

KEMI Journal of Educational Leadership and Management

KJELM

[ISSN 3079-4048]

Volume: 2 Issue: 3 | Nov-2026

Job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness nexus among faculty staff at Isabela State University Jones Campus, Philippines

Benilda M. Hangdaan[1,2], **Francis Michael P. Yambao**[1]

Centro Escolar University, Manila, Philippines[1], *Isabela State University, Jones Campus, Philippines*[2]

Corresponding Author Email: benilda.m.hangdaan@isu.edu.ph

Cite this article in APA

https://doi.org/10.68147/6add2e9f

Copyright: ©2026 by the author(s). Open access under CC BY.

Abstract

Job satisfaction is a critical determinant of faculty experiences and organisational functioning in higher education institutions. This study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among full-time faculty members at Isabela State University, Jones Campus. A descriptive-correlational research design was adopted, involving 27 of the 35 full-time faculty members. Data were collected using a validated structured questionnaire, whose content validity was established using Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR), with all items scoring 1.00. The instrument demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.950. Job satisfaction was assessed across six domains: work environment; rank and employment status; faculty adequacy and teaching load; salaries, fringe benefits and incentives; professional development; and peer communication. Descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlation analysis were used to analyse the data. The findings indicated that faculty members were generally satisfied with their work environment, employment status, remuneration, professional development opportunities and peer communication, but expressed neutrality regarding faculty adequacy and teaching workload. Teaching effectiveness, based on student evaluations, recorded an overall mean of 4.66, indicating outstanding performance. Although a positive relationship was established between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness, it was not statistically significant ($r = 0.357$, $p = 0.067$, 95% CI [−0.027, 0.649]). This suggests that teaching effectiveness may also be influenced by other institutional and individual factors, including research productivity, academic outputs and professional development. The study

recommends strengthening faculty welfare policies, improving staffing and workload management, and expanding professional development opportunities to enhance faculty performance and institutional effectiveness.

Key terms: Job Satisfaction; Teaching Effectiveness; Work environment

1.0 Introduction

The Philippine higher education institutions are continually challenged to deliver quality instruction, produce relevant research, and extend meaningful community services. The effective delivery of these institutional mandates is highly dependent on faculty members who are regarded as an essential element of organizational effectiveness and academic excellence. Faculty members are central to accreditation processes, agency monitoring and evaluation, graduation-related activities, research initiatives, extension programs, and a host of academic and administrative functions, as they are major contributors to institutional success. They are typically leading the charge in the development and execution of these initiatives.

With these multiple duties, faculty members are involved in many activities outside of the classroom, making this a very demanding and multifaceted profession. Among these multiple responsibilities, it is important to look at how faculty members view their work, particularly their degree of job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness. It is important to know these factors as job satisfaction may affect the quality of work they provide and their contribution to institutional goals. Thus, the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among faculty members must be assessed and evaluated. Ensuring that faculty members are satisfied in their job while performing well has a big impact in their productivity, professional development, and success of colleges and universities. Pius (2025) stated that "Job satisfaction was identified as a strong predictor of productivity. Faculty members who felt valued, empowered, and emotionally stable were more inclined to excel in both teaching and research." (p. 9).

1.1 Statement of Study Problem

Job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness have been extensively studied in higher education but there is limited evidence in the study of faculty members who are assigned to satellite campuses of State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines. For instance, Bongalonta (2022) investigated job satisfaction among faculty members of State Universities and Colleges in Bicol, while Briones et al. (2021) examined the relationships among work engagement, job satisfaction, and faculty performance at Laguna State Polytechnic University. In addition, Albano (2017) investigated teaching performance, job satisfaction, and resilience among faculty members of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines while Miano (2018) studied on the job and life satisfaction of teaching personnel in a state university. Urbano et al. (2022) examined job satisfaction among faculty members of Bulacan Agricultural State College, considering factors such as work environment, workload, compensation, professional development, and peer communication. Collectively, these studies provide evidence that faculty job satisfaction and teaching-related performance have been examined in Philippine higher education. However, most studies have examined faculty on main campuses or at the university-wide level. Thus, the findings may not apply to satellite campuses, where faculty often have different working conditions, administrative support, resources, and professional development opportunities just like in the case at Isabela State University -Jones Campus.

As stated by Barcelona (2025), "SUCs remain essential to Philippine education, yet challenges in ensuring high-quality teaching persist. Despite structured recruitment processes, gaps remain, particularly in satellite campuses where faculty qualifications do not always align with program requirements".

