INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Volume VI, Issue 1 January 2026, eISSN: 2799-0664

Teachers' Self Efficacy and Work Performance

Darren C. Balasabas [1]* & William A. Buquia [2]

Abstract — This study examined the self-efficacy levels of teachers and their relationship to work performance in a district in a small-sized division in Central Philippines. It also tends to establish a basis for an intervention plan. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the researchers conducted a census sampling of 105 public school teachers. The data were gathered using a validated and contextually researcher-made structured questionnaire on teachers' demographic profiles, self-efficacy across five domains, and work performance anchored on established performance indicators. Data analysis used descriptive statistics, normality testing, and correlation procedures to describe the differences and relationships among the variables. Results showed that a majority of the teachers fall under the mid-career category and are occupying the Teacher III position, with very high efficacy in behavior management and high efficacy in instructional, motivational, and general domains, while having a moderately high self-efficacy in the student engagement domain. Similarly, the overall work performance is generally rated as very satisfactory. This study also noted correlations of overall self-efficacy with profile variables such as age, monthly income, and teaching position. However, overall self-efficacy is not significantly related to work performance. Results imply differential levels of confidence across certain aspects and, notably, below-average performance in student engagement. It is hereby concluded that domain-specific competencies should be consolidated to support continuous instructional improvement; hence, schools may consider differentiated professional development that prioritizes enhancement of engagement-focused teaching practices.

Keywords: Teachers' Self-Efficacy, Work Performance, Student Engagement, Professional Development, Instructional Effectiveness

I. INTRODUCTION

The quality of education in the Philippines is profoundly shaped by teachers' competence, confidence, and capacity to manage classrooms while sustaining learner engagement. In light of ongoing national reforms, including the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers and the Performance Management and Evaluation System, teacher self-efficacy—anchored in Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory—has emerged as a pivotal indicator of instructional quality, influencing resilience, innovation, and classroom effectiveness (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2020; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2021). Nevertheless, numerous teachers continue to encounter challenges that undermine self-belief, such as increasing curricular demands, heterogeneous learner needs, and administrative workload pressures. Although theory robustly supports the value of self-efficacy, empirical investigations into its relationship with actual work performance within Philippine public schools remain limited. This study addresses this gap by examining teachers' demographic and professional profiles, their self-efficacy across key domains, their work performance in accordance with established standards, and the extent to which self-efficacy and profile variables relate to performance. Employing a descriptive-correlational design with 105 teachers, the study aims to generate evidence to inform the development of targeted and sustainable professional development programs that bolster teacher capability, confidence, and long-term instructional effectiveness.

Literature Review

Teacher self-efficacy, defined as teachers' belief in their capacity to organize and enact the actions required for effective instruction, constitutes a central psychological construct that shapes instructional behavior, persistence, and student outcomes. Rooted in Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, self-efficacy affects cognition, motivation, and resilience, enabling teachers to be more adaptive, innovative, and responsive to learner diversity. A substantial body of research consistently demonstrates its strong impact on instructional quality, classroom management, and student engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2020; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2021), with meta-analytic findings identifying it as a robust predictor of student achievement (Hattie, 2017). Contemporary investigations emphasize its domain-specific character, its development through leadership and

collaborative culture, and its protective role against stress and burnout (Zee & Koomen, 2021; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2020). Philippine-based research similarly underscores the influence of institutional support, cultural expectations, and contextual challenges in shaping efficacy beliefs. The literature additionally demonstrates consistent positive associations between teacher efficacy and instructional strategies, engagement practices, job performance, and resilience (Abdon-Liwanag et al., 2024; Cabayag & Guhao Jr., 2024). While some studies report discrepancies between perceived efficacy and learner outcomes, such differences are frequently attributed to contextual conditions such as resource availability, leadership, and student characteristics (Emiru & Gedifew, 2024). Overall, the evidence supports teacher self-efficacy as a key predictor of instructional quality and learner success; however, empirical investigations directly linking self-efficacy to work performance in Philippine basic education remain limited. The present study addresses this gap by examining how demographic factors interact with teachers' efficacy beliefs and work performance, thereby informing more responsive professional development.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a descriptive-correlational design to determine the teachers' levels of self-efficacy and work performance and their relationships with selected demographic variables. From a complete enumeration approach, a total of 105 valid questionnaires responses were obtained from the teacher population. Requisite permissions were obtained prior to data collection, followed by coordination with school administrators and an orientation that outlined the study's purpose, voluntary participation, confidentiality measures, and withdrawal rights. The main instrument used in this study was a structured, previously validated questionnaire researcher made for contextual relevance comprising three sections, namely: (1) demographic profile; (2) self-efficacy across five domains on a five-point Likert scale; and (3) self-rated work performance aligned with the Department of Education's IPCRF indicators. Minor revisions were made to enhance clarity without compromising validity. The administration and collection of the questionnaire were systematic, and all ethical guidelines were strictly observed. Data analysis consisted of descriptive statistics, normality testing, appropriate parametric or non-parametric tests for group differences, and

