

Teaching Readiness, Workload Analysis and Performance of Teachers in Luna District

ABSTRACT

Aims: This study analyzed the workload of teachers as to teaching load, other assignment/s and total workload and determined the profile of the teachers in terms of demographic profile, professional profile and administrative profile; teachers' teaching readiness; performance of teachers; relationship of the profile and teaching readiness of teachers, profile and performance of teachers, profile and workload, teaching readiness and performance of teachers and workload and performance of teachers.

Study design: The researcher used the documentary analysis method.

Place and Duration of Study: This study was conducted at the secondary schools of Luna, Apayao, from January 2018 to June 2018.

Methodology: Sixty-five teachers were chosen as respondents through the simple random sampling. Data were collected through the survey questionnaire and School Form 7 and analyzed through frequency counts, percentage, mean and Pearson (r).

Results: Majority of the respondents are 38 years old, females, married, Roman Catholic, Ilocano, Teacher I, 10 years in the service, master's degree holder, eligible to teach, and English majors, and have attended 3 trainings or seminars related to their field of specialization. Majority are very ready in their teaching career with 37 or 56.92 percent of them. The respondents' average workload is 23, most of them are given 2 other assignments and have an average weekly workload of 25 hours. Majority perform "Very Satisfactory" in their task as a whole. There is a significant relationship between age and teaching readiness, plantilla positions, length of service and performance of the teachers. There is no significant relationship between the profile of the teachers and workload, teaching readiness and performance of teachers, performance and workload of teachers.

Conclusion: There is so much room for professional growth among the teachers They do their tasks with competence, are service-oriented and are reliable even in doing assigned tasks different from their workload.

Keywords: Teaching readiness, workload, workload analysis, performance of teachers

1. INTRODUCTION

No dynamic teaching is attainable without an active teacher. So an effective teacher is known through their quality and efficient teaching [1]. In all educational systems, the performance of teachers is one of the handfuls of factors determining school effectiveness and learning outcomes. According to Naik [2], teaching is noble, but it is a demanding occupation. In order for teachers to maintain a high level of professional performance under certain condition, they must assume personal responsibility for their own performance, growth and development. Mohanty as cited by Nadeem [1] explains that the teacher performance as the most crucial input in the field of education [3, 4]. Teachers are perhaps the most essential component of any system of education. The quality of their teaching depends on motivation, qualification, experience, training, aptitude and a lot of other factors [1], not the least of these being the environment and management structures within which they perform their role. Teachers must be seen as part of the solution and not as part of the problem[4,5]. Low salary, low status and morale are key causes of poor performance of teachers[6, 7, 8]. Across the world, millions of teachers, most of them women, are working tirelessly for poverty wages educating the next generation[9]. Internal factors have an impact on teachers feeling of success[10] and a number of external forces can either aid or hinder

teachers success[11]. Increased duties and demands on time, low pay, and disruptive students have a significant impact on teachers' attitudes toward their jobs[12, 13]. In addition, lack of support from staff at all levels has an effect on teacher performance. Teachers are no exception. Low pay[14,] and student conduct problems in the classroom [15, 16] are just a couple of issues that teachers face. Aside from these, low morale among teachers is another problem that must be addressed [17, 18] . In order to work toward a solution, the first step is to identify those factors that have the greatest impact on morale levels, both negative and positive. Pakistan is a developing country of South Asia like other developing countries whose main reasons for its underdevelopment is the low quality of education which has in turn great impact on the country's social, economical and political system [1].

Teaching is a great profession [19, 20] and teachers have a great role in their students' intellectual[21], personal and social development[22, 23], thereby influencing the whole nation's development. Teaching is the supreme art of the teacher to awaken joy in creative expression and knowledge[24,25]. Teachers can have influence more profound than others [26, 27]. In fact it is an ideal teacher at the climax of his performance that brings about a positive change in the overall behavior of his students by leading them to a lofty character and to exemplary morals.