This study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among full-time faculty members at Isabela State University–Jones Campus. Although job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness have been widely examined in education, evidence from individual campuses of Philippine State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) remains important for understanding how these variables are associated within specific institutional contexts. By focusing on a single campus, this study provides context-specific empirical evidence on faculty members' job satisfaction across several dimensions and its relationship with their teaching effectiveness. Its findings contribute to the existing literature by documenting whether and to what extent these variables are associated in a campus-level setting, thereby providing a basis for further investigation in other SUC campuses. The results may also inform campus administrators and policymakers in identifying faculty-related concerns and developing context-responsive initiatives to support faculty well-being and instructional quality. However, the findings should be interpreted within the limits of the study's institutional setting and sample.

1.2 Research Questions

This study addresses these gaps by investigating the following central problem: What is the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among faculty members at ISU Jones Campus?

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

What is the profile of respondents according to highest educational attainment, sex, academic rank, years of teaching experience, department or college?

What are the levels of job satisfaction among faculty members at ISU Jones Campus across various dimensions (work environment, rank and employment status, faculty adequacy and loading, salaries, fringe benefits, and incentives, faculty development, peer communication)?

What is the level of teaching effectiveness of the faculty members at ISU Jones Campus?

Is there a relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among faculty members at ISU Jones Campus?

2.0 Literature Review

This section reviews relevant literature and studies that provide the foundation for the present research and support the understanding of the variables under investigation.

2.1 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a multi-dimensional construct that includes the feelings and attitudes of the individuals towards their jobs. It's a leading factor in employee wellness and company health, influencing absenteeism, turnover and productivity. Job satisfaction depends not just on present job conditions but also on prior experiences and future expectations (Hajdukova & Klementova, 2015; Cranny et al., 1992). The factors of job satisfaction can be divided into numerous categories, among which are the requirements and advantages of labor, relationships in the workplace and job design (Hajdukova & Klementova, 2015).

Assessing faculty performance in higher education institutions is a complex undertaking that involves various measures of academic productivity and performance. These measures may include research output, scholarly publications, and other indicators of academic output. As faculty productivity becomes more relevant to institutional evaluation and university rankings, higher education institutions use different criteria and indicators to assess and compare academic performance (Webber, 2011). The focus on productivity is a result of the push for more accountability and efficiency, which compels colleges to

scrutinize their faculty strictly (El-Khawas, 2010). Employment conditions are important considerations in understanding faculty job satisfaction and work-related outcomes. Factors such as workload distribution, compensation, benefits, job security, and institutional support may influence faculty members' satisfaction with their work. Previous studies have examined the relationship between faculty job satisfaction and various work-related outcomes. In particular, Bakan et al. (2014) found a positive relationship between job satisfaction, job performance, and occupational commitment of academic staff. Similarly, studies by Oshagbemi (1998) and Valadez and Anthony (2001) highlight the value of understanding job satisfaction in relation to faculty experiences, responsibilities, and employment conditions.

2.2 Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness refers to the extent to which teachers facilitate student learning through effective instructional practices, clear lesson delivery, appropriate assessment, classroom management, and the achievement of intended learning outcomes. Wenglinsky (2000, as cited in Tolentino, 2023) define teaching effectiveness as to the faculty members' ability to engage students, facilitate learning, and achieve desired educational outcomes. It is distinct from student satisfaction, which reflects students' perceptions of and feelings about their learning experiences. Student evaluations of teaching are one source of information about teaching effectiveness because they capture students' perceptions of instructors' teaching practices and classroom experiences; however, they do not directly measure all aspects of instructional quality or students' actual learning outcomes.

3.0 Methodology

This section presents the methods and procedures employed in conducting the study. It discusses the research design, respondents of the study, research instrument, data-gathering procedure, and statistical tools used to analyze and interpret the collected data.

3.1 Research Design

The study utilized descriptive-correlational design to identify the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness. The descriptive part defined the level of job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness of the faculty members while the correlational component was used to determine strength of the relationships between the job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among faculty members.

3.2 Target Population and Sample Size

The study was conducted at Isabela State University, Jones Campus, in the Philippines. The ISU, Jones Campus is one of several satellite campuses of the Isabela State University system whose main campus is located in Echague, Isabela. The Jones Campus is a satellite campus serving the educational needs of the students of the southern municipalities of Isabela province and the adjacent areas.

The study involved the faculty members of the Isabela State University-Jones Campus. Among the 40 identified faculty members, 35 met the set inclusion criteria and were deemed eligible to participate in the study. The inclusion criteria of faculty members were to be a full-time faculty member and not newly hired in order for them to be able to provide relevant information regarding their job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness. The five faculty members excluded were four part-time faculty members and one new faculty member who did not meet the established criteria. Among 35 eligible faculty members, 27 completed the questionnaires and the other eight did not respond or return the questionnaire, resulting in a response rate of 77.14 percent. However, it is acknowledged that the nonresponse of eight faculty members is a limitation, as this may mean that their views and experiences are not reflected in the

findings of the study.