correlational analyses conducted at 0.05 significance level. Its findings serve as empirical basis for the formulation of a specific intervention plan.

Research Design

This is a descriptive-correlational study that aimed to determine the extent of association between teachers' self-efficacy and work performance and whether self-efficacy differs across the profile variables such as age, sex, income, and plantilla position. The descriptive aspect involves the systematic recording of the self-efficacy levels of teachers in five domains: sense of efficacy, behavior management, student engagement, instructional strategies, and motivational strategies, and the work performance, using set indicators. The correlational aspect allowed the testing of the direction and magnitude of the relationship, though not causal, of these variables to develop insights on the application of professional development work. Results obtained from this design will support the formulation of an intervention plan that will enhance teachers' self-efficacy and performance.

Sample of the Study

The population consisted of 144 public school teachers from the academic year studied. A sample size was computed using Cochran's formula for finite populations at a 95% level of confidence, which requires a margin of error set at 5%, and this generated a sample size of 105 teachers. This number would be satisfactory to estimate the teachers' self-efficacy and work performance. This sampling method used proportionate stratified random sampling where every school within the system served as a stratum and was allocated respondents in proportion to its teacher population. Individual participants were then selected through simple random sampling from within the strata, ensuring equal representation in these subgroups and minimizing the problem of sampling bias. Therefore, the focused sampling strategy improved the quality and representativeness of the present study and can narrow the generalization of results to differences in teachers' profiles, levels of self-efficacy, and work performances.

Procedure

The study followed a structured and ethically compliant protocol, starting with the attainment of formal permissions from relevant academic and institutional authorities. Subsequent to authorization, coordination was done with school administrators to arrange data collection and determine the eligible teacher respondents. Before survey administration, an orientation was conducted to outline the purpose of the study, ensure voluntary participation, detail confidentiality measures, and explain the right of the respondents to withdraw from the study at any time. Informed consent was collected before the distribution of the researcher made and previously validated questionnaires, which were modified only for contextual relevance. Data collection proceeded in a systematic manner. Then, all completed instruments were retrieved for analysis. Through the course of the process, the researcher adhered closely to the protection of ethical principles that ensured participants' protection, data integrity, and responsible conduct of research.

Measures

This research Adapted a structured survey questionnaire from previously validated instruments that measure teachers' self-efficacy and work performance, with minor modifications to make them contextually and linguistically relevant. The instrument consists of three parts: (1) demographic and professional profile (age, sex, income level, and teaching position); (2) self-efficacy across the five dimensions-sense of efficacy, behavior management, student engagement, instructional strategies, and motivational strategies-rated along a five-point Likert scale; and (3) self-rated work performance aligned with established professional standards. Content validity was established through expert evaluation by three doctoral-trained specialists in educational management, pedagogy, and research, using the criteria of Carter V. Good and Douglas E. Scates. Prior to full deployment, the instrument underwent a pilot test among 30 teachers from a nearby district, with a reliability index of 0.978 interpreted as excellent. Such validation and reliability procedures made the instrument valid for accuracy and contextual appropriateness, thus assuring high-quality data on the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and work performance, as well as an intervention plan targeted accordingly.

