



# The Effect of Performance-Based Incentives on School Performance and Job Satisfaction of Public-School Teachers

Albert Julian D. Arciaga<sup>1</sup>, Emie A. Genton, PhD<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Education, Kyumad Integrated School, Division of Sarangani, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Graduate School, Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges, Philippines

Email: [albert.arciaga@deped.gov.ph](mailto:albert.arciaga@deped.gov.ph)

Publication history:

## Abstract

This study aimed to determine the significant relationship between performance-based incentives and both school performance and job satisfaction among public school teachers in Maasim 1 District, Division of Sarangani, for the School Year 2024-2025. This study employed a quantitative descriptive correlational research design. Using simple proportional random sampling as the technique, the study selected a sample of 233 teachers from the total 555 respondents. The data gathered in the study were collated, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to ensure accuracy and reliability of results. Specifically, the mean was used to determine the average levels of performance in various areas, while Pearson's correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was employed to measure the strength and direction of the relationships between reading comprehension, word problem-solving skills, and academic performance. Based on the results of the study, the extent of performance-based incentives was manifested most of the time. On the other hand, the level of school performance and job satisfaction were high. Also, there was a significant relationship between performance-based incentives and school performance and performance-based incentives and job satisfaction.

## Keywords

educational management, performance-based incentives, school performance, job satisfaction, public school teachers, qualitative, descriptive correlation, Philippines

## 1. Introduction

Public schools continue to face challenges related to declining school performance and fluctuating levels of teacher job satisfaction. Issues such as increasing workloads, administrative demands, inadequate resources, and pressure to produce higher student outcomes contribute to stress and reduced motivation among teachers. When educators experience diminished job satisfaction, it can negatively influence instructional quality, classroom management, and student success. Low school performance, in turn, often reflects systemic gaps that hinder effective teaching and learning. These interconnected challenges highlight the need for programs that address both academic outcomes and teacher well-being to ensure schools function effectively and sustainably (Fabella et al., 2022; Han et al., 2022; Keltu, 2024; Quines & Pablo Jr., 2023).



However, school performance and job satisfaction are critically important because they directly influence the overall quality of education. Schools with higher performance levels often demonstrate improved student achievement, enhanced learning experiences, and stronger community trust. Meanwhile, satisfied teachers exhibit greater motivation, reduced absenteeism, and stronger commitment to their profession. When educators feel fulfilled in their roles, they are more likely to engage in professional development, adopt innovative teaching strategies, and build meaningful relationships with learners. Ultimately, supporting school performance and job satisfaction fosters a positive school climate, promotes organizational growth, and contributes to long-term educational success (Aksoy & Şahin, 2022; Erwin et al., 2021; McGee et al., 2023; Quines & Piñero, 2022).

Moreover, studies examining performance-based incentives suggest a strong correlation between such programs and improvements in school performance. Incentive systems that reward teachers based on student outcomes, completion of school targets, and improved program implementation encourage more focused instruction and strategic planning. When teachers are financially motivated, they may invest more effort in designing effective learning activities, attending trainings, and collaborating with colleagues to reach performance benchmarks. Consequently, schools may experience growth in academic achievement, higher assessment scores, and improved institutional ratings. However, the extent of improvement often depends on adequate resources, administrative support, and fairness in the evaluation process (Balondo et al., 2024; Hungo et al., 2024; Luzon, 2022; Maligsay & Quines, 2023).

Furthermore, there is also a notable correlation between performance-based incentives and teacher job satisfaction. Financial rewards can serve as recognition of effort, affirming teachers' contributions and strengthening their sense of value within the institution. Such incentives may reduce the feeling of being overworked and underappreciated, which is common in public school settings. As teachers experience increased satisfaction, their motivation, morale, and commitment to the profession tend to rise. This can lead to better student engagement, reduced turnover, and a more stable workforce. Nevertheless, inconsistencies in incentive distribution or perceived unfairness may diminish these positive effects, emphasizing the importance of transparent and equitable implementation (Aydin Sünbül & Aslan Gördesli, 2021; Oco, 2022; Quines & Maguan, 2025; Ra et al., 2023).

At the local level, the issue surrounding performance-based incentives, school performance, and job satisfaction in DepEd Maasim presents a growing concern. Many schools in the municipality struggle to meet performance benchmarks due to limited access to instructional materials, insufficient classroom facilities, and inconsistent technological support. As a result, teachers face heightened pressure to produce desirable student outcomes despite a lack of adequate resources. This situation contributes to declining job satisfaction, as teachers may feel undervalued, overburdened, and inadequately supported in fulfilling their roles. Consequently, school performance may suffer, creating a cycle in which teachers are unable to achieve the standards required for incentive eligibility, further diminishing motivation and morale among the teaching workforce (Bommareddy, 2025; Filmer et al., 2025; Suelto-cordovilla & Cruz, 2021).