Research Instruments

A structured survey questionnaire was designed and validated to assess the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness. The instrument was organized into two primary parts. Part I is composing of the demographic profile which captures the essential respondent data, including highest educational attainment, sex, academic rank, years of teaching experience, and departmental or college affiliation. The part II is the job satisfaction dimensions which evaluates the faculty's level of satisfaction across six critical domains which are work environment; rank and employment status; faculty adequacy and loading; salaries, fringe benefits, and incentives; professional development; and lastly, peer communication.

The instrument was adapted from Urbano et al. (2022), and to ensure it fit the purpose, the original items were adjusted and rephrased to better align with the current research's institutional context and objectives. Adaptations included rewording statements for clarity, adding statements to address undercovered dimensions, and deleting irrelevant items. The same five-point Likert scale was used, but with a little modification by adding a neutral response option. The questionnaire was then subjected to expert validation and reliability testing to assess the instrument's relevance, clarity, and consistency.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

Official permission to conduct the study was requested from the Campus Administrator by the researcher. Ethical approval was obtained prior to data collection and informed consent was obtained from all participants for use of their evaluation responses for research purposes. Participation was totally voluntary and measures were taken to ensure that participants were not subjected to any form of coercion or undue influence by their supervisors. Upon approval, the research questionnaires were distributed onsite for data collection. The process of gathering data, distribution and collection of the questionnaires, was completed within a week.

The teaching effectiveness rating of faculty members for the 2nd semester of 2025-2026 was requested from the office of the campus academic affairs director. The teaching effectiveness rating evaluates faculty each semester for all their subjects based specifically on their management of teaching and learning; content knowledge, pedagogy, technology; and commitment and transparency. Although student evaluations provide useful information about students' perceptions of instructional practices and classroom experiences, they may not fully capture all dimensions of teaching effectiveness, such as actual learning gains, the quality of assessment, and the long-term impact of instruction.

The overall faculty teaching effectiveness mean rating should be understood as an indication of perceived teaching effectiveness based on student evaluations rather than a comprehensive or independent measure of instructional quality. This measurement limitation was considered in interpreting the findings and drawing conclusions about the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness.

3.5 Data Analysis Procedure

The research instrument content validity was measured using the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) developed by Lawshe (1975). Five experts evaluated each item of the questionnaire by classifying it as Essential, Useful but Not Essential or Not Necessary. Calculation of the CVR of each item was done using the Lawshe's formula. All 36 items received an essential rating from all five evaluators, resulting in a CVR of 1.00 for every item. This value exceeded the critical CVR of 0.99 for a five-expert panel under Lawshe's original criterion. All items were retained because they demonstrated unanimous expert agreement

regarding their essentiality for measuring the intended constructs. Reliability of the research instrument was determined using Cronbach's alpha. The 36 items questionnaire was administered on 15 respondents for pilot test who were excluded from the main study. Before conducting the analysis, negatively worded items in the questionnaire were reverse-coded to ensure consistency in the interpretation of responses. Using a five-point Likert scale, reverse coding was performed by subtracting each original response score from six (6). The overall Cronbach alpha coefficient obtained was 0.950 which signifies excellent internal consistency. The reliability coefficients of the six dimensions were as follows: work environment (α = 0.752), rank and employment status (α = 0.757), faculty adequacy and loading (α = 0.878), salaries, fringe benefits and incentives (α = 0.828), faculty development (α = 0.710) and peer communication (α = 0.797). Overall, the coefficients indicated acceptable to good internal consistency across all dimensions, supporting the reliability of the questionnaire for use in the main study.

Descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, percentages, and means , were used to summarize respondents' demographic profiles, satisfaction levels and teaching effectiveness. A five-point Likert scale (Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied) was used to interpret responses for job satisfaction- related. The responses were analyzed and interpreted using the mean and standard deviation. Pearson's correlation was used to measure the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness of the faculty.

Research Findings and Discussion

This section presents and discusses the findings on job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among faculty members of Isabela State University–Jones Campus.

4.1 What is the profile of respondents according to highest educational attainment, sex, academic rank, years of teaching experience, department or college?

To provide an overview of the respondents' demographic and professional characteristics, the study examined their highest educational attainment, sex, academic rank, years of teaching experience, and department or college affiliation. These variables describe the composition of the faculty respondents and provide relevant background for understanding the findings on job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness.