Data Processing

Data were employed from 105 teacher respondents who returned usable questionnaires. The study used descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. The demographic variables were summarized by frequencies and percentages. The levels of self-efficacy across the five domains, namely sense of efficacy, behavioral management, student engagement, instructional strategies, and motivational strategies, and self-rated work performance were described by mean scores and standard deviations. Normality was checked using the Shapiro–Wilk test to decide on appropriate methods of analysis. For data that proved to be normally distributed, independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA were used to test differences across demographic variables; otherwise, the non-parametric alternatives in the forms of the Mann–Whitney U test and Kruskal–Wallis H test were applied. Self-efficacy and work performance relationships were tested for using Pearson's or Spearman's correlation coefficients, depending on whether the data were normally distributed or not. All inferential tests were done at a 0.05 level of significance to ensure that interpretations of the results are reliable.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Teachers' Self-Efficacy

This section presents the findings on the level of teachers' self-efficacy as measured across five key areas: teacher sense of efficacy, behavior management strategies, student engagement, instructional strategies, and motivational strategies.

TABLE 1
TEACHER SENSE OF EFFICACY

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Ability to respond effectively to difficult student questions.	4.34	Very High Level
2. Ability to provide appropriate challenges for highly capable students.	4.19	High Level
3. Ability to implement alternative teaching strategies when necessary.	4.44	Very High Level
4. Ability to provide alternative explanations or examples when students are confused.	4.44	Very High Level
5. Effectiveness in helping students value the importance of learning.	4.95	Very High Level
6. Effectiveness in motivating students with low interest in schoolwork.	4.50	Very High Level
7. Ability to improve the academic understanding of students who are failing.	4.50	Very High Level
8. Effectiveness in reaching and supporting the most difficult students.	4.46	Very High Level
9. Clarity in communicating expectations regarding student behavior.	4.36	Very High Level
10. Effectiveness in ensuring student compliance with classroom rules.	3.48	High Level
11. Ability to manage and control disruptive behavior in the classroom.	3.22	Moderate Level
12. Effectiveness in preventing a few problem students from disrupting the entire lesson.	3.58	High Level
Overall Mean	**4.20**	**High Level**

Legend: *4.21-5.00=Very High Level; 3.41-4.20=High Level; 2.61-3.40=Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60=Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level*

Data on teachers' sense of efficacy in managing instructional and behavioral challenges are summarized in Table 1. The general mean rating is 4.20, which, when interpreted, falls within the High Level. Hence, it means that teachers in the district perceive themselves as confident in carrying out instructional strategies, managing student behavior, and promoting learner success. This level of self-efficacy indicates a general sense among the teachers that they are effective facilitators of student learning. However, the lowest item mean pertains to "Ability to manage and control disruptive behavior in the classroom" (M = 3.22, Moderate Level), which suggests the prevalence of difficulties in behavioral management. This could be attributed to factors such as large class sizes, lack of support personnel, or absence of clear school-wide behavior management

systems. In DepEd schools, especially in classrooms with large numbers of students, such challenges increase disruption in learning, heighten teacher stress, and lower academic focus. If not mitigated, these challenges could lead to teacher burnout and decreased instructional quality, especially in multi-grade or heterogeneous learning environments.

The highest mean rating was seen for the item "Effectiveness in helping students value the importance of learning," with M = 4.95, classified as a Very High Level. This reflects teachers' strong capacity to cultivate a positive attitude toward learning among students, even under resource-constrained conditions. This is perhaps manifested when teachers use storytelling, relate lessons to real-life Filipino contexts, or align academic tasks with students' future aspirations-such as urging students to study hard for the sake of their families or to have professional careers. Teachers often go beyond teaching by mentoring learners and infusing moral and life lessons into daily activities. For instance, integrating values education into Araling Panlipunan or science classes may make students appreciate subjects more in relation to their lives and communities. This capacity is also an indicator of emotional intelligence and genuine concern for students' development. Demonstrating enthusiasm and perseverance despite a lack of instructional materials can serve as a model for students to persist. Implications are immense: Students are most likely to engage, participate, and develop lifelong learning habits. In addition, resilience and growth mindset, which are particularly important in socioeconomically challenged communities, will be nurtured. Teachers become motivators rather than mere instructors, sustaining educational goals despite unfavorable external conditions.