Despite the growing implementation of performance-based incentive systems in the Philippines, there remains a clear research gap on their effects on school performance and job satisfaction in rural or underserved communities like Maasim. Most existing studies focus on urban settings, offering limited insight into local challenges such as resource disparities and limited professional development. This lack of localized research makes it difficult for policymakers to design effective, context-based strategies. Therefore, further investigation is needed to understand how performance-based incentives influence teacher motivation and school outcomes in socioeconomically challenged areas (Amayreh & Arshad, 2025; Hemati & Moradi, 2021; Hirshleifer, 2021).

Hence, given these circumstances, the urgency of conducting this study becomes evident. Without timely research, performance-based incentive programs may continue to operate in ways that



unintentionally disadvantage teachers in resource-limited schools, potentially widening educational inequities. Insights from this research can provide valuable evidence to inform policy adjustments, improve program implementation, and foster a more supportive teaching environment in DepEd Maasim. By exploring the relationship between performance-based incentives, school performance, and job satisfaction, this study seeks to contribute practical recommendations that can enhance teacher morale, elevate academic outcomes, and strengthen the overall quality of public education in the region. Such efforts are essential to ensuring that incentive programs achieve their intended purpose: improving education for all learners (Cohodes et al., 2023; Ortagus et al., 2023; Ryu & Jinnai, 2021).

### Research Objectives

This study aimed to determine the common of performance-based incentives on school performance and job satisfaction of public-school teachers.

Specifically, the following objectives were formulated:

1. To determine the common performance-based incentives in terms of:
  - 1.1. performance-based financial rewards,
  - 1.2. recognition and appreciation, and
  - 1.3. opportunities for career advancement;
2. To determine the school performance in terms of:
  - 2.1. retention,
  - 2.2. completion,
  - 2.3. graduation,
  - 2.4. promotion,
  - 2.5. repetition,
  - 2.6. drop-out, and
  - 2.7. failure;
3. To determine the level of job satisfaction of public-school teachers in terms of:
  - 3.1. security,
  - 3.2. work environment,
  - 3.3. job responsibilities, and
  - 3.4. community attachments/linkages; and
4. To determine the significant relationship between:
  - 4.1. performance-based incentives and school performance; and
  - 4.2. performance-based incentives and job satisfaction.



## 2. Methodology

### Research Design

This study employed a quantitative non-experimental descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationships among the variables under investigation. The quantitative approach enabled the collection and analysis of numerical data using statistical methods, while the descriptive component determined the levels of the variables. The correlational aspect assessed the strength and direction of the relationships among these variables without manipulating them. This design was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to investigate naturally occurring conditions and generate objective findings that could serve as a basis for conclusions and recommendations.

### Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in selected public elementary and secondary schools in the municipalities of Maasim, Kiamba, and Maitum (MAKIMA) in the province of Sarangani, Philippines. Specifically, the research included schools from the three municipalities to examine how school performance and incentive structures influence teachers' job satisfaction. Data were gathered from the selected schools to provide insights into teachers' perceptions of motivation, institutional support, and professional fulfillment.

### Population and Sample

The respondents for this study were public school teachers from the three municipalities in Sarangani Province: Maasim, Kiamba, and Maitum, collectively known as MAKIMA. Specifically, there are 220 teachers from Maasim, 200 teachers from Kiamba, and 135 teachers from Maitum, resulting in a total of 555 teachers across the three municipalities. To determine the desired sample size, the Slovin's formula was applied. Using simple proportional random sampling as the technique, the study selected a total of 233 teachers from the population of 555. The use of simple proportional random sampling for 233 respondents is a strong and appropriate technique, as it ensures that each teacher from the three municipalities had an equal and fair chance of being included in the sample based on their population proportion. This method guarantees a representative subset of teachers, thereby improving the accuracy and validity of the data analysis.

**Table 1. Distribution of the Respondents**

| Municipality | N          | n          |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Maasim       | 220        | 92         |
| Kiamba       | 200        | 84         |
| Maitum       | 135        | 57         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>555</b> | <b>233</b> |

### Research Instrument

The study utilized three instruments, with the first being an adapted and modified from the study of Abd, Mahmood, Mohammed. (2022), entitled: Incentives in Achieving Job Satisfaction: A Study of a Sample of Employees Working in the General Directorate of Education, Diyala Governorate. It had 3 indicators: performance-based financial rewards, recognition and appreciation, and opportunities for career advancement. To assess the common performance-based incentives, the rating scale below was used:

| Range     | Description            | Rating Scale                                                                         |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.50-6.00 | Very Strongly Agree    | The performance-based incentives have a very strong positive effect on learners.     |
| 4.50-5.49 | Strongly Agree         | The performance-based incentives have a strong positive effect on learners.          |
| 3.50-4.49 | Moderately Agree       | The performance-based incentives have a moderate positive effect on learners.        |
| 2.50-3.49 | Moderately Disagree    | The performance-based incentives have a low positive effect on learners.             |
| 1.50-2.49 | Strongly Disagree      | The performance-based incentives have a very minimal positive effect on learners.    |
| 1.0-1.49  | Very Strongly Disagree | The performance-based incentives have no or an almost negligible effect on learners. |