Table 1. Profile of the respondents according to the demographic variables

Demographic Variables		Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Female	11	40.7
Sex	Male	16	59.3
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor Degree	1	3.7
Highest Educational Attainment	With units in Master	5	18.5
Highest Educational Attainment	Master Degree	8	29.6
Highest Educational Attainment	With units in Doctorate	5	18.5
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctorate Degree	8	29.6
Academic Rank	Instructor	18	66.7
Academic Rank	Assistant Professor	5	18.5
Academic Rank	Associate Professor	4	14.8

Department/ College	Agriculture Department	7	25.9
Department/ College	College of Criminal Justice Education (CCJE)	4	14.8
Department/ College	College of Education (CED	14	51.9
Department/ College	Information Communication & Technology Department (ICTD)	2	7.4
Years of Teaching Experience	1 -5	14	51.9
Years of Teaching Experience	6 -10	8	29.6
Years of Teaching Experience	11- 15	3	11.1
Years of Teaching Experience	16 -20	2	7.4

The majority of respondents were 16 male (59.3 percent). For their educational achievement, 1 or 3.7 percent have a bachelor's degree, 5 or 18.5 percent have both master's and doctorate qualifications while 8 or 29.6 percent have both master's and doctorate degrees, this means the faculty members are seeking to improve themselves by pursuing doctoral degrees. Furthermore, 66.7 percent of the participants were instructors, 18.5 percent were assistant professor and 14.8 percent were associate professor. The majority of the respondents were from the College of Education as their faculty members also teach general education subjects in other departments and colleges. Also, 51.9 percent of the faculty members had 1-5 years of teaching experience and only 7.4 percent of the respondents had 16-20 years of experience.

4.2 What are the levels of job satisfaction among faculty members at ISU Jones Campus across various dimensions?

To determine the levels of job satisfaction among faculty members at Isabela State University–Jones Campus, their responses were analyzed across six dimensions: work environment; rank and employment status; adequacy of teaching load; salaries, fringe benefits, and incentives; faculty development; and peer communication. The results provide an overview of faculty members' satisfaction across these dimensions. Table 2 presents the mean ratings and corresponding descriptive interpretations for each dimension.

Table 2 Levels of Faculty Job Satisfaction across the Domains

Item Statements	Mean	Descriptive Rating
1. WORK ENVIRONMENT	3.44	S
a. I am satisfied with the cleanliness and maintenance of the physical work environment at ISU Jones Campus	3.56	S
b. I am dissatisfied with the level of value and respect I receive from my colleagues.	2.84	N
c. I am satisfied with how workplace conflicts are managed and mitigated within the institution.	3.22	N

d. I am satisfied with the timeliness and effectiveness of the administration's response to faculty concerns.	3.52	S
e. I am satisfied with the inclusivity of the work environment and the sense of belonging fostered on campus.	3.78	S
f. I am satisfied with the encouragement provided for innovation and my professional growth.	3.70	S
2. RANK AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	3.51	S
a. I am satisfied with the access to professional development opportunities regardless of my academic rank.	3.44	S
b. I am dissatisfied with the access to professional development opportunities regardless of academic rank.	3.15	N
c. I am satisfied with the fairness in the treatment of faculty members regardless of their rank and employment status.	3.59	S
d. I am satisfied with the clarity and timeliness of the notification regarding my rank following a promotion evaluation.	3.56	S
e. I am satisfied with the appropriateness of my academic rank in relation to my assigned job responsibilities.	3.63	S
f. I am satisfied with the fairness of the evaluation process used in determining faculty rank.	3.67	S

Item Statements	**Mean**	**Descriptive Rating**
3. FACULTY ADEQUACY AND LOADING	3.20	N
a. I am satisfied that the faculty-student ratio meets program requirements and standards	2.93	N
b. I am satisfied with the incentives provided for overload teaching in accordance with institutional guidelines.	3.0	N
c. I am satisfied with the adequacy of my workload in allowing sufficient time for teaching, research, extension, and other tasks.	3.07	N
d. I am satisfied with the fairness in the distribution of teaching loads and assignments among faculty members.	3.67	S
e. I am dissatisfied with the heavy volume of different course preparations I must manage each semester.	3.11	N
f. I am satisfied with the adherence of workload assignments to established institutional policies and guidelines.	3.41	S
4. SALARIES, FRINGE BENEFITS, AND INCENTIVES	3.55	S