This supports the work of Han and Wang (2021), who emphasize that motivation-centered teacher efficacy is vital in developing positive academic behaviors and a constructive classroom climate. In this meta-analysis, it is determined that students perform better and are more engaged when teachers consistently communicate the value of education-a factor of particular importance in public-school settings where socio-economic constraints can dampen student enthusiasm. The ability to impact learners' perceptions of education as one avenue to personal and family improvement has a real consequence. Han and Wang's research also reveals that students who

experience highly efficacious teachers are more likely to set long-term academic goals and to develop stronger self-efficacy. For this reason, it is imperative to develop teacher motivational strategies within DepEd contexts, given the realities that many learners face from external circumstances. Enhancing these practices through ongoing professional development might contribute to even stronger outcomes for both students and teachers.

TABLE 2
BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. I establish specific rules and consequences for student misbehavior.	4.59	Very High Level
2. I monitor the entire classroom.	4.19	High Level
3. I correct misbehavior immediately	4.10	High Level
4. I reward (e.g., praise) good behavior.	4.96	Very High Level
5. I use consistent disciplinary practices.	3.89	High Level
6. I discourage misbehavior.	4.00	High Level
7. I discuss behavioral problems with students to get their perspectives.	4.00	High Level
Overall Mean	**4.25**	**Very High Level**

Legend: *4.21-5.00=Very High Level; 3.41-4.20=High Level; 2.61-3.40=Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60=Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level*

Table 2 shows the self-rating of teachers regarding behavior management strategies. The general mean is 4.25, described as a Very High Level, which means that teachers generally perceive themselves as able in managing student behavior. This implies that classroom management is very strong within the district and serves as a basis for maintaining orderly and respectful learning environments. The item that ranked the lowest is “I use consistent disciplinary practices” (M = 3.89, High Level), indicating that although most of the teachers are consistent, there are differences in the implementation of disciplinary measures. This could be because of school policies, support of the administrator, or maybe unclear implementation of the Child Protection Policy. In many DepEd schools, especially in rural or underserved areas, teachers usually handle discipline individually instead of through organized behavior programs at the

school level. This inconsistency could result in mixed responses from students and occasionally in unequal outcomes, which would make the teacher lose authority in the classroom. Moreover, there were many changes in disciplinary procedures during remote or blended learning which may further increase challenges in consistency. Additionally, teachers may not be trained in methods of restorative discipline and thus be more reactive rather than proactive. Without explicit support coming from the school head or guidance office, a teacher may not act strictly, specifically in cases involving influential citizens within the community. The presence of a unified behavioral policy implemented by the school governing council and the support service staff can help.

The behavior management strategy rated highest was "I reward (e.g., praise) good behavior," with a mean of 4.96, reflecting a Very High Level of use. This shows that DepEd teachers consistently utilize positive reinforcement as a core strategy. In practice, this may take the form of verbal praise, flag ceremony recognition, star stickers for younger students, or personalized feedback. Teachers realize that highlighting desirable behavior should ensure it will be repeated and should create an encouraging classroom climate. For many public schools, praise also serves to ensure that the students feel noticed and valued, especially those who are not likely to get any form of positive reinforcement at home. Statements as unsophisticated as "Very good, anak!" or the granting of a "Best in Participation" ribbon achieve long-term benefits. This approach minimizes the need for punishment and creates a caring atmosphere. As a reward strategy, praise encourages respect and discipline without fear, increases the ability to engage in learning, and reduces class disruptions. At the same time, it allows teachers to establish rapport and model civility-activities that the students may imitate.

This finding is consistent with the study conducted by Yang et al. (2020), where it was found that positive behavioral interventions greatly enhance discipline among students and the general classroom environment. This study showed that continual praise minimized disruptions and built mutual respect among teachers and learners. This aspect, therefore, becomes important in DepEd settings, where class sizes are often large, for order maintenance without relying heavily on punitive measures. The study further showed that recognition of good behavior produces a ripple effect and motivates other students to emulate such behavior. Positive reinforcement also translates into increased teacher satisfaction and reduced burnout. Institutionalization of this

approach through behavior management training programs and policy support would sustain harmony in the classrooms and lead to an improvement in learning outcomes.