The second instrument was adapted from a standardized DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015. It has 7 indicators: retention, completion, graduation, promotion, repetition, drop-out, and failure. To assess the level of school performance, the rating scale below was used:

| Rating    | Verbal Description       | Interpretation                                                                                                                                                                |
|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 100%-95%  | (5) Excellent            | This level represents the highest level of performance and indicates that the school has exceeded expectations on a particular KPI.                                           |
| 94%-90%   | (4) Good                 | This level represents a level of performance that meets expectations and indicates that the school is performing well on a particular KPI.                                    |
| 89%-85%   | (3) Satisfactory         | This level represents a level of performance that is adequate, but may have room for improvement.                                                                             |
| 84%-80%   | (2) Needs of Improvement | This level represents a level of performance that falls below expectations and indicates that the school needs to take action to improve its performance on a particular KPI. |
| 79%-Below | (1) Poor                 | This level represents the lowest level of performance and indicates that the school's performance is significantly below expectations on a particular KPI.                    |

The third instrument, which measured job satisfaction among public school teachers, was adapted from the Job Satisfaction Level of K To 12 Teachers Utilizing Multiple Statistical Tools by Glorineil, Romero Ph.D. and Dr. Nimrod F. Bantigue (2017). It has four indicators: security, work environment, job responsibilities, and community attachments/linkages. To assess the level of job satisfaction, the rating scale below was used:

| Range     | Description         | Interpretation                                                                                        |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.50-6.00 | Very Strongly Agree | Extremely High- This indicates that respondents are overwhelmingly satisfied with their job.          |
| 4.50-5.49 | Strongly Agree      | Very High- This shows that respondents are highly satisfied, though with minor areas for improvement. |

|           |                        |                                                                                                                                   |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.50-4.49 | Moderately Agree       | Fairly High- This suggests that respondents feel moderately satisfied but may have some notable concerns.                         |
| 2.50-3.49 | Moderately Disagree    | Fairly Low- This implies that respondents have a low level of satisfaction, with several concerns affecting their job experience. |
| 1.50-2.49 | Strongly Disagree      | Very Low- This reflects that respondents are highly dissatisfied, with major issues impacting their job satisfaction.             |
| 1.0-1.49  | Very Strongly Disagree | Extremely Low- This signals that respondents feel extremely dissatisfied or experience almost no satisfaction in their job.       |

### Ethical Considerations

This study strictly adhered to ethical standards to protect the rights, dignity, and welfare of all teacher participants in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 and the guidelines of the RMMC Ethics and Review Committee. Participation was voluntary, with respondents fully informed about the study's purpose, procedures, benefits, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Privacy and confidentiality were ensured through anonymous data collection, secure storage of research records, and the reporting of results in aggregate form only. The study involved minimal risk, avoided any form of coercion, deception, data fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism, and maintained transparency throughout the research process. Necessary permissions were secured from the appropriate educational authorities and school administrators before data collection. Furthermore, no conflict of interest was declared, and authorship was based on actual scholarly contributions to uphold academic integrity and research credibility.

### 3. Results and Discussion

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data gathered in the study.

#### Common Performance-Based Incentives

Table 2 shows that the common performance-based incentives and their perceived impact were generally rated as Moderately Agree ( $M = 3.80$ ). Among the indicators, Performance-Based Financial Rewards received the highest mean score ( $M = 4.40$ ), indicating that financial incentives are perceived as the most effective motivator. Recognition and Appreciation followed with a mean of 3.90, suggesting that acknowledgment and praise also contribute positively to performance. In contrast, Opportunities for Career Advancement obtained the lowest mean score ( $M = 3.00$ ), implying that career growth opportunities are perceived as less influential compared to financial and recognition-based incentives. Overall, the findings indicate that performance-based incentives have a moderate positive impact on motivation and performance.

*Table 2. Common Performance-Based Incentives*

| INDICATORS                           | MEAN | DESCRIPTION      |
|--------------------------------------|------|------------------|
| Performance-Based Financial Rewards  | 4.4  | Moderately Agree |
| Recognition and Appreciation         | 3.9  | Moderately Agree |
| Opportunities for Career Advancement | 3.0  | Moderately Agree |
| TOTAL                                | 3.8  | Moderately Agree |

### Level of School Performance

Table 3 shows that the overall level of school performance was Satisfactory (88.3%). Among the key performance indicators, Completion Rate obtained the highest score (91%), followed by Repetition Rate (92%), both interpreted as Good, indicating that most learners successfully complete their educational level and progress without repeating grades. Meanwhile, Retention (86%), Graduation (89%), Promotion (87%), Drop-out (88%), and Failure (85%) rates were rated Satisfactory, suggesting that the school is generally meeting expected performance standards but still has areas that require improvement. Overall, the findings indicate that the school demonstrates satisfactory performance in supporting learners' academic progress and achievement.