a. I am satisfied with the fringe benefits provided by the institution (e.g., study leave, vacation leave, performance-based bonus, research incentives, compensatory leave, deloading, and thesis/dissertation support).	3.85	S
b. I am satisfied with the clarity and transparency of policies on salaries, benefits, and privileges.	3.93	S
c. I am satisfied with the degree to which my professional contributions and job responsibilities are appropriately compensated.	3.74	S
d. I am satisfied with the compensation provided for teaching assignments beyond the regular load (e.g., overload pay, service credits).	3.19	N
e. I am satisfied with the recognition, credits or incentives given to faculty involved in the production of scholarly materials.	3.59	S
f. I am dissatisfied with the current system of awards and incentives for faculty performance.	3.0	N
5. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT	3.47	S
a. I am satisfied with the institution's implementation of a faculty development program.	3.58	S
b. I am satisfied with the institution's support for faculty participation in seminars, workshops, and conferences.	3.48	S
c. I am satisfied with the regularity and relevance of in-service training programs conducted by the institution.	3.44	S
d. I am satisfied with the objectivity of the selection process for scholarships, fellowships, and training opportunities.	3.44	S
e. I am dissatisfied with the lack of fairness in how professional development opportunities are distributed.	3.37	N
f. I am satisfied with the assistance/privileges/incentives (scholarship programs, dissertation assistance/incentive, etc) provided for pursuing advanced degree programs.	3.48	S
6. PEER COMMUNICATION	3.51	S
a. I am satisfied with the clarity and effectiveness of communication among faculty members.	3.63	S
b. I am satisfied with the level of collaboration and information-sharing among faculty members.	3.52	S
c. I am satisfied with the respect and professionalism observed in communication among faculty.	3.67	S
d. I am satisfied with the effectiveness of conflict communication and resolution among faculty members.	3.44	S

e. I am dissatisfied with the level of transparent communication and idea-sharing within the faculty.	3.31	N
f. I am satisfied with the equal access of all faculty members to important institutional information.	3.51	S

Legend:

Descriptive Rating Range Description

VS 4.21 – 5.00 Very Satisfied

S 3.41 – 4.20 Satisfied

N 2.61 – 3.40 Neutral

D 1.81 – 2.60 Dissatisfied

VD 1.00 – 1.80 Very Dissatisfied

Work environment

The faculty were generally satisfied with the work environment (M = 3.44, SD = 0.63). The study reaffirms the significance of workplace inclusivity and a robust sense of belonging. This finding indicates that the school has managed to create a work environment where professors are recognized, appreciated and valued regardless of their background. Such an environment may support positive interpersonal relationships, mutual assistance, and a sense of community among staff. These findings provide campus-specific evidence of the work environment as an important dimension of faculty job satisfaction, thereby addressing the limited research focusing on the working conditions and job satisfaction of faculty members in satellite campuses of state universities and colleges. This observation is consistent with Lacy and Sheehan (1997), who emphasized the importance of university culture, collegial relationships, and a supportive academic community in understanding faculty job satisfaction. The interaction of these characteristics indicates that a sense of community, pleasant relationships, and an inclusive work environment are significant in improving job satisfaction. This means that organizations that foster inclusion and a sense of belonging are expected to have happy employees which will attach them to the workplace.

Rank and employment status

The respondents are satisfied based on rank and employment position (M = 3.51, SD = 0.54). A study by Bataineh (2014) found out that job satisfaction among faculty members is highly affected by their rank and employment status especially in terms of perceived fairness of evaluation processes. Faculty with higher rank tend to express higher levels of satisfaction with their jobs, probably because they are more secure in their jobs and have a higher status in the institution. In addition, promotion was identified as positively influencing employee engagement, morale, and productivity, as well as in the reduction of absenteeism (Guzman et.al, 2023). Fairness in the evaluation process for faculty members can promote more trust and loyalty for the institution, which can lead to higher levels of engagement and motivation. Therefore, if institutions respect fairness in the evaluation process and establish transparent promotion requirements, they are likely to improve their faculty's job satisfaction and eventually the institution's overall efficacy and retention. The connection between rank, employment status, and perceived fairness of evaluation processes is crucial. Considering these characteristics may lead to a more satisfied and committed faculty body that will eventually benefit the educational environment as a whole (Bataineh, 2014).