TABLE 3
STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Encourage students to participate actively during discussions.	4.10	High Level
2. Promote collaborative learning through group activities.	3.20	Moderate Level
3. Incorporate real-life applications to make lessons more relevant.	2.80	Moderate Level
4. Stimulate curiosity by asking thought-provoking questions.	4.00	High Level
5. Facilitate meaningful learner interaction and peer feedback.	2.90	Moderate Level
6. Design engaging and varied instructional activities.	2.70	Moderate Level
7. Inspire students to take ownership of their learning.	3.80	High Level
8. Monitor student interest and adjust strategies accordingly.	3.60	High Level
Overall Mean	**3.39**	**Moderate Level**

Legend: *4.21-5.00=Very High Level; 3.41-4.20=High Level; 2.61-3.40=Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60=Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level*

Table 3 presents the student engagement practices as perceived by respondents along such dimensions as encouraging participation, promoting collaboration, applying real-world relevance, stimulating curiosity, facilitating peer interaction, designing varied activities, inspiring ownership of learning, and monitoring interest. It is of paramount importance to understand the dynamics of student engagement because it is one of the core components of teachers' self-efficacy and directly relates to learner outcomes.

The overall mean of 3.39 indicates a moderate level of student engagement strategies among participants. This implies that while teachers do apply some engagement techniques, there is still ample space to develop practices from a moderate to a high or very high level. Noticeably, the item "Encourage students to participate actively during discussions" gives the highest mean score of 4.10, interpreted as high. The interpretation is that generally, participation opportunities are offered to students, which is a very important aspect of garnering engagement and classroom interaction among students. Furthermore, "Stimulate curiosity by asking thought-provoking questions" was rated as high, with a score of 4.00, indicating perceived importance of developing critical thinking and curiosity among learners. These results taken together suggest strengths in the

areas of initiating involvement for students during discussions and challenging the students intellectually, which are very vital aspects of establishing an interactive and stimulating learning environment.

In contrast, the item "Design engaging and varied instructional activities" obtains the lowest mean score of 2.70, interpreted as a moderate level. This implies that, though some diversification of instructional strategies is evident, many teachers may still rely heavily on traditional methods and not undertake a full repertoire of creative, engaging techniques that better suit diverse learning styles. Similarly, "Incorporate real-life applications to make lessons more relevant" with a mean of 2.80, and "Facilitate meaningful learner interaction and peer feedback" with a mean of 2.90, were rated as being at a moderate level. These indicate areas amenable for improvements. Arguably, while teachers are able to engender basic student engagement through discussion and questioning, there is still considerable difficulty in fully linking lessons to real-world contexts and in pushing students toward desirable peer-to-peer learning experiences. These observations indicate that targeted professional development is required in the domains of instructional design, real-life integration, and student-centered approaches, since these domains are integral to increasing overall motivation among students and deep learning and ownership of knowledge. These findings are in line with Han (2021), who added that strategies of teachers regarding real-life applications, instructional activities of varied nature, and peer collaboration significantly predict higher levels of engagement by students. She emphasized that professional development programs aimed at enhancing creativity in instruction, questioning techniques, and collaborative learning approaches do indeed improve the emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement of students.

TABLE 4
INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Item	Mean	Interpretation
9. I present new material in small steps	3.99	High Level
10. I explain difficult ideas in a simple way.	4.10	High Level
11. When the pupil does not understand the question, I rephrase it.	4.45	Very High Level
12. I check that the pupils understand the lesson	4.19	High Level
13. I am well prepared.	3.59	High Level
14. I systematically review previously taught materials.	3.50	High Level
15. I give the pupils feedback on their exams or tests.	3.78	High Level
Overall Mean	**3.94**	**High Level**

Legend: *4.21-5.00=Very High Level; 3.41-4.20=High Level; 2.61-3.40=Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60=Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level*

Table 4 outlines the instructional strategies used by the teachers to facilitate effective teaching and learning. The overall mean of 3.94 falls under a High Level, that is, generally, the teachers have good instructional practices though improvement can still be made. The lowest mean is on the item "I systematically review previously taught materials" (M = 3.50, High Level). This suggests that perhaps, concepts are not sufficiently reinforced. In the DepEd context, where the pacing of the curriculum is relatively fast and has a heavy subject load, many teachers may focus on covering what needs to be covered, instead of concentrating on mastery. Also, the limiting multigrade classrooms or big class sizes impede scheduled reviews. This may potentially jeopardize retention and understanding from students who have lower initial mastery of skills/concepts learned in school. To improve this area, the LAC can be organized in schools focusing on spiral and spiral-review. Additional support materials, such as review workbooks or supplementary online/digital modules, can also be provided.

