
5. Teachers receive support from DepEd for their professional growth.	3.37	0.71	Highly Motivating
Overall for Growth	3.54	0.63	Highly Motivating

Note. N=100. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.

Table 9 presents the Level of Motivation Factors in terms of Growth. From the statement, “Teaching provides an opportunity to serve others.” got the highest mean score of 3.63, SD=0.72 and was remarked as “Highly Motivating”. Conversely, “Teachers receive support from DepEd for their professional growth.”

received the lowest mean score of 3.37, SD=0.71 and was remarked “Motivating”. Overall, the level of Motivation Factors in terms of Growth gathered a weighted mean score of 3.54, SD=0.63 and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 10. Level of Hygiene Factors in Terms of Bureaucracy

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Teachers are given the authority to make decisions about their lessons instead of waiting for their superior to give them instructions.	3.20	0.77	Motivating
2. School supports and accepts ideas of new members of the school.	3.36	0.70	Highly Motivating
3. Teaching and non-teaching personnel are engaged in deciding about materials and resources.	3.32	0.74	Highly Motivating
4. School heads hold meetings to the involved personnel to address issues in order to enhance teachers' sense of professionalism and institutional belongingness.	3.45	0.74	Highly Motivating
5. Professional relationships that are helpful, cooperative, empowered, and transparent are characteristics of effective schools.	3.51	0.73	Highly Motivating
Overall for Bureaucracy	3.37	0.66	Highly Motivating

Note. N=100. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.



Table 10 presents the Level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Bureaucracy. From the statement, “Professional relationships that are helpful, cooperative, empowered, and transparent are characteristics of effective schools.” got the highest mean score of 3.51, $SD=0.73$ and was regarded as “Highly Motivating”. While “Teachers are given the authority to make decisions about

their lessons instead of waiting for their superior to give them instructions.” received the lowest mean score of 3.20, $SD=0.77$ and was regarded “Motivating”. Overall, the level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Bureaucracy gathered a weighted mean score of 3.37, $SD=0.66$ and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 11. Level of Hygiene Factors in Terms of Relationships

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Teachers' schedules reflect frequent communication opportunities for co-teachers and staff.	3.45	0.66	Highly Motivating
2. Teachers and school personnel spend time together outside the workplace to socialize with one another.	3.36	0.69	Highly Motivating
3. Teachers and school personnel seek for the problem and find a solution rather than blaming others.	3.44	0.72	Highly Motivating
4. Teachers and school personnel are interdependent and value each other.	3.49	0.66	Highly Motivating
5. Schools create equal opportunities for the development and growth of their teachers.	3.46	0.70	Highly Motivating
Overall for Relationships	3.44	0.62	Highly Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.

Table 11 presents the Level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Relationships. From the statement, “Teachers and school personnel are interdependent and value each other.” received the highest mean score of 3.49, $SD=0.66$ and was regarded as “Highly Motivating”. Conversely, “Teachers and school personnel spend time together outside the workplace to socialize

with one another.” received the lowest mean score of 3.36, $SD=0.69$ and was regarded as “Highly Motivating”. Overall, the level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Relationships received a weighted mean score of 3.44, $SD=0.62$ and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 12. Level of Hygiene Factors in Terms of Work Condition

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. School reflects a true sense of community.	3.46	0.72	Highly Motivating
2. Schools with a healthy environment, accomplish teamwork and everyone equally contributes to the success of students.	3.57	0.71	Highly Motivating
3. Commitment to the organization can be strengthened by making the school's structure more adaptable and fostering a collaborative culture.	3.51	0.72	Highly Motivating
4. Teachers exhibit more professional behaviors in a healthy school environment where there is cooperation and professional development.	3.56	0.70	Highly Motivating
5. Pupil and teacher ratio impacts teaching.	3.58	0.71	Highly Motivating
Overall for Work Condition	3.54	0.67	Highly Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.