Faculty Adequacy and Loading

Respondents were neutral in terms of their job satisfaction regarding faculty adequacy and loading (M =3.20, SD = 0.62). Based on the population of the students and faculty for the 2nd semester 2025- 2026, the faculty-student ratio was 1:34. They may be satisfied with the fairness in the distribution of teaching loads and assignments among faculty members, but they were uncertain in faculty-student ratio and incentives provided for overload teaching. Findings from a national survey of pharmacy faculty by Malcom et al. (2024) showed that although many faculty members believed workload assignments were fair in principle, there was only moderate agreement between the assigned and actual workloads and a common lack of formal written workload policies. This difference between perceived fairness and operational reality may explain why satisfaction does not reach a high level as faculty sense fairness in the structure, but see practical problems in the day-to-day delivery. O'Meara et al. (2019) found out that department conditions and practices related to perceived workload equity are strongly associated with faculty satisfaction and a positive departmental climate. Faculty are generally more satisfied with the process when they believe that loads are distributed based on clear, mutually agreed-upon criteria. Although it does not meet the faculty-student ratio, especially for subjects with laboratories or research, this is a factor to consider as it may exhaust the faculty in terms of preparation, consultation and other activities. Shockness (2015) found out in a study of nurse educators that higher student loads are associated with greater teaching demands, which can contribute to job dissatisfaction and impact faculty retention. When the ratio is poor, faculty feel additional pressure not only in teaching but also in advising, mentoring and administrative duties — all of which add to the sense of inadequacy.

Salaries, Fringe Benefits & Incentives

The respondents were satisfied with the salaries they are getting and with the fringe benefits such as study leave, vacation leave, performance-based bonus, research incentives, compensatory leave, deloading, thesis/dissertation support and the recognition, credits or incentive given to faculty involved in the production of scholarly materials (M = 3.55, SD = 0.59). These benefits are essential components of compensation packages, which have a significant impact on the faculty's morale and retention rates (Zaman et al., 2014). However, the compensation provided beyond the regular load and the existing system of awards and incentives for faculty performance needs to be reviewed as it gives neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction to the faculty.

Faculty Development

The faculty are generally satisfied with the institution's implementation of faculty development program in which there is a strong support for faculty in participating in seminars, workshops and conferences as well as with the assistance or incentives provided for pursuing advanced degree programs (M = 3.47, SD = 0.52). These programs matter because they give faculty opportunities to strengthen their skills, gain advanced knowledge, and pursue professional growth. Furthermore, fellowships and institutional support for advanced studies serve as valuable mechanisms for promoting continuous faculty development. Ullian and Stritter (1997) identified fellowships and other structured activities as important components of faculty development programs. Similarly, Knight et al. (2007) found that participation in longitudinal faculty development programs had sustained positive effects on participants' career growth, teaching abilities, and career development. These findings show the importance of institutional support for professional development in strengthening faculty competencies and improving their teaching capabilities.

The workshops, financial support and incentives to further education are overall a supportive framework that contributes to faculty satisfaction and professional development aligned with the University goals of

continuous improvement in teaching and learning contexts. But to ensure all faculty members are given equal opportunity to advance their careers, it is necessary to see if professional development opportunities are fairly allocated among faculty through monitoring the implementation of the faculty development plan and encouraging the faculty to look for seminars or trainings under their specialization.

Peer Communication

Over all, the respondents are satisfied in the peer communication among their colleagues as they practice respect and professionalism in communication among the faculty members (M = 3.51, SD = 0.77). Positive communication and collegial relationships among faculty members contribute to a respectful and supportive university environment, which is an important aspect of job satisfaction. Blau et al. (2005) found that satisfaction with peer communication was associated with job satisfaction and intentions to withdraw professionally. Similarly, Glomo-Narzoles (2012) found a significant relationship between communication climate and institutional productivity in a higher education institution. These findings show the importance of supporting open communication, mutual respect, and professional partnership among faculty members to strengthen workplace relationships and promote a constructive organizational climate.

4.3 What is the level of teaching effectiveness among faculty members at ISU Jones Campus in terms of teaching effectiveness?

Faculty teaching effectiveness at Isabela State University–Jones Campus was assessed by analyzing student evaluation results. This assessment focused on faculty members' overall teaching performance as perceived by students. Table 3 displays the evaluation results, including the corresponding mean scores and descriptive interpretations of teaching effectiveness.

Table 3. Level of Teaching Effectiveness by faculty members at ISU Jones Campus

College / Department	Rating	Descriptive Rating
Agriculture Department	4.67	Outstanding
College of Criminal Justice Education (CCJE)	4.76	Outstanding
College of Education (CED)	4.63	Outstanding
Information Communication & Technology Department (ICTD)	4.66	Outstanding
Overall	4.66	Outstanding