The highest rated was "When the pupil does not understand the question, I rephrase it," with a mean of 4.45, classified as a Very High Level. This result shows teachers' flexibility and responsiveness to ensure understanding. In a typical DepEd classroom, where learner ability and language backgrounds are mixed, the need to rephrase questions is a major factor in inclusive teaching. For instance, if a learner does not understand an English-item, a teacher may rephrase it in Filipino or use culturally relevant exemplars. Such a practice lessens gaps in comprehension,

reduces fear in students, and shows that teachers are attentive to student needs, including their willingness to scaffold learning. In classrooms that have learners with disabilities or students from IP communities, this strategy becomes very important. This is congruent with differentiated instruction principles and Universal Design for Learning. The impact is obvious: increasingly more student engagement, less fear of participating in discussions, and greater confidence in the expression of ideas, alongside reduced failure rates and increased mastery. This practice is corroborated by Cheng et al. (2024), who note that language adjustment and responsive questioning facilitate greater comprehension and inclusivity. Their review underlines the fact that responsive questioning occupies a vital position in classrooms with diverse learning styles, as in the case of multi-grade or mixed-ability settings in the Philippines. Reframing questions also reduces anxiety among students and stimulates active participation. Cheng et al. stress that instructional responsiveness enhances engagement and promotes equity in understanding, especially in linguistically diverse settings. This stands in support of DepEd's calls for inclusive education and differentiated instruction. Therefore, the development of this teaching skill through peer mentoring or lesson-study groups could provide even more significant capacity in terms of classroom interaction and comprehension.

TABLE 5
MOTIVATIONAL STRATEGIES

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. I make a special effort to give my students work that is creative and imaginative	4.19	High Level
2. I make a special effort to give my students work that has meaning in their everyday lives.	4.21	Very High Level
3. I make my subject/s really interesting	3.89	High Level
4. I stress to students that I want them to understand the work rather than just memorize it.	4.19	High Level
Overall Mean	**4.12**	**High Level**

Legend: *4.21-5.00=Very High Level; 3.41-4.20=High Level; 2.61-3.40=Moderate Level; 1.81-2.60=Low Level; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Level*

Table 5 presents data related to the ways in which teachers motivate students through relevant and interactive teaching methods. The overall mean is 4.12, categorized as a High Level,

which indicates that teachers are active in engaging themselves with efforts intended to maintain the motivation of students. The lowest mean is recorded for the statement "I make my subject/s really interesting" (M = 3.89, High Level), and although the majority has motivated the students, a few probably do not maintain interest in the particular subject taught. This could be due to limited resources, outdated textbooks, or inadequate training in creative methodologies. Many public schools lack projectors and other visual aids; this would make the delivery by the teacher the prime determinant of the excitement in lessons that limits options for interactive opportunities such as role-playing, experiments, or digital storytelling because time for lesson preparation is compromised by non-teaching concerns.

The highest rated item, "I make a special effort to give my students work that has meaning in their everyday lives," has a mean of 4.21, Very High Level. This result shows a conscious structuring of learning activities relevant to the students' experiences. For instance, a mathematics teacher could use examples of sales from a sari-sari store, while a science teacher could relate concepts to health practices and typhoon preparedness. Such contextualizing enhances student interest and enables them to apply their knowledge to solving real-life problems. In DepEd schools, this is supported by the MELCs, which are purposefully worded to ensure applicability to real life. Teachers who practice this tend to have higher participation rates and more substantial classroom discussions; this also encourages critical thinking and a sense of purpose for their schooling. This is corroborated by the work of Radil et al. (2023), who established that authentic and personally relevant tasks significantly improve student motivation. Their research shows that students are more likely to participate in activities in the classroom when the contents address their concerns and aspirations. For public schools in DepEd, it could be in the form of local materials, addressing community concerns, or the use of practical scenarios within lessons. Radil et al. add that meaningful learning experiences contribute to more reflective and higher-order thinking. Teachers practicing this help learners find meaning in their studies; this way, intrinsic motivation becomes reinforced. The strategy addresses DepEd's call for contextualized and culture-based teaching methods, where teacher training would include localizing and adapting the content.