Table 12 presents the Level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Work Condition. From the statement, “Pupil and teacher ratio impacts teaching.” received the highest mean score of 3.58, $SD=0.71$ and was regarded as “Highly Motivating”. While “School reflects a true sense of community.” received the lowest mean score of 3.46,

$SD=0.72$ and was regarded as “Highly Motivating”. Overall, the level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Work Condition received a weighted mean score of 3.54, $SD=0.67$ and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

**Table 13: Level of Hygiene Factors in Terms of Status**

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Employment status affects work performance.	3.19	0.87	Motivating
2. Teachers who feel respected and valued in their status tend to have a positive attitude towards their work.	3.66	0.70	Highly Motivating
3. Permanent teaching position attracts teacher applicants to pursue their teaching career.	3.61	0.71	Highly Motivating
4. Teacher applicants choose to enter public schools over private schools due to permanent positions.	3.62	0.75	Highly Motivating
5. Teachers are more likely to stay with the teaching profession for a long term because of the permanent status.	3.57	0.74	Highly Motivating
Overall for Status	3.53	0.66	Highly Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.

Table 13 presents the Level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Status. From the statement, “Teachers who feel respected and valued in their status tend to have a positive attitude towards their work.” gathered the highest mean score of 3.66, $SD=0.70$ and was regarded as “Highly Motivating”. While “Employment status affects work performance.” received the lowest mean score of

3.19, $SD=0.87$ and was regarded as “Motivating”. Overall, the level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Status gathered a weighted mean score of 3.53, $SD=0.66$ and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 14. Level of Hygiene Factors in Terms of Salary

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Salary is enough to cover a local cost of living.	2.69	0.73	Motivating
2. Teachers' salaries are enough to sustain family needs.	2.59	0.73	Motivating
3. Public school teachers are considered as well-waged workers.	2.66	0.78	Motivating
4. Teachers who earn higher wages tend to feel more motivated to give their best on doing their jobs.	3.31	0.80	Highly Motivating
5. Job-seeking teachers consider salary when deciding to practice their profession.	3.26	0.79	Highly Motivating
Overall for Salary	2.90	0.55	Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.

Table 14 presents the Level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Salary. From the statement, “Teachers who earn higher wages tend to feel more motivated to give their best on doing their jobs.” got the highest mean score of 3.31, $SD=0.80$ and was regarded as “Highly Motivating”. While “Teachers' salaries are enough to

sustain family needs.” received the lowest mean score of 2.59, $SD=0.73$ and was regarded as “Demotivating”. Overall, the level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Salary got a weighted mean score of 2.90, $SD=0.55$ and was Demotivating among the respondents.

Table 15. Level of Hygiene Factors in Terms of Security

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Teaching in public school has job security.	3.51	0.72	Highly Motivating
2. Teaching in public schools offers permanent positions.	3.51	0.77	Highly Motivating
3. The attractiveness of the teaching profession depends on the terms of employment they are offered.	3.37	0.72	Highly Motivating
4. Tenure gives the teacher a sense of job security.	3.40	0.67	Highly Motivating
5. I decided to become a teacher because I am aware that there would always be a need for educators.	3.22	0.80	Motivating
Overall for Security	3.40	0.64	Highly Motivating

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly motivating, 2.50–3.24=Motivating, 1.75–2.49=Less motivating, 1.00–1.74=Not motivating.



Table 15 presents the Level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Security. From the statement, “Teaching in public school has job security.” and “Teaching in public schools offers permanent positions.” yielded the highest mean score of 3.51, $SD=0.72$ and 3.51, $SD=0.77$ respectively and was regarded as “Highly Motivating”. Conversely, “I decided to become a teacher because

I am aware that there would always be a need for educators.” received the lowest mean score of 3.22, $SD=0.80$ and was regarded as “Demotivating”. Overall, the level of Hygiene Factors in terms of Security got a weighted mean score of 3.40, $SD=0.64$ and was Highly Motivating among the respondents.

Table 16. Level of Commitment to Organization in Terms of Affective Commitment

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. DepEd is a good organization to work with.	3.33	0.70	HC
2. DepEd motivates me to provide the best performance.	3.34	0.71	HC
3. I will make a great effort to help DepEd achieve its goals.	3.53	0.69	HC
4. I am ready to do any task that will be given to me in school.	3.46	0.73	HC
5. I will participate in the school activities.	3.56	0.69	HC
Overall for Affective Commitment	3.44	0.64	HC

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly committed (HC), 2.50–3.24=Committed (C), 1.75–2.49=Less committed (LC), 1.00–1.74=Not committed (NC).