Performance of teachers mainly depends on the teacher characteristics such as knowledge-based [28], sense of responsibility [29], and inquisitiveness[30]. The student characteristics such as opportunity to learn, and academic work [31, 32]; the teaching factors such as lesson structure, and communication[33]; the learning aspects such as involvement and success [34] ; and the classroom phenomena such as environment and climate, and organization and management [35]. If the teachers take care of these factors, their performance can be enhanced to the optimum level [30]. Leigh and Mead [36] clearly bring about the fact that the quality of teaching has come down gradually world over, demonstrate that the skills of teachers have come down due to outdated preparation on the part of the teacher and stagnant compensation schemes by the management of the educational institution. Their suggestion for lifting performance of teachers have emphasized the need for periodical performance appraisal just as it is in the corporate or business organization [37, 38]. Teachers will have to be periodically evaluated and the compensation structure will have to be based on performance . A stringent policy will have to be developed in order to modernize and enrich teacher quality for hiring, evaluating and compensating. Merit based rewards yielded the best performance[39, 40]. They have indicated how quality matters by comparing the performance of students of an average teacher with that of the performance of students of an excellent teacher.

With these bases, the researchers finally decided to venture on this study considering the effect of workload of teachers to performance of teachers in the different schools in Luna District.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

RESEARCH DESIGN

The researcher made use of documentary analysis method. This method is necessary for an adequate analysis of the teachers' workload and how this affects teaching readiness and performance.

LOCALE OF THE STUDY

This was conducted in the six secondary schools of Luna, Apayao namely Apayao Science High School, Bac-Da National High School, Luna National High School, Tumog National Agricultural & Trade High School, Marag Valley Agricultural and Trade High School and San Francisco National Agricultural and Trade High School.

The schools are little far from each other since they are scattered all throughout the town. The learners could reach their respective schools through public utility vehicles or even by mere walking. These schools have school Principals and Teachers-in-Charge who guide them in the profession.

RESPONDENTS OF THE STUDY

This study made use of the simple random sampling considering 85 percent of the total teacher population per school. This was used to determine the exact number of respondents teaching in each participating school in Luna District. The schools are accessible by public utility vehicles. The number of respondents is presented in a tabular form.

Chart 1. Distribution of teacher respondents

Name of school	Number of teacher respondents
Bac-Da National High School	13
Apayao Science High School	12
Luna National High School	17
Tumog National Agricultural & Trade High School	10
Marag Valley Agricultural & Trade High School	7
San Francisco National Agricultural & Trade High School	6
Total	65

The table shows the distribution of respondents from the six secondary schools being identified.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The survey questionnaire was the primary instrument used in gathering the needed data for this study. Part I asked the demographic profile of the respondents while the second part was a survey questionnaire asking the teacher's readiness. It is a 15-item instrument on a 5-point scale scored from 1 which is 'Strongly Disagree' to 5 which is 'Strongly Agree'.

Documentary analysis using the School Form 7 and IPCRF was used to analyze the workload and the teachers' performance.

DATA GATHERING

The researcher sought approval from the Division Superintendent of the Division of Apayao to conduct the said study in Luna District. Then, letters of request were sent to the school heads of all the schools involved in this study.

Upon approval, the researcher personally administered the floating of questionnaires to the respondents in order to ensure that all necessary information were kept safe and intact after the respondents have finished filling out the needed information in the instrument to be used.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data gathered were recorded, tabulated, summarized, analyzed and interpreted based on the problems of this study by means of the following statistical treatments:

Frequency counts, percentage and mean distribution were used in determining the profile of the respondents.

Pearson (r) was used to see any relationship in the variables under study.

In describing the level of readiness and performance of teachers, the 5- point scale below was used.