Level of Teachers Work Performance

This section assesses the performance of teachers at work using available data on performance indicators and self-assessment from respondents. An understanding of the work performance of teachers shows how well they carry out their professional duties, including classroom instruction, learner development, management of the learning environment, and professional collaboration. Teacher performance is an important indicator of the quality of education, especially in the DepEd, where performance ratings are more often than not dictated by the IPCRF.

TABLE 6
LEVEL OF TEACHERS WORK PERFORMANCE

	Frequency	Percentage
Outstanding	9	8.60
Very Satisfactory	96	91.40
Overall Mean	**105**	**100.00**

Table 6 presents the distribution of respondents based on their own assessment of their work performance. Based on the data, most of the teachers received a Very Satisfactory rating, with 96 out of 105 respondents, 91.40% of the total, while only 9 teachers or 8.60% were rated as Outstanding in performance. The integrated findings would show that, overall, the level of work performance of the teacher-respondents in this district is very good, for there are no respondents rated as Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Poor. The predominance of Very Satisfactory ratings suggests that the teachers consistently meet and often exceed job expectations. Such a pattern reflects a generally effective teaching work force maintaining standards concerning lesson delivery, classroom management, and learner achievement, as rated through the Department of Education's IPCRF.

However, the relatively small percentage receiving an Outstanding rating suggests that systemic or contextual factors, such as lack of access to professional development and mentoring opportunities, hamper a larger percentage of teachers from earning the highest performance tier. More precisely, the 8.60% reaching Outstanding indicates that while exemplary teaching is present, it is not yet widespread. Teachers in this category could merely exceed minimum

expectations, employ innovative pedagogies, or take on leadership roles in school-based programs, and/or participate in continuous learning and community involvement through active means. In practical DepEd contexts, this could be functioning as a coordinator for school improvement projects or resource speakers during LAC sessions or facilitating remediation and enrichment activities for learners. Performance could be enhanced by strong support from school principals in the form of class assignments that are of a manageable size and access to instructional resources. The low percentage at the top may indicate areas of unequal training, recognition, or institutional support across schools in the district.

Advancing more teachers to the Outstanding level could be facilitated through targeted mentoring, formal recognition mechanisms, and differentiated professional development programs that build on the teachers' strengths and address identified gaps in classroom instruction and learner outcomes. These findings are in line with Rosaroso, 2020, who noted that most Philippine public school teachers are rated Very Satisfactory due to the use of standardized rubrics for teacher evaluation and the wide diffusion of performance-based evaluations. The study also points out that although many teachers are rated as meeting expectations, relatively few are rated as distinguished due to constraints imposed by workload imbalance, lack of individualized support systems, and insufficient incentives for excellence. Rosaroso added that meaningful professional development and teacher leadership could potentially enhance instructional performance and motivation for innovation. This emphasizes the need for school-based capacity-building programs aimed at enhancing both teacher self-efficacy and classroom impact.

Significant Relationship Between the Level of Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Work Performance to Each of the Aforementioned Variables

This section presents the statistical findings regarding whether there are significant differences in the teachers' self-efficacy across its primary domains, namely teacher sense of efficacy, behavior management strategies, instructional strategies, and motivational strategies, when grouped and compared according to demographic profiles..

TABLE 7
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY AND WORK PERFORMANCE TO EACH OF THE AFOREMENTIONED VARIABLES

Correlates	N	Rho	Level of Sig	p-value	Interpretation
Age Level of Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Work Performance	105	.045	0.05	.449	Not Significant
Sex Level of Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Work Performance		.059		.439	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment Level of Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Work Performance		-.016		.827	Not Significant
Years of Teaching Service Level of Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Work Performance		-.005		.923	Not Significant
Plantilla Position Level of Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Work Performance		-.152		.002	Significant
Average Family Monthly Income Level of Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Work Performance		-.121		.051	Not Significant
Numbers of Relevant Seminars Trainings Attended Level of Effectiveness of the Guidance and Counseling Programs		-.018		.741	Not Significant

Table 7 presents the significant relationship of teachers' selfefficacy and work performance when measured against each profile variable. It is observed that, out of the profile variables considered, only the plantilla position showed a significant relationship at 0.05 level. Thus, the remaining variables such as age, sex, highest educational attainment, years of teaching service, average family monthly income, and number of relevant seminars and trainings attended have no significant relationships with levels of self-efficacy and work performance.