*Table 3. Level of School Performance*

| INDICATORS | RATING | DESCRIPTION  |
|------------|--------|--------------|
| Retention  | 86     | Satisfactory |
| Completion | 91     | Good         |
| Graduation | 89     | Satisfactory |
| Promotion  | 87     | Satisfactory |
| Repetition | 92     | Good         |
| Drop-out   | 88     | Satisfactory |
| Failure    | 85     | Satisfactory |
| TOTAL      | 88.3   | Satisfactory |

### Level of Job Satisfaction

Table 4 shows that the overall level of job satisfaction among respondents was high, with an overall mean score of 4.50, interpreted as Strongly Agree. Among the indicators, Job Responsibilities obtained the highest mean score ( $M = 4.70$ ), followed by Community Attachments/Linkages ( $M = 4.60$ ) and Security ( $M = 4.50$ ), all interpreted as Strongly Agree. These findings indicate that respondents are highly satisfied with their assigned duties, relationships with the community, and job stability. In contrast, Work Environment received the lowest mean score ( $M = 4.00$ ), which falls under Moderately Agree, suggesting that although respondents are generally satisfied with their workplace conditions, there is still room for improvement. Overall, the results reflect a positive level of job satisfaction among the respondents.

*Table 4. Level of Job Satisfaction*

| INDICATORS                      | MEAN | DESCRIPTION      |
|---------------------------------|------|------------------|
| Security                        | 4.5  | Strongly Agree   |
| Work Environment                | 4.0  | Moderately Agree |
| Job Responsibilities            | 4.7  | Strongly Agree   |
| Community Attachments/ Linkages | 4.6  | Strongly Agree   |
| TOTAL                           | 4.5  | Strongly Agree   |

### Significant Relationship Between Performance-Based Incentives and School Performance

Table 5 shows a significant relationship between performance-based incentives and school performance. The computed correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.84$ ) is substantially higher than the critical  $r$ -value (0.120), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This indicates a strong positive relationship between the two variables, suggesting that higher levels of performance-based incentives are associated with improved school performance. The findings imply that effective incentive systems can contribute positively to school outcomes and overall educational success.

**Table 5. Significant Relationship Between Performance-Based Incentives and School Performance**

| Score                                                                         | Df<br>n-2  | rx-value<br>233 |              | Decision                      | Analysis           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
|                                                                               |            | Computed        | Tabular      |                               |                    |
| <b>Performance-Based Incentives</b><br><b>vs</b><br><b>School Performance</b> | <b>231</b> | <b>0.84</b>     | <b>0.120</b> | <b>Reject null hypothesis</b> | <b>Significant</b> |

### Significant Relationship Between Performance-Based Incentives and Job Satisfaction

Table 6 shows a significant relationship between performance-based incentives and job satisfaction. The computed correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.82$ ) is considerably higher than the critical  $r$ -value (0.120), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This indicates a strong positive relationship between the two variables, suggesting that higher levels of performance-based incentives are associated with greater job satisfaction. The findings imply that effective incentive systems contribute positively to employees' motivation, sense of fulfillment, and overall satisfaction in their work.

**Table 6. Significant Relationship Between Performance-Based Incentives and Job Satisfaction**

| Score                                                                       | Df<br>n-2  | rx-value<br>233 |              | Decision                      | Analysis           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
|                                                                             |            | Computed        | Tabular      |                               |                    |
| <b>Performance-Based Incentives</b><br><b>vs</b><br><b>Job Satisfaction</b> | <b>231</b> | <b>0.82</b>     | <b>0.120</b> | <b>Reject null hypothesis</b> | <b>Significant</b> |

## Discussion

### Common Performance-Based Incentives

The findings reveal that performance-based incentives are moderately practiced and are perceived to have a moderate positive effect on learners and educational outcomes. Financial rewards received the highest rating, followed by recognition and appreciation, while opportunities for career advancement obtained the lowest rating, indicating that respondents generally view incentives as beneficial but not highly effective. This suggests that although performance-based incentives contribute to teacher motivation, productivity, and improved learner outcomes, their impact may be limited by implementation challenges and unequal access to professional growth opportunities. These findings support Expectancy Theory, which posits that individuals are motivated when they believe their efforts will lead to desirable performance outcomes and meaningful rewards. Related studies indicate

that performance-based incentives can enhance teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and instructional effectiveness when supported by fair evaluation systems and professional development opportunities (Hobson et al., 2021; Mitani, 2025). However, concerns regarding fairness, sustainability, and disparities in school resources may reduce their effectiveness (Lin et al., 2022; Sumanasena & Mohamed, 2022; Weisbrod, 2025). In the Philippine context, incentive programs such as the Performance-Based Bonus aim to improve teacher performance and student achievement, yet differences in resources and working conditions may affect their implementation and outcomes (Luzon, 2022; Torneo & Mojica, 2019). Overall, the findings suggest that performance-based incentives are valuable motivational tools, but their effectiveness can be enhanced through more equitable, transparent, and supportive implementation.