Chart 2: Describing the level of readiness and performance of teachers

Scale	Limits of description	Level of readiness	Descriptive on performance of teachers
5	4.20-5.00	Very Ready	Outstanding
4	3.40- 4.19	Ready	Very Satisfactory

3	2.60- 3.39	Neutral	Satisfactory
2	1.80- 2.59	Sometimes not Ready	Fairly
1	1.00- 1.79	Not Ready	Poor

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Demographic profile

Variables	F (n+65)	%
Age		
21-25 years old	3	4.62
26-30 years old	12	18.46
31-35 years old	10	15.38
36- 40 years old	17	26.15
41-45 years old	10	15.38
46- 50 years old	4	6.15
51- 55 years old	3	4.62
56- 60 years old	6	9.23
Mean age:38 years old		
Sex		
Male	12	18.46
Female	53	81.54
Civil status		
Single	12	18.46
Married	52	80.00
Widowed	1	1.54
Religion		
Roman Catholic	33	50.77
Pentecost	12	18.46
Others	20	30.77
Ethnicity		

Ilocano	50	76.92
Isnag	7	10.77
Others	8	12.31

The table shows the demographic profile of the secondary teachers of Luna District in terms of age, sex, civil status, religion, and ethnicity.

The study reveals that 17 or 26.15 percent, 12 or 18.46 percent and 10 or 15.38 percent are with age that ranges from 36-40 years, 26 - 30 years and 31- 35 and 41 - 45 years old. Likewise, 6 or 9.23 percent, 4 or 6.15 percent and 3 or 4.62 percent belongs to age ranging from 56 – 60 years, 46 – 50 years and 51- 55 years and 21 – 25 years, respectively. The table further shows that the mean age of the respondents is 38 years old.

It can be gleaned in the table that 53 or 81.54 percent and 12 or 18.46 percent of the respondents are females and males, respectively.

Fifty-two (52) or 80 percent, 12 or 18.46 percent and 1 or 1.54 percent of the respondents are married, single and widowed, respectively. This is expected as majority of the teachers are within the age 36 - 40 years, the marrying age.

In terms of religion, 33 or 50.77 percent, 20 or 30.77 percent and 12 or 18.46 percent of the respondents are Roman Catholic, in other religion and Pentecost, respectively.

Fifty (50) or 76.92 percent, 8 or 12.31 percent and 7 or 10.77 percent of the respondents are Ilocano, in other ethnic group and Isnag, respectively.

Table 2: Professional profile

Variables	f (n=65)	%
Educational attainment		
BS Degree	26	40.00
Master's Degree	39	60.00
Eligibility		
PBET/LET	63	96.92
CS	1	1.54
NCII	1	1.54
Field of specialization		
English	13	20.00
Filipino	7	10.77
MAPEH	3	4.62
PEHM	2	3.08
Math	10	15.38
Technology & Livelihood Education	9	13.85

Information & Communication Technology	2	3.08
Home Economics	1	1.54
Science	2	3.08
Social Studies	7	10.77
Biology	4	6.15
Chemistry	1	1.54
General Science	2	3.08
Social Science	1	1.54
Business Administration	1	1.54

Table 2 presents the professional profile of the respondents in terms of educational attainment, eligibility, and field of specialization.

In terms of educational attainment, 39 or 60 percent of the respondents' are master's degree holder and 26 or 40 percent are bachelor's degree holder.

In line with their eligibility, 50 or 76.92 percent of the respondents passed the Licensure Examination for Teachers (76.92 %), 13 or 20 percent passed the PBET and 1 or 1.54 percent passed the NCII and Civil Service, respectively. Ninety- six point ninety- two percent (96.92%) of the respondents are eligible to teach.

In terms of field of specialization, 13 or 20 percent of the respondents are English major, 10 or 15.38 percent are Mathematics major, 9 or 13.85 percent are TLE major, 7 or 10.77 percent each are Filipino and Social Studies major, 4 or 6.15 percent are Biology major, 3 or 4.62 percent are MAPEH major, 2 or 3.08 percent each PEHM, ICT, Science, and General Science major, and 1 or 1.54 percent each are Home Economics, Social Science, and Business Administration major.