Table 16 presents the Level of Commitment to Organization in terms of Affective Commitment. From the statement, “I will participate in the school activities.” garnered the highest mean score of 3.56, $SD=0.69$ and was regarded as “Highly Committed”. While “DepEd is a good organization to work with.” received the

lowest mean score of 3.33, $SD=0.70$ and was regarded as “Highly Committed”. Overall, the level of Commitment to Organization in terms of Affective Commitment got a weighted mean score of 3.44, $SD=0.64$ and was Highly Committed among the respondents.

Table 17. Level of Commitment to Organization in Terms of Normative Commitment

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. DepEd is the right organization for teachers.	3.48	0.73	Highly Committed
2. I have the obligation to teach the Filipino youth.	3.64	0.72	Highly Committed
3. I took the professional oath for teachers.	3.63	0.75	Highly Committed
4. As a LET (Licensure Examination for Teacher) passer, it is just right to commit to a teaching career.	3.50	0.76	Highly Committed
5. I have a sense of obligation to the education sector.	3.59	0.71	Highly Committed
Overall for Normative Commitment	3.57	0.68	Highly Committed

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly committed, 2.50–3.24=Committed, 1.75–2.49=Less committed, 1.00–1.74=Not committed.

Table 17 presents the Level of Commitment to Organization in terms of Normative Commitment. From the statement, “I have the obligation to teach the Filipino youth.” got the highest mean score of 3.64, $SD=0.72$ and was regarded as “Highly Committed”. While “DepEd is the right organization for teachers.” got the

lowest mean score of 3.48, $SD=0.73$ and was regarded “Highly Committed”. Overall, the level of Commitment to Organization in terms of Normative Commitment got a weighted mean score of 3.57, $SD=0.68$ and was Highly Committed among the respondents.

Table 18. Level of Commitment to Organization in Terms of Continuance Commitment

Indicator	M	SD	Interpretation
1. I have already invested significant time and energy in my application.	3.63	0.69	Highly Committed
2. A career shift will be costly.	3.13	0.82	Committed
3. I don't know any job aside from teaching.	2.52	0.97	Committed
4. Giving up would require me considerable personal sacrifice.	2.98	0.89	Committed
5. I would have to make too many changes and delays to my life if I gave up on my teaching career.	2.98	0.85	Committed
Overall for Continuance Commitment	3.05	0.61	Committed

Note. $N=100$. The mean is interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00=Highly committed, 2.50–3.24=Committed, 1.75–2.49=Less committed, 1.00–1.74=Not committed.



Table 18 presents the Level of Commitment to Organization in terms of Continuance Commitment. From the statement, "I have already invested significant time and energy in my application." got the highest mean score of 3.63, SD=0.69 and was regarded as "Highly Committed". While "I don't know any job aside from teaching." received the lowest mean score of 2.52, SD=0.97) and

was regarded as "Committed". Overall, the level of Commitment to Organization in terms of Continuance Commitment got a weighted mean score of 3.05, SD=0.61 and was Committed among the respondents.

Table 19. Relationships Among Five Profile Variables and Three Organizational Commitment Variables

Profile variable	Organizational commitment variable		
	Affective commitment	Normative commitment	Continuance commitment
Age	$r_s(98)=-.003$ $p=.974$	$r_s(98)=.076$ $p=.450$	$r_s(98)=.017$ $p=.866$
Gender	$F(1,97)=0.61$ $p=.438$	$F(1,22.6)=1.61^a$ $p=.218$	$F(1,97)=0.012$ $p=.913$
Civil status	$F(1,97)=0.035$ $p=.853$	$F(1,97)=0.33$ $p=.565$	$F(1,97)=0.003$ $p=.954$
Educational attainment	$r_s(98)=.210^*$ $p=.036$	$r_s(98)=.270^{**}$ $p=.007$	$r_s(98)=.185$ $p=.065$
Subject specialization	$F(1,97)=0.398$ $p=.879$	$F(1,97)=0.473$ $p=.827$	$F(1,97)=1.42$ $p=.216$

Note. Cell contains test statistics and its corresponding p value. For gender, one observation was excluded with "Prefer not to say" response. For civil status, one observation was excluded with "Prefer not to say" response. For subject specialization, one observation was excluded with "Values Education" response.