### **Level of School Performance**

The findings indicate that the level of school performance is satisfactory, suggesting that schools are meeting acceptable standards in key areas such as retention, completion, graduation, promotion, drop-out, and failure rates. While this reflects adequate support for student progress and academic success, the results also highlight opportunities for further improvement to achieve higher levels of performance. Respondents generally perceive school performance as satisfactory, recognizing that schools are fulfilling their basic educational objectives but still require strengthened instructional practices, student support systems, and engagement strategies to enhance outcomes. These findings are consistent with studies showing that performance-based incentives can positively influence school performance when aligned with meaningful goals and supported by effective educational policies and resources (Duran, 2025; Shin et al., 2024). However, the success of such initiatives depends on a supportive educational environment, adequate resources, and opportunities for professional development, which help improve teacher effectiveness and student achievement (Spring, 2019; Hussain et al., 2022; Kelchen et al., 2024). Furthermore, research suggests that incentive systems should be carefully designed to complement intrinsic motivation and sustain long-term improvements in performance (Fabella et al., 2022; Han et al., 2022). Overall, the findings suggest that while school performance is satisfactory, continuous improvement efforts are necessary to achieve higher levels of educational quality and learner success.

### **Level of Job Satisfaction**

The findings reveal a very high level of job satisfaction among respondents, indicating that they are highly satisfied with their work, particularly in terms of job responsibilities, community attachments and linkages, and job security. This suggests that respondents feel motivated, fulfilled, and engaged in their professional roles, which can contribute to improved performance and a positive school environment. These findings support Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which emphasizes that job satisfaction is influenced by both motivator factors, such as achievement, recognition, and responsibility, and hygiene factors, such as work conditions and job security. The high level of satisfaction observed in this study suggests that motivator factors are strongly present, while the relatively lower rating for work environment indicates areas that may still require improvement. Related studies affirm that teachers who experience supportive working conditions, recognition, positive professional relationships, and opportunities for growth tend to report higher levels of job satisfaction, motivation, and commitment to their work (Aksoy & Şahin, 2022; Keltu, 2024; Erwin et al., 2021; McGee et al., 2023). Furthermore, adequate resources, manageable workloads, and strong administrative support have been identified as essential factors in sustaining teacher satisfaction and effectiveness (Balondo et al., 2024; Hongo et al., 2024). Overall, the findings suggest that maintaining a supportive and rewarding work environment is vital for sustaining high levels of job satisfaction and enhancing educational outcomes.

### **Significant Relationship Between Performance-Based Incentives and School Performance**



The findings reveal a significant positive relationship between performance-based incentives and school performance, indicating that higher levels of incentives are associated with improved school outcomes. This suggests that rewards, recognition, and opportunities for professional growth motivate teachers and staff to enhance their performance, which contributes to better retention, promotion, completion, and graduation rates. The findings support Expectancy Theory, which explains that individuals are motivated when they believe their efforts will lead to desirable rewards. Related studies also confirm that effective and fair incentive systems can improve teacher motivation, instructional practices, and overall school performance (Lavy, 2020; Aydin Sünbül & Aslan Gördesli, 2021; Oco, 2022). Overall, the results highlight the importance of well-designed performance-based incentives in improving educational outcomes.

### **Significant Relationship Between Performance-Based Incentives and Job Satisfaction**

The findings reveal a significant positive relationship between performance-based incentives and job satisfaction, indicating that higher levels of incentives are associated with greater employee satisfaction. This suggests that when teachers and staff receive fair rewards, recognition, and opportunities for professional growth, they are more likely to feel motivated, valued, and fulfilled in their work. The findings support Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which emphasizes that motivators such as achievement, recognition, and advancement contribute to higher job satisfaction. Related studies also show that performance-based incentives, particularly financial rewards and recognition programs, can enhance employee motivation, job satisfaction, and retention by acknowledging and rewarding good performance (Cohodes et al., 2023; Hirshleifer, 2021; Ortagus et al., 2023; Ryu & Jinnai, 2021). Overall, the results highlight the importance of effective incentive systems in promoting teacher satisfaction and sustaining a motivated workforce.

## **4. Conclusion and Recommendations**

### **Conclusion**

Based on the results, the following conclusions were established: Performance-based incentives have a significant and positive impact on both school performance and job satisfaction. The findings revealed that among the incentive indicators, performance-based financial rewards were perceived as the most influential, followed by recognition and appreciation, and opportunities for career advancement, all contributing to a moderate level of agreement regarding their effectiveness. Meanwhile, school performance indicators collectively demonstrated a satisfactory level, suggesting that while educational outcomes are generally acceptable, there remains room for improvement. Furthermore, job satisfaction among respondents was found to be high, particularly in areas of job responsibilities, security, and community attachments, although the work environment showed slightly lower satisfaction. These results suggest that effective and well-implemented incentive systems enhance employee motivation and overall performance.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the conclusions of this study, it is recommended that the Department of Education (DepEd), school administrators, and teachers take deliberate actions to strengthen the implementation of performance-based incentive systems. DepEd may continue refining these programs to ensure fairness, transparency, and alignment with improving teacher performance and learner outcomes. Policies may be carefully reviewed and monitored to guarantee that rewards are distributed equitably. Moreover, school administrators and school heads are encouraged to diversify both monetary and non-monetary incentives to promote teacher motivation and professional satisfaction. Incentives such as awards, recognition, and opportunities for career advancement should be designed to appreciate teachers' efforts and encourage continuous improvement. By incorporating a combination of rewards, administrators can foster a supportive and empowering work environment



that inspires teachers to excel. For future researchers, it is recommended to explore the long-term impact of performance-based incentives on teacher motivation, student achievement, and overall school performance. Further studies may focus on comparing the effectiveness of monetary, non-monetary, and community-based incentives in different educational settings.