Table 3: Administrative profile

Variables	f (n=65)	%
Plantilla position		
Teacher I	27	41.54
Teacher II	12	18.46
Teacher III	22	33.85
Master Teacher I	4	6.15
Length of service		
1 - 5 years	24	36.92
6- 10 years	19	29.23
11-15 years	9	13.85
16- 20 years	5	7.69

21-25 years	1	1.54
26- 30 years	6	9.23
31-35 years	1	1.54
Mean length of service:10 years		
Number of attended trainings and seminars related to their field of specialization		
None at All	12	18.46
Attended 1 training and seminar	13	20.00
Attended 2 trainings and seminars	14	21.54
Attended 3 trainings and seminars	20	30.77
Attended 4 trainings and seminars	3	4.62
Attended 5 or more trainings and seminars	3	4.62

Table 3 presents the administrative profile of the respondents in terms of plantilla position, length of service, educational attainment, and number of attended trainings and seminars related to their field of specialization.

It can be gleaned in the table that 27 or 41.54 percent of the respondents are Teacher I, 22 or 33.85 percent are Teacher III, 12 or 18.46 percent are Teacher II and 4 or 6.15 percent are Master Teacher I. Majority of the respondents are Teacher I.

With regards to the length of service of the respondents, 24 or 36.92 percent, 19 or 29.23 percent, 9 or 13.85 percent, and 6 or 9.23 percent are on the service for 1 – 5 years, 6 – 10 years, 11 – 15 years and 26 – 30 years respectively. Also, 5 or 7.69 percent are on the service for 16 – 20 years and 1 or 1.54 percent are on the service for 21 – 25 years and 31 – 35 years. It was also observed that mean length of service in years of the respondents is 10 years.

In terms of number of attended trainings and seminars related to field of specialization, 20 or 30.77 percent of the respondents attended 3 trainings and seminars related to field of specialization, 14 or 21.54 percent attended 2 trainings and seminars related to field of specialization, 13 or 20 percent attended 1 training and seminar related to field of specialization, 3 or 4.62 percent each attended 4 and 5 or more trainings and seminars related to field of specialization, respectively. Twelve (12) or 18.46 percent haven't attended a training and seminar related to their field of specialization. An employee who receives the necessary training is better able to perform her job.

Table 4. Teaching readiness

Statement	Mean	Verbal description
I am ready to teach my daily class.	4.48	Very Ready
I prepare my daily lesson log.	4.02	Ready
I have ready instructional materials to use in my classroom teaching.	3.89	Ready
I have developed evaluative tools for every lessons taught	3.83	Ready

I am eager to enter my class daily.	4.51	Very Ready
I know how to settle disputes in my class when they arise.	4.62	Very Ready
I teach my subjects with enjoyment	4.54	Very Ready
I am interested in every lesson shared with my students.	4.51	Very Ready
I have enough hands on activities in my lessons.	4.05	Ready
I develop activities suitable to every lesson.	4.42	Very Ready
I see to it that activities given in my class are beneficial to my students.	4.63	Very Ready
I spend time developing instructional materials	3.89	Ready
I make students records on time.	4.32	Very Ready
I give feedback to students' performance after evaluation.	4.05	Ready
I see to it that I have ample time to address students' needs and problems.	4.26	Very Ready
Over – all mean	4.27	Very Ready

The researchers used the 5-point Likert Scale to describe the level of readiness. The findings show that 37 or 56.92 percent of the respondents are very ready in their teaching career. The remaining faculty members which are 28 or 43.08 percent of the total respondents are 'Ready'. The findings show further that the teaching readiness of the respondents are in general 'Very Ready' with an over – all mean of 4.27. However, while majority of the respondents are 'Very Ready' in their profession, a big number of the remaining faculty have to still better themselves in their profession.

Table 5: Workload of teachers

Teaching load (No. of hours rendered in teaching per week)	f (n=65)	%
26-30	22	33.85
21-25	22	33.85
16-20	21	32.31
Average teaching load	23 hours	
Number of other assignment		
4	2	3.08
3	6	9.23
2	23	35.38

1	30	46.15
0	4	6.15
Average number of other assignments	2	
Total workload		
31-35	4	6.15
26-30	26	40.00
21-25	24	36.92
16-20	11	16.92
Average total workload	25	

The data presented shows the workload of the respondents. It can be gleaned in the table the teaching loads of the respondents per week, 22 or 33.85 percent of the respondents each have 21-25 and 26-30 teaching loads, and 21 or 32.31 percent have 16-20 teaching loads.