The faculty are evaluated every semester in all their subjects by the students in terms of their teaching effectiveness. For the 2nd semester 2025 - 2026, the faculty had a general mean rating of 4.66 with a standard deviation of 0.22, which indicates outstanding performance. The evaluation covers three aspects namely, management of teaching and learning (organization, time management, classroom activities); content knowledge, pedagogy and technology; and commitment and transparency (willingness to assist students and dedication, and clarity in providing feedback and rating criteria). The rating suggests that faculty members are always organized in handling the classroom and are efficient in time use. They design student-centered activities that promote critical thinking, independent learning, reflection, and decision-making. Additionally, they demonstrate extensive knowledge of their subjects, encourage active learning, and use appropriate assessments. Their commitment and transparency are shown by consistently assisting students and providing clear feedback based on transparent criteria. The outcome of the evaluation shows that the students are satisfied and contented with the performance of the faculty which also reflects improved students learning outcome. Lalla et al., (2011) found out that the

faculty members' outstanding teaching effectiveness significantly impacts students' learning efficiency and satisfaction. When faculty members are able to effectively achieve the learning objectives, it not only affects the academic performance of students but also positively influences the overall engagement of students in the learning process. Teaching well, then, is teaching in a way that creates an environment in which students want to engage, and this is critical to their success. Moreover, high teaching effectiveness is often linked to higher student satisfaction, as evaluations typically assess students' perceptions of teaching styles and behaviors. As a whole, the impact of outstanding teaching effectiveness goes beyond mere academic achievement to creating a climate of participation and fulfillment that is essential to the success of any educational system.

4.4 What is the relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among faculty members at ISU Jones Campus?

Table 4. Correlation between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness

Variable	Pearson Correlation (r)	P-value
Job Satisfaction and Teaching Effectiveness	0.357	0.067

The study found a positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness of the faculty members at ISU Jones Campus (r = 0.357). However, the relationship is not strong, implying that there is not enough evidence to conclude that a relationship exists between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness among faculty members at ISU Jones Campus. The findings of the recent study are consistent with Zia et al. (2024) who reported a weak positive link between job satisfaction and performance of university teachers in Azad Jammu and Kashmir, suggesting that the relationship exists but may be very weak. This suggests that job satisfaction alone may not be a good predictor of faculty success. Other criteria such as professional skill, personal devotion, research productivity or academic outputs may be more influential for teaching effectiveness. As found by Valdez et al (2025) of the Mariano Marcos State University, Philippines, faculty members with high job satisfaction are much more committed to institutional goals and that satisfaction is highly correlated to productivity in research and extension. Therefore, attempts to improve faculty performance should not only concentrate on raising job satisfaction but also on other organizational and professional factors. Lima et al. (2023) found out that job performance was positively related to job satisfaction, whereby promotion, perks, type of work, communication and supervision were the greatest predictors of performance. Therefore, the university must continue to innovate and support the faculty in terms of the different dimensions to maintain and strengthen the faculty performance not only in the teaching effectiveness but to include other aspects like research and extension productivity as it achieves its goal in providing the quality education system it offers.

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1 Conclusion

Overall, ISU Jones Campus faculty members are satisfied with their job implying that the university has generated positive conditions conducive to faculty satisfaction and positive work experiences. However, the findings also suggest areas that may require further attention, particularly workload management, to address faculty members' concerns and sustain a supportive working environment.

The ISU Jones Campus faculty show an outstanding teaching performance which also means that students are highly satisfied with the level of education they receive. Hence, the findings reflect the faculty members' abilities and professional dedication to support the university's academic aims and educational

mission.

The findings indicate that job satisfaction may not completely explain the variations in teaching effectiveness seen among faculty. The study found a weak, statistically non-significant relationship between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness, but this result does not rule out an association. Other factors such as professional competence, organizational commitment, motivation, involvement in research and extension, leadership support, and opportunities for professional development may also be included in future studies. Thus, the university may continue strengthening its support systems, improving working conditions, and providing opportunities for professional growth to support faculty members' performance in teaching, research, and extension.

5.2 Areas for Further Research

Future researchers may consider incorporating additional measures of teaching effectiveness, such as supervisor evaluations and Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) ratings, to provide a more comprehensive assessment of faculty members' teaching performance. Using multiple evaluation sources may also provide a broader perspective on teaching effectiveness.

Future researchers may explore additional dimensions of job satisfaction or employ alternative assessment methods to gain a deeper understanding of faculty members' levels of job satisfaction.