Plantilla position showed an inverse correlation, with Rho = -.152 and a p-value of .002, which means there is a statistically significant negative relationship. The implication of this finding is that moving to a higher plantilla position may mean greater variation in perceived self-efficacy and work performance, probably because responsibilities are no longer the same, now covering more administrative, mentoring, and leadership concerns, rather than purely instructional ones. Those in higher positions may face different demands of work that could affect their perceptions about their self-efficacy compared to those who are purely teaching in the classroom.

On the other hand, age (p = .449), sex (p = .439), highest educational attainment (p = .827), years of teaching service (p = .923), average family monthly income (p = .051), and the number of relevant seminars and trainings attended (p = .741) were found to be insignificant in their relationships with the level of teachers' self-efficacy and work performance. These results signal that demographic characteristics, educational backgrounds, financial status, and participation in training activities are not determinants of variations in teachers' confidence and professional effectiveness. They mean that self-efficacy and work performance are more closely linked to personal, situational, and professional context factors than to static background attributes.

These findings agree with Malmberg et al. (2022), who stated that it is role expectations, institutional responsibilities, and perceived autonomy-not demographic profiles-that substantially shape teachers' self-efficacy and performance. Their study shows that offering professional development related to the role in question and keeping instructional focus, even for teachers who have advanced in their careers, sustains self-efficacy and work performance at high levels.

IV. CONCLUSION

Results indicated that the majority of the teachers were mid-career professionals aged 31–40, predominantly female, occupying Teacher III positions, had master’s units, and received a monthly income of ₱10,001–₱30,000 and had completed 11–15 years of service with very limited seminar attendance. Teachers demonstrated very high levels of behavior management and high levels of sense of efficacy, instructional practices, and motivational strategies, although the student

engagement was rated as only moderately high. Likewise, the general work performance was rated very satisfactory with only a few considered outstanding. Analyses also revealed that self-efficacy is significantly related to age, income, and teaching position but not with sex, educational attainment, and years of service, nor with seminar attendance. On the other hand, work performance is significantly related to the teaching position, having excluded the other profile variables as measurable relationships. Moreover, no significant relationship exists between teachers' self-efficacy and work performance. These results imply that targeted and differentiated professional development could actually sustain both teacher competence and learner outcomes.

REFERENCES

[1.] Abdon-Liwanag, B., Padohinog, E., & Balsicas, N. (2024). Teacher self-efficacy through achievement goals, instructional strategies, and student engagement in the Philippine setting. *Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal*, 11, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.56278/apherj.v11i1.2618

[2.] Cabayag, S. J. L., & Guhao, E. S., Jr. (2024). Self-efficacy, job performance, and transformational leadership: A structural equation model on organizational commitment among public school teachers. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 11(1).

[3.] Emiru, E., & Gedifew, M. T. (2024). The effect of teacher self-efficacy on learning engagement of secondary school students. *Cogent Education*, 11. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2308432

[4.] Han, F. (2021). The relations between teaching strategies, students' engagement in learning, and teachers' self-concept. *Sustainability*, 13. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13095020

[5.] Han, Y., & Wang, Y. (2021). Investigating the correlation among Chinese EFL teachers' self-efficacy, work engagement, and reflection. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.763234

[6.] Malmberg, L.-E., Hagger, H., & Webster, S. (2022). Teachers' situation-specific mastery experiences: Teacher, student group and lesson effects. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-013-0206-1

[7.] Radil, A. I., Goegan, L. D., & Daniels, L. M. (2023). Teachers' authentic strategies to support student motivation. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1040996

[8.] Rosaroso, R. (2020). *Performance-based assessment in selected higher education institutions in Cebu City, Philippines*. [Unpublished manuscript].

[9.] Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2021). Teacher self-efficacy and its impact on classroom management: A review of empirical research. *Educational Research Review*, 19, 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.08.002

[10.] Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2020). Cultivating teacher self-efficacy: The role of leaders and professional community. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(7), 754–770. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2019-0185

[11.] Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2020). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of professional practice. In C. Day (Ed.), *The Routledge international handbook of teacher and school development*. Routledge.

[12.] Yang, C., Chan, M. K., & Ma, T. L. (2020). School-wide social emotional learning (SEL) and bullying victimization: Moderating role of school climate in elementary, middle, and high schools. *Journal of School Psychology*, 82, 49–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2020.08.002

[13.] Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2021). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4).