In terms of number of other assignments 30 or 46.15 percent of the respondents have 1 other assignment, 23 or 35.38 percent have 2 other assignments, 6 or 9.23 percent have 3 other assignments, 2 or 3.08 percent have 4 other assignments. Four (4) or 6.15 percent haven't other assignment. Most of the respondents have more than one other assignment.

It can be gleaned in the table the total workloads of the respondents in a week. Twenty-six (26) or 40 percent have 25- 30 hours total workload in a week, 24 or 36.92 percent have 21- 25 hours total workload in a week, 11 or 16.92 percent have 16-20 hour total workload in a week, and 4 or 6.15 percent have 31-35 hours total workload in a week.

Table 6. Performance of teachers

Variables	f (n=65)	%	Description
Mean Score Range			
4.20-5.00	13	20.00	Outstanding
3.40-4.19	52	80.00	Very Satisfactory

The data presented above shows the performance of the respondents as a whole. Using the 5-point Likert scale, the table reveals that 52 or 80 percent of the respondents are 'Very Satisfactory' and 13 or 20 percent of the respondents are 'Outstanding'. Improving classroom management organization, facilitating the improvement of pupils or students outcome, engaging as partners in the pursuit of DepEd's interest, sustaining partnership with stakeholders, keeping abreast with information about partners in education, searching for solutions to local issues and concerns on the teaching-learning process, introducing innovations in the workplace, observing punctuality and complete attendance to school.

Table 7: Relationship between profile variables and teaching readiness

Profile variable	Computed r	Tabular r	Interpretation
Age	0.74	0.25	S
Sex	0.02	0.25	NS

Civil status	-0.16	0.25	NS
Religion	0.01	0.25	NS
Ethnicity	0.19	0.25	NS
Education attainment	-0.03	0.25	NS
Eligibility	0.18	0.25	NS
Field of specialization	-0.09	0.25	NS
Plantilla position	0.02	0.25	NS
Length of service	0.06	0.25	NS
Seminars & trainings attended related to the field of specialization	-0.10	0.25	NS

Using the r-correlation, the data on the table above shows that 10 or 91 percent of the computed r are less than the tabulated r- values. It means that there is no significant relationship between the profile variables (sex, civil status, religion, ethnicity, educational attainment, eligibility, field of specialization, plantilla position, length of service and number of seminars attended) and teaching readiness. However, age and teaching readiness has a significant relationship. The age of the respondents has an effect to the teaching readiness of the respondents.

Majority of the respondents are relatively young. This is of advantage to the workplace as young people are full of energy, young people can offer a cost-effective way to grow a workforce, and young people bring enthusiasm. In the right environment and with the right guidance and supervision, young people can excel within a company and surprise even the most apprehensive of employers

Table 8: Relationship between profile variables and performance of teachers

Profile variable	Computed r	Tabular r	Interpretation
Age	-0.01	0.25	NS
Sex	-0.09	0.25	NS
Civil status	-0.03	0.25	NS
Religion	-0.12	0.25	NS
Ethnicity	0.17	0.25	NS
Education attainment	-0.14	0.25	NS
Eligibility	-0.23	0.25	NS
Field of Specialization	-0.14	0.25	NS
Plantilla position	0.48	0.25	S
Length of service	0.40	0.25	S
Seminars & trainings attended related	-0.33	0.25	NS

to the field of specialization			
--------------------------------	--	--	--

The table shows the relationship of the Profile variable and Performance of the teachers. It shows that Plantilla position and Length of Service of the respondents has significant relationship with teaching performance. This means that the respondents teaching performance is dependent from the plantilla position and the length of service. Moreover, the other profile variables have no significant relationship with the teaching performance of the respondents. This implies that teaching performance is independent from the other profile variables.