References

1. Albano, G. M. A. (2017). Teaching performance, job satisfaction and resiliency quotient of faculty members of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines: A correlation study. Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Conference Proceedings, 1(3), 22–27.https://ojs.aaresearchindex.com/index.php/aajmrcp/article/view/945
2. Briones, M. R., Yazon, A. D., Sarmiento, M. B., Ang-Manaig, K., Buama, C. A. C., & Tesoro, J. F. B. (2021). Examining the work engagement, job satisfaction, and performance of faculty in one state university in the Philippines. Psychology and Education, 58(5), 7–24.https://psychologyandeducation.net/pae/index.php/pae/article/view/5120
3. Bongalonta, M. B. . (2022). Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members of State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Bicol, Philippines. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 3(5), 935-947. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.05.19
4. Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). Job satisfaction: how people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. https://openlibrary.org/books/OL26690064M/Job_satisfaction_how_people_feel_about_their_jobs_and_how_it_affects_their_performance
5. El-Khawas, E. (2010). Human Resource Issues in Higher Education (pp. 527–532). https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00859-9
6. Glomo-Narzoles, D. T. (2012). Communication climate: its relation to institutional productivity. Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1(4), 196–205. http://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/40019544080
7. Guzman, A. B., Dela Cruz, J., & Santos, M. (2023). President Ramon Magsaysay State University Graduate School (PRMSU-GS) lecturers' job satisfaction in the 'new normal'. Journal of Advances in Education and Philosophy, 7(5), 179-186. https://doi.org/10.36348/jaep.2023.v07i05.002
8. Hajdukova, A., & Klementova, J. (2015). The Job Satisfaction as a Regulator of the Working Behaviour. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 190, 471–476. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SBSPRO.2015.05.028

9. Knight, A.M., Carrese, J.A. and Wright, S.M. (2007), Qualitative assessment of the long-term impact of a faculty development programme in teaching skills. Medical Education, 41: 592-600. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2007.02770.x
10. Kumari, N. (2014). A Case Study Showing Parameters Affecting the Quality of Education: Faculty Perspective. Journal of Educational Psychology, 8(1), 26–36. https://doi.org/10.26634/JPSY.8.1.2766
11. Lacy, F. J., & Sheehan, B. A. (1997). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. Higher Education, 34(3), 305–322. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003019822147
12. Lalla, M., Frederic, P., & Ferrari, D. (2011). Students' Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: Satisfaction and Related Factors (pp. 113–129). Physica-Verlag HD. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7908-2375-2_8
13. Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. Personnel Psychology, 28(4), 563–575. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x
14. Malcom, D. R., Attarabeen, O. F., Castleberry, A., et al. (2024). A national survey of perceptions around conditions associated with pharmacy faculty workload equity. The American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajpe.2024.100664
15. Miano, L. C. (2018). Job and life satisfaction of teaching personnel in a state university in Quezon Province. 11th International Scholars Conference, 6(1), 226. https://jurnal.unai.edu/index.php/isc/article/view/1368
16. O'Meara, K., Lennartz, C., Kuvaeva, A., et al. (2019). Department conditions and practices associated with faculty workload satisfaction and perceptions of equity. The Journal of Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2019.1584025
17. Oshagbemi, T. (1998). The Impact of Age on the Job Satisfaction of University Teachers. Research in Education, 59(59), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1177/003452379805900110
18. Pius, Jessica. (2025). Higher Education and Faculty Job Satisfaction: Examining the Link Between Attitude, Productivity, and Professional Growth- A Qualitative Study. Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management. 10. 01-12. 10.52783/jisem.v10i50s.10094.
19. Shockness, S. (2015). Faculty perspectives on factors impacting work as nurse educators. https://scispace.com/papers/faculty-perspectives-on-factors-impacting-work-as-nurse-35wqe7s3zg
20. Tolentino, M. A. (2023). Job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness in emergency remote teaching among higher education faculty. Warasan Wichai Ratchaphat Chiang Mai, 17(2), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.57260/rcmrj.2023.265660
21. Ullian, J. A., & Stritter, F. T. (1997). Types of faculty development programs. Family Medicine, 29(4), 237–241. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9110157/
22. Urbano, R. C., Santos, J., & Cruz, A. (2022). Exploring job satisfaction of the faculty at Bulacan Agricultural State College: Input to enhance performance in the new normal. International Journal of Education Teaching and Social Sciences, 2(4), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.47747/ijets.v2i4.838
23. Valadez, J. R., & Anthony, J. S. (2001). Job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25(2), 97–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920150218489
24. Valdez, A. P., et al. (2025). Productivity assessment of faculty members of the College of Business, Economics and Accountancy, Mariano Marcos State University, Philippines. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14862839

25. Webber, K. L. (2011). Measuring Faculty Productivity (pp. 105–121). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1116-7_6

26. Zaman, S., Jahan, A., & Mahmud, Md. A. L. (2014). Job Satisfaction of University Teacher's: A Study on Private University in Bangladesh. European Journal of Business and Management, 6(31), 138–147. https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/download/16537/16943

27. Zia, A., et al. (2024). Relationship of job satisfaction with the performance of university faculty in Azad Jammu & Kashmir. Journal of Contemporary Teacher Education, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.58444/jcte.v7i1.1033