Compliance with ethical standards

## References

1. Abu-Tineh, A. M., Romanowski, M. H., Chaaban, Y., Alkhatib, H., Ghamrawi, N., & Alshaboul, Y. M. (2023). Career advancement, job satisfaction, career retention, and other related dimensions for sustainability: A perception study of Qatari public school teachers. *Sustainability*, 15(5), 4370. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054370>
2. Adabuna: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pemikiran, 5(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.38073/adabuna.v5i1.3199>
3. Adams, J. S. (2015). Equity theory. In *Organizational Behavior* 1 (pp. 134-158). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315702018-11>
4. Adu-Baffoe, E., & Bonney, S. (2021). A study of job satisfaction and retention amongst public and private basic school teachers in Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(3), 136-149. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/12-3-16>
5. Aksoy, S., & Şahin, S. (2022). Ways to evaluate teachers' professional performance in the context of performance based payment policies. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(4), 322-342. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25mar766>
6. Alshmemri, M., Shahwan-Akl, L., & Maude, P. (2017). Herzberg's two-factor theory. *Life Science Journal*, 14(5), 12-16. <https://doi.org/10.7537/marslsj140517.03>
7. Amayreh, M. M. N., & Arshad, M. A. (2025). Exploring the relationships between external and internal motivation on job satisfaction among primary teachers in the ministry of education in Jordan: The moderating effect of perceived organizational support. *International Journal of Academic*
8. Anastasiou, S., & Garametsi, V. (2021). Perceived leadership style and job satisfaction of teachers in public and private schools. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 15(1), 58-77. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMIE.2021.111817>
9. Aydin Sünbül, Z., & Aslan Gördesli, M. (2021). Psychological capital and job satisfaction in public-school teachers: The mediating role of prosocial behaviours. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 47(2), 147-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2021.1877086>
10. Bahtilla, M., & Hui, X. (2021). The impact of school environment on teachers' job satisfaction in secondary schools. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 8(7). <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v8i7.3799>
11. Balbes, C. A. J., & Quines, L. A. (2022). The mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between work engagement and individual work performance among public school teachers. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(5), 102-113. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v1i5.882>
12. Balondo, J. B., Bauat, J., & Agustin, N. (2024). Assessment of job satisfaction of private high school teachers in Gapan city: A basis for strategic planning. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5052976>
13. Beckmann, J., & Heckhausen, H. (2025). Motivation as a function of expectancy and incentive. In *Motivation and action* (pp. 165-225). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-87947-0\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-87947-0_5)
14. Bommareddy, H. (2025). The causal effect of performance-based incentives on educational outcomes: Evidence from US public school districts. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5527461>



15. Cabaron, G. J., & Oco, R. M. (2023). Teachers' level of motivation and job satisfaction. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 45(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2023/v45i1971>
16. Celis, J. A., Tan, D. A., Celis Jr, V. G., & Tan, R. J. (2023). Classroom management, job satisfaction, and stress coping mechanism on the performance of senior high school teachers. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 11(6), 395-406. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-11-6-8>
17. Chan, M., Mabel, Z., & Mbekeani, P. P. (2023). Incentivizing equity? The effects of performance-based funding on race-based gaps in college completion. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 94(3), 381-413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2022.2082762>
18. Clegg, S. R., & Bailey, J. R. (2008). Expectancy theory. In *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies* (Vol. 4, pp. 485-487). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412956246.n170>
19. Cohodes, S., Eren, O., & Ozturk, O. (2023). The long run effects of a comprehensive teacher performance pay program on student outcomes (No. w31056). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w31056>
20. Comighud, S. M. T., & Arevalo, M. J. (2021). Motivation in relation to teachers' performance. <https://doi.org/10.33107/ubt-ic.2021.485>
21. Dami, Z. A., Imron, A., & Supriyanto, A. (2022). Servant leadership and life satisfaction at public School in Indonesia: Career satisfaction as mediator. *Pedagogy Studies/Pedagogika*, 145(1). <https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2022.145.6>
22. Demir-Yıldız, C. (2023). Unveiling job satisfaction of teachers through a blend of methodologies. *Sustainability*, 15(18), 13986. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813986>
23. Deutz, D. B., Drachen, T. M., Drongstrup, D., Opstrup, N., & Wien, C. (2021). Quantitative quality: A study on how performance-based measures may change the publication patterns of Danish researchers. *Scientometrics*, 126(4), 3303-3320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03881-7>
24. Duran, C. (2025). Leading with impact: The relationship between school heads' multifactor leadership styles and teachers' job satisfaction in public secondary schools. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, 4(6), 01-14. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjtep.2025.4.6.1>
25. Erwin, C., Binder, M., Miller, C., & Krause, K. (2021). Performance-based aid, enhanced advising, and the income gap in college graduation: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 43(1), 134-153. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720979180>
26. Esman, E. N., Bual, J. M., & Madrigal, D. V. (2023). Twenty-first century teaching skills and job satisfaction of public senior high school teachers in central Philippines. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, 17(7), 46-62. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2023/v17i7493>
27. Fabella, F. E. T., So, K. F., Ybut, G. P., & Joven, J. A. A. (2022). Job satisfaction of selected Filipino teachers working in Philippine public schools and in US public schools: A comparative study. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 16(2), 1054-1065. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2022.16.2.1288>
28. Fang, J., & Qi, Z. (2023). The influence of school climate on teachers' job satisfaction: The mediating role of teachers' self-efficacy. *Plos one*, 18(10), e0287555. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287555>
29. Fife, S. T., & Gossner, J. D. (2024). Deductive qualitative analysis: Evaluating, expanding, and refining theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 23, 16094069241244856. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241244856>
30. Filmer, D., Habyarimana, J., & Sabarwal, S. (2025). Teacher performance-based incentives and learning inequality. *Journal of Human Resources*, 60(3), 812-856. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.1120-11313R2>