^aWelch's ANOVA was used due to violation of assumption of homogeneity of variance.

* $p<.05$. ** $p<.01$. *** $p<.001$.

Table 19 reveals that Age, Gender, Civil Status, and Subject Specialization are not statistically significantly correlated with any of the Organizational Commitment variables with all F values not statistically significant at 0.05 level. Educational Attainment has statistically significant correlation with Affective Commitment, $r_s(98)=.210$ and $p=.036$, Normative Commitment, $r_s(98)=.270$, $p=.007$, and Continuance Commitment, $r_s(98)=.185$, $p=.065$. Moreover, there appears to be significance because the p-values were below the significance alpha of 0.05. Referring to these results, the null hypothesis, which states that "There is no significant relationship between the demographic

profile of the respondents and the level of their organizational commitment," is partially accepted at the 0.05 level of significance except for Educational Attainment which has significant correlation with Organizational Commitment. Therefore, it is appropriate to partially reject the alternative hypothesis which implies that there is no significant difference between them. It means that there is no significant difference in Organizational Commitments of the ranked secondary teacher applicants when grouped according to profile except for Educational Attainment.

Table 20. Correlations Among Three Status and Challenges Variables and Three Organizational Commitment Variables

Status and Challenges Variable	Organizational commitment variable		
	Affective commitment	Normative commitment	Continuance commitment
Recruitment process	.684*** moderate	.740*** high	.419*** moderate
Organizational culture	.472*** moderate	.354*** low	.532*** moderate
Plantilla item	.523*** moderate	.438*** moderate	.465*** moderate

Note. $df=98$. Cell contains Pearson r correlation coefficient and verbal interpretation of its strength.

* $p<.05$. ** $p<.01$. *** $p<.001$.

The correlation is interpreted as follows: 0.80-1.00=Very strong, 0.60-0.79=Strong, 0.40-0.59=Moderate, 0.20-0.39=Weak, 0.00-0.19=Very weak



Table 20 shows that all Status and Challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents' variables are statistically significantly correlated with all the Organizational Commitment variables with all p values less than 0.001. Recruitment Process and Affective Commitment have moderate correlation with each other, and this correlation is statistically significant, $r=.684$, $p<.001$. On the other hand, the Recruitment Process and Normative Commitment have a high correlation with each other, $r=.740$, $p<.001$. Finally, the Recruitment Process and Continuance Commitment have moderate correlation with each other, $r=.419$, $p<.001$. Organizational Culture and Affective Commitment are moderately correlated with each other, and this correlation is statistically significant, $r=.472$, $p<.001$. Organizational Culture and Normative Commitment have a low

correlation with each other, but this correlation is still statistically significant, $r=.354$, $p<.001$. Also, Organizational Culture and Continuance Commitment are moderately correlated with each other, and this correlation is statistically significant, $r=.532$, $p<.001$. Lastly, Plantilla item has moderate correlation with all the three Organizational Commitment and this correlation is statistically significant with $r=.523$, $r=.438$, and $r=.465$, at $p<.001$ respectively. According to these results, the null hypothesis, which states that "there is no significant relationship between the issues and challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents and the level of their organizational commitment," is partially rejected at the 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the alternative hypothesis, which shows that they have a significant relationship, should be partially accepted.

Table 21. Correlations Among Six Motivation Factors and Three Organizational Commitment Variables

Motivation factors	Organizational commitment variable		
	Affective commitment	Normative commitment	Continuance commitment
Achievement	.768*** high	.827*** high	.464*** moderate
Recognition	.686*** moderate	.630*** moderate	.476*** moderate
The work itself	.770*** high	.861*** high	.422*** moderate
Responsibility	.792*** high	.823*** high	.823*** high
Advancement	.806*** high	.772*** high	.514*** moderate
Growth	.787*** high	.835*** high	.408*** moderate

Note. $df=98$. Cell contains Pearson r correlation coefficient and verbal interpretation of its strength.