Teachers show the greatest productivity gains during their first few years on the job [41, 42], after which their performance tends to level off. This illustrates a diminishing marginal returns to experience .

Table 9: Relationship between profile variables and workload of teachers

Profile Variable	Computed r	Tabular r	Interpretation
Age	-0.07	0.25	NS
Sex	-0.15	0.25	NS
Civil Status	-0.04	0.25	NS
Religion	-0.28	0.25	NS
Ethnicity	-0.08	0.25	NS
Education Attainment	-0.11	0.25	NS
Eligibility	-0.07	0.25	NS
Field of Specialization	0.06	0.25	NS
Plantilla Position	0.22	0.25	NS
Length of Service	0.16	0.25	NS
Seminars & Trainings Attended Related to the Field of Specialization	-0.03	0.25	NS

The data shows that profile variable has no significant relationship with the workload of teachers. Moreover, since all the computed r value are within the acceptance region at 5 percent significant level having an r tabular value of 0.25. It means that the profile variables are independent from the workloads of the respondents.

Table 10: Relationship between teaching readiness and performance of teachers

Variable	Computed r	Tabular r	Interpretation
Teaching Readiness and Performance	0.06	0.25	NS

* 5% level of significance

The table shows that teaching readiness has no significant relationship with the performance of teachers having an r value of 0.06, which is less than the tabular r – value 0.25. It means that teaching readiness and performance of teachers are independent of each other.

This is contradicted by the study of Sulaiman, T. et. al. where readiness and competency in teaching among trainee teachers have a positive relationship with creativity in teaching [43]. This is tantamount to saying that the more ready the teacher is, the better is his/her performance in the delivery of instruction.

Table 11: Relationship between workload and performance of teachers

Variable	Computed r	Tabular r	Interpretation
Workload and Performance of Teachers	0.10	0.25	NS

The data above shows that performance of teachers has no significant relationship with the workload having a Pearson coefficient (r) value of 0.10, which is less than the tabular r-value 0.25. It means that performance of teachers and workload are independent with each other. This implies that performance is independent from the number of workloads of the respondents.

The findings of this study was contrary to the study of Tancinco [44], titled Status of Teachers' Workload and Performance in State Universities of Eastern Visayas: Implications to Educational Management. He stated that workload status was highly related to the level of work performance. This suggests that workload status of the teacher- respondents had a significant relationship to their job performance.

Changes in workload are related to performance in that increases in workload are accompanied by decreases in performance[45]. Nevertheless, a study by U.S Army Research argues that at extremely low levels of workload, the workers' capabilities are under-utilized and he or she may become bored and complacent [46, 47]. In these circumstances the worker can miss input signals and for that or related reasons become less proficient. The study continues by saying that with intermediate levels of workload, performance can be expected to be acceptably high. As task demands become more extremely high, workload levels may exceed the worker's ability or willingness to commit more skill resources or to exert more effort. At that level of workload, performance will decrease, perhaps at some point or after some extended period, catastrophically. Performance may remain at an acceptable level over a considerable range of workload variation. In general, however, workload extremes are related to poor performance.

4. CONCLUSION

From the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. There is so much room for professional growth among secondary teachers in Luna District.
2. Teachers do their tasks with competence.
3. Majority of the respondents are assigned other tasks aside from their teaching load.
4. Secondary teachers in Luna District are service-oriented people. They can be relied upon in whatever tasks assigned to them.
5. Teachers do all the tasks stipulated in their workload because they see it as a duty, a calling which has to be carried out regardless of factors that could influence their degree of work performance.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Both authors declare that ethical approval was obtained from the Apayao State College and the DepEd division of Apayao.

Consent

As per international standard or university standard, respondents' written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

REFERENCES

1. Nadeem, Mohammad, et. al (2011) Teacher's Competencies and Factors Affecting the Performance of Female Teachers in Bahawalpur (Southern Punjab) Pakistan. Accessed on March 29, 2018. Retrieved from <http://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol 2 No 19 Special Issue October 2011/27.pdf>
2. Naik, S.P. (1998). *Education for the twenty first century*. New Delhi: Anmol publications.
3. Kumar IA, Parveen S. Teacher education in the age of globalization. *Research Journal of Educational Sciences*. 2013 Apr;1(1):8-12.