31. Fischer, H. E., Boone, W. J., & Neumann, K. (2023). Quantitative research designs and approaches. In *Handbook of Research on Science Education* (pp. 28-59). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367855758-3>
32. Fradkin-Hayslip, A. (2021). Teacher autonomy, motivation, and job satisfaction: Perceptions of elementary school teachers according to self-determination theory. *Ilkogretim online*, 20(2). 10.17051/ilkonline.2021.02.25
33. Gadsden, T., Mabunda, S. A., Palagyi, A., Maharani, A., Sujarwoto, S., Baddeley, M., & Jan, S. (2021). Performance-based incentives and community health workers' outputs, a systematic review. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 99(11), 805. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.20.285218>
34. Gao, Z., Hu, G., Akram, S., Ul Hassan, M., Shahzad, M. F., & Jan, S. A. (2025). Comparative analysis of managerial strategies for enhancing teacher motivation in public and private schools. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1), 6272. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-90900-9>
35. García, E., & Han, E. S. (2022). Teachers' base salary and districts' academic performance: Evidence from national data. *Sage Open*, 12(1), 21582440221082138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221082138>
36. George, T. P., Thulla, P. F. Y., Massaquoi, S. B., & Fayiah, M. (2025). Comparative assessment of job satisfaction levels among teachers in public and private secondary schools in Sierra Leone.
37. Ghanad, A. (2023). An overview of quantitative research methods. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 6(08), 3794-3803. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v6-i8-52>
38. Glaveli, N., Manolitzas, P., Tsourou, E., & Grigoroudis, E. (2024). Unlocking teacher job satisfaction during the COVID-19 pandemic: A multi-criteria satisfaction analysis. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 15(1), 1264-1285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-01124-z>
39. Han, B., Tösten, R., & Elçiçek, Z. (2022). Public leadership behaviors of school principals: Does it affect teacher motivation and job satisfaction in Turkish culture?. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 18(3), 209-228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPL-03-2021-0026>
40. Hemati, A. G., & Moradi, S. (2021). Job burnout in public and special school teachers. *Клиническая и специальная психология*, 10(2), 63-75. <https://doi.org/10.17759/cpse.2021100205>
41. Hirshleifer, S. R. (2021). Incentives for effort or outputs? A field experiment to improve student performance. <https://doi.org/10.5072/FK23J3JR55>
42. Hobson, J. L., Sommerfeldt, R. D., & Wang, L. W. (2021). Cheating for the cause: The effects of performance-based pay on socially oriented misreporting. *The Accounting Review*, 96(5), 317-336. <https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2019-0357>
43. Holt, S. B. (2022). For the children? Teachers motivation and systems for recruitment, retention, and evaluation. In *Research Handbook on Motivation in Public Administration* (pp. 264-283). Edward Elgar Publishing.
44. Hungo, M., Casinillo, L., Dagohoy, R., & Llave JR, E. (2024). Job satisfaction and intention to stay among selected private school teachers:
45. Hussain, S., Saba, N. U., Ali, Z., Hussain, H., Hussain, A., & Khan, A. (2022). Job satisfaction as a predictor of wellbeing among secondary school teachers. *Sage Open*, 12(4), 21582440221138726. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221138726>
46. Implication to educational policy. *Diversitas Journal*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.48017/dj.v9i2.3035>
47. Jamoral, R., Batag, M. J., & Andres, K. A. (2023). Work performance incentivization in the Philippine public educational organization. *Journal of Management, Economics, and Industrial Organization*, 7(2), 77-94. <https://doi.org/10.31039/jomeino.2023.7.2.5>
48. Jeong, Y. H., Healy, L. C., & McEwan, D. (2023). The application of goal setting theory to goal setting interventions in sport: A systematic review. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16(1), 474-499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2021.1901298>