* $p<.05$. ** $p<.01$. *** $p<.001$.

The correlation is interpreted as follows: 0.80-1.00=Very strong, 0.60-0.79=Strong, 0.40-0.59=Moderate, 0.20-0.39=Weak, 0.00-0.19=Very weak

The correlation coefficients in Table 21 indicate a moderate to strong positive association, ranging from 0.408 to 0.861. From these findings, we can assume that the null hypothesis "There is no significant relationship between the level of Motivation Factors of the respondents and their level of organizational

commitment" at 0.05 level of significance is partially rejected. Therefore, it is appropriate to partially accept the alternative hypothesis, which suggests that they have a significant relationship.

Table 22. Correlations Among Six Hygiene Factors and Three Organizational Commitment Variables

Hygiene factors	Organizational commitment variable		
	Affective commitment	Normative commitment	Continuance commitment
Bureaucracy	.693*** moderate	.681*** moderate	.468*** moderate
Relationships	.688*** moderate	.718*** high	.368*** low
Work conditions	.789*** high	.843*** high	.468*** moderate
Status	.779*** high	.829*** high	.375*** low
Salary	.462*** moderate	.443*** moderate	.399*** low
Security	.789*** high	.873*** high	.445*** moderate

Note. $df=98$. Cell contains Pearson r correlation coefficient and verbal interpretation of its strength.



* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The correlation is interpreted as follows: 0.80-1.00=Very strong, 0.60-0.79=Strong, 0.40-0.59=Moderate, 0.20-0.39=Weak, 0.00-0.19=Very weak

Table 22 shows a weak to strong positive relationship with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.368 to 0.873. From these findings, we can assume that the null hypothesis "There is no significant relationship between the level of Hygiene Factors of the respondents and their level of organizational commitment." is partially rejected at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the alternative hypothesis which shows that there is a significant relationship between them should be partially accepted.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

Considering the study's findings, the hypothesis which implies that the demographic profile of the respondents and the level of their organizational commitment has no significant correlation with each other is accepted. Furthermore, there is enough statistical evidence to reject the research hypotheses which state that there is no significant relationship between the issues and challenges in DepEd as perceived by the respondents and the level of their organizational commitment; there is no significant relationship between the level of Motivation Factors of the respondents and their level of organizational commitment; and there is no significant relationship between the level of Hygiene Factors of the respondents and their level of organizational commitment.

Recommendation

In view of the conclusion, the following recommendations were given. The HRMP SB of DepEd SDO Laguna may reconsider the recalibration of score in ranking for Teacher I where in teacher applicants who have already completed the review procedure in previous ranking will not be required to go through it again; just a recalibration or updating of points in compliance with the established rules of pointing system. The Personnel Unit may also establish a database of RQA applicants where in their employment history is indicated including the times they applied, their history of substitution, volunteer works, Local School Board (LSB), Learning Support Aide (LSA), and job order works in DepEd which may be use as consideration in their deployment. Lastly, address the allocation of personnel, in DepEd. In particular, DepEd must dive deeply into the shortage issue of human resources and collaborate with the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) to provide necessary support for increasing Plantilla positions.

REFERENCES

1. DEPED ORDER NO. 007, S. 2023 (2023). *Guidelines on Recruitment, Selection, and Appointment in the Department of Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2023/03/23/march-22-2023-do-007-s-2023-guidelines-on-recruitment-selection-and-appointment-in-the-department-of-education/>
2. HERZBERG, F. (1968). *One more time. How do you motivate employees*, pp. 53-62.
3. KABIR, S.M.S. (2016). *Introduction to Research*, pp. 8. ResearchGate. Retrieved from n at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325846733>
4. KURT, S. (2021). *Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory: Two-Factor*. Education Library
5. MEYER, J. P. & ALLEN, N. J. (1991). *A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61- 98.
6. NIKOLOPOULOU, K. (2022). *What Is Purposive Sampling?* Retrieved from <https://www.scribbr.com/author/kassianin/page/11/#:~:text=Published%20on%20August%2011%2C%202022,on%20purpose%2080%9D%20in%20purposive%20sampling.>