4. Malathy M. Gender Perspective and Teacher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ijtrd.com/papers/IJTRD15947.pdf>
5. Warner L. Overseas trained teachers: part of a problem or part of a solution?. *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal (TEAN)*. 2010 Dec 6;1(2).
6. Mayher J, Rossi R. No RESPECT: Blaming teachers and teacher educators for the 'crises' in American schools. *English in Australia*. 2011 Jan;46(2):21-6.
7. Mackenzie N. Teacher morale: More complex than we think?. *The Australian Educational Researcher*. 2007 Apr;34(1):89-104.
8. Bennell P. Teacher motivation and incentives in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. *Knowledge and Skills for development*, Brighton. 2004 Jul;1(1):1-52.
9. Ingersol RM, Merrill E, Stuckey D, Collins G. Seven Trends: The Transformation of the Teaching Force. Updated October 2018. CPRE Research Report# RR 2018-2. Consortium for Policy Research in Education. 2018 Nov 1.
10. Russell, T. and McPherson, S., 2001, May. Indicators of success in teacher education. In *Communication présentée à Pan-Canadian Education Research Agenda Symposium Teacher Education/Educator Training: Current Trends and Future Directions, Université Laval, Québec*. Repéré à http://www.cesc.ca/pceradocs/2001/papers/01Russell_McPherson_e.pdf.
11. Dembo MH, Gibson S. Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. *The elementary school journal*. 1985 Nov 1;86(2):173-84.
12. Evers WJ, Brouwers A, Tomic W. Burnout and self-efficacy: A study on teachers' beliefs when implementing an innovative educational system in the Netherlands. *British Journal of educational psychology*. 2002 Jun;72(2):227-43.
13. Cooper C, Travers C. *Teachers under pressure: Stress in the teaching profession*. Routledge; 2012 Dec 6. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203059975/teachers-pressure-cary-cooper-cary-cooper-cherly-travers>
14. Podgursky MJ, Springer MG. Teacher performance pay: A review. *Journal of policy analysis and management*. 2007 Oct 1;26(4):909-49.
15. Tehseen S, Hadi NU. Factors influencing teachers' performance and retention. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 2015 Jan 7;6(1):233.
16. Sutherland KS, Oswald DP. The relationship between teacher and student behavior in classrooms for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: Transactional processes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. 2005 Mar 1;14(1):1.
17. Nolan C, Stitzlein SM. Meaningful hope for teachers in times of high anxiety and low morale. *Democracy and Education*. 2011;19(1):2.
18. Naong M. The impact of the abolition of corporal punishment on teacher morale: 1994–2004. *South African journal of education*. 2007;27(2).
19. Manzura N. Sustainable Activity in the Teaching Profession and Its Foundations. *Psychology and Education Journal*. 2021;58(2):1339-45.
20. Hord SM, Tobia EF. *Reclaiming our teaching profession: The power of educators learning in community*. Teachers College Press; 2015 Apr 24.
21. Felder RM, Brent R. The intellectual development of science and engineering students. Part 2: Teaching to promote growth. *Journal of Engineering Education*. 2004 Oct;93(4):279-91.