49. Jiang, Y., & Nair, S. (2025). Competition and reward practices: Evidence from public schools. *The Accounting Review*, 100(5), 207-235. <https://doi.org/10.2308/TAR-2024-0041>
50. *Journal of School Leadership*, 33(5), 535-549. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10526846221143039>
51. Keddie, S. L., & Magnan, M. (2023). Are ESG performance-based incentives a panacea or a smokescreen for excess compensation?. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 14(3), 591-634. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-11-2022-0605>
52. Kelchen, R., Ortagus, J., Rosinger, K., & Cassell, A. (2024). Investing in the workforce: The impact of performance-based funding on student earnings outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 95(2), 172-199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2023.2171201>
53. Keltu, T. T. (2024). The effect of human resource development practice on employee performance with the mediating role of job satisfaction among Mizan Tepi University's academic staff in Southwestern Ethiopia. *Heliyon*, 10(8). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29821>
54. Kivistö, J., & Mathies, C. (2023). Incentives, rationales, and expected impact: Linking performance-based research funding to internal funding distributions of universities. In *Handbook of public funding of research* (pp. 186-202). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800883086.00019>
55. Kuratomi, K., Johnsen, L., Kitagami, S., Hatano, A., & Murayama, K. (2023). People underestimate their capability to motivate themselves without performance-based extrinsic incentives. *Motivation and Emotion*, 47(4), 509-523. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-022-09996-5>
56. Levatino, A., Verger, A., Camphuijsen, M., Termes, A., & Parcerisa, L. (2024). School governance through performance-based accountability: A comparative analysis of its side effects across different regulatory regimes. *Review of Research in Education*, 48(1), 248-286. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X241270672>
57. Li, H., Su, L., Zuo, J., Zhao, X., Chang, R., & Wang, F. (2022). Incentive mechanism for performance-based payment of infrastructure PPP projects: Coupling of reputation and ratchet effects. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 26(1), 35-55. <https://doi.org/10.3846/ijspm.2022.15969>
58. Lim, W. M. (2025). What is quantitative research? An overview and guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(3), 325-348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264622>
59. Lin, T. K., Werner, K., Witter, S., Alluhidan, M., Alghaith, T., Hamza, M. M., & Alazemi, N. (2022). Individual performance-based incentives for health care workers in organisation for economic co-operation and development member countries: A systematic literature review. *Health Policy*, 126(6), 512-521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2022.03.016>
60. Lintner, T. (2024). Effects of performance-based financial incentives on higher education students: A meta-analysis using causal evidence. *Educational Research Review*, 44, 100621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100621>
61. Locke, E., & Latham, G. (2015). Goal-setting theory. In *Organizational behavior 1* (pp. 159-183). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315702018-12>
62. Long, Y., & Fan, X. (2024). Beyond test scores: Exploring the multiple determinants of performance pay for teachers in China. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-024-09997-8>
63. Lumanug II, C. G., & Dimla, R. B. (2021). Interaction effects of teachers' job satisfaction and their self-efficacy on teaching performance. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 7(1), 48-65. <https://doi.org/10.31578/jebs.v7i1.249>
64. Luzon, A. Z. (2022). Effects of performance-based bonus on employees' productivity and motivation in a state college, Philippines. *International Journal of Educational Science*, 36(1-3), 41-53. [10.31901/24566322.2022/36.1-3.1207](https://doi.org/10.31901/24566322.2022/36.1-3.1207)



65. Maheshwari, G. (2022). Influence of teacher-perceived transformational and transactional school leadership on teachers' job satisfaction and performance: A case of Vietnam. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 21(4), 876-890. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2020.1866020>
66. Maier, C., Thatcher, J. B., Grover, V., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Cross-sectional research: A critical perspective, use cases, and recommendations for IS research. *International Journal of Information Management*, 70, 102625. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102625>
67. Mainali, B., & Belbase, S. (2023). Job satisfaction, professional growth, and mathematics teachers' impressions about school environment. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 31. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.31.7424>
68. Maligsay, M. B., & Quines, L. A. (2023). *The mediating effect of affective commitment on the relationship between transformational leadership of school heads and organizational change among public elementary schools*. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(2). <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/4789>
69. Martins, P. S., & Ferreira, J. R. (2025). Effects of individual incentive reforms in the public sector: The case of teachers. *Public Choice*, 204(3), 457-481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-024-01256-z>
70. McGee, J. R., Shoaf, G., Huelsman, T., & McClannon, T. (2023). The complexity of teacher job satisfaction: Balancing joys and challenges.
71. Mitani, H. (2025). Performance-based compensation systems and principal job performance. *American Educational Research Journal*, 62(2), 414-455. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312241303760>
72. Morrison, E. A., Adu, D. A., & Kimani, D. (2025). Propelling the transition to circular economy: Exploring the role of corporate circular economy performance-based incentive policy. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 34(5), 6024-6053. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.4285>
73. Noori, A. Q. (2023). Job satisfaction variance among public and private school teachers: A case study. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), 2189425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2189425>
74. Oco, R. (2022). Level of job satisfaction of public high school teachers: A survey. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 95(1), 114-133. [10.47119/10.47119/IJRP100951220222888](https://doi.org/10.47119/10.47119/IJRP100