22. Day C, Leitch R. Teachers' and teacher educators' lives: The role of emotion. *Teaching and teacher education*. 2001 May 1;17(4):403-15.
23. Laker A. *Developing personal, social and moral education through physical education: A practical guide for teachers*. Routledge; 2002 Jan 4.
24. Mehay R, Romito A, Waters M, Baldwin K, Begum H. Five Pearls of Educational Theory. In *The Essential Handbook for GP Training and Education 2021* Jul 28 (pp. 114-132). CRC Press.
25. Allison DL. Integrated arts: an integral part of teacher education. *ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ ЧЕРЕЗ ВСЮ ЖИЗНЬ: НЕПРЕРЫВНОЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ ДЛЯ УСТОЙЧИВОГО РАЗВИТИЯ//Материалы*. 2006:63.
26. Hattie J. Teachers Make a Difference, What is the research evidence?. Retrieved from https://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=research_conference_2003
27. Hattie J. It's official: teachers make a difference. *Educare news*. 2004 Feb(144). Retrieved from <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/aeipt.132958>
28. Kefela GT. Knowledge-based economy and society has become a vital commodity to countries. *International NGO Journal*. 2010 Aug 31;5(7):160-6.
29. Bolshakova VL, Johnson CC, Czerniak CM. "It depends on what science teacher you got": Urban science self-efficacy from teacher and student voices. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*. 2011 Dec;6(4):961-97.
30. Chamundeswari S2. Job satisfaction and performance of school teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 2013 May 1;3(5):420.
31. Nonis SA, Hudson GI. Academic performance of college students: Influence of time spent studying and working. *Journal of education for business*. 2006 Jan 1;81(3):151-9.
32. Rubie-Davies C, Hattie J, Hamilton R. Expecting the best for students: Teacher expectations and academic outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2006 Sep;76(3):429-44.
33. Chidananda AL. 13. A Study on Classroom Management Styles and Teacher Effectiveness of Teachers at Secondary Level Schools of Hassan District. *MULTI-DISCIPLINARY RESEARCH EXPLORER*.:74.
34. Rao DB. *School teacher effectiveness*. Discovery Publishing House; 2004.
35. MOSES-PROMISE OJ, Anyamele SC. Continuance Commitment and Teachers' Performance in Secondary Schools in Rivers State. Retrieved from http://wwjmr.com/upload/continuance-commitment-and-teachers-performance-in-secondary-schools-in-rivers-state_1539602377.pdf
36. Leigh, A. and Mead, S. (2005). *Lifting Performance of teachers*. *Policy Report*, Progressive Policy Institute.
37. Jethi R, Kumar B. Students Rating of Teachers' Performance. *Interaction*. 2011;29(2):127-31.
38. Yusuf AR, Ajidagba UA, Agbonna SA, Olumorin CO. University teachers' perception of the effects of students evaluation of teaching on lecturers instructional practices in Nigeria. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference of Collaborational of Education Faculties in West Africa (CEFWA) 2010* Feb 9 (pp. 1-16).
39. Zenger TR, Marshall CR. Determinants of incentive intensity in group-based rewards. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2000 Apr 1;43(2):149-63.
40. Johnson ST. Plan Your Organization's Reward Strategy through Pay-for-Performance Dynamics. *Compensation & Benefits Review*. 1998 May;30(3):67-72.
41. Rice JK. *The Impact of Teacher Experience: Examining the Evidence and Policy Implications*. Brief No. 11. National center for analysis of longitudinal data in education research. 2010 Aug.

42. Podolsky A, Kini T, Darling-Hammond L. Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of US research. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*. 2019 Jun 28.
43. Sulaiman, T., Hamzah, S. N. and Abdul Rahim, S. S. (2017). The Relationship between Readiness and Teachers' Competency towards Creativity in Teaching among Trainee Teachers. Accessed on April 21, 2022. <http://www.ijssh.org/vol7/883-SH057.pdf>
44. Tancinco N.P (2016) Status of Teachers' Workload and Performance in State Universities of Eastern Visayas: Implications to Educational Management. Accessed on March 29, 2018. Retrieved from <http://iosrjournals.org/iosr-ibm/papers/Vol18-issue6/Version-4/H1806044657.pdf>
45. Yurko YY, Scerbo MW, Prabhu AS, Acker CE, Stefanidis D. Higher mental workload is associated with poorer laparoscopic performance as measured by the NASA-TLX tool. *Simulation in healthcare*. 2010 Oct 1;5(5):267-71.
46. Christ RE. Incorporating operator workload issues and concerns into the system acquisition process: A pamphlet for Army managers. US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences; 1990.
47. Omondi PJ. *The influence of workload on performance of teachers in public primary schools in Kombewa division, Kisumu West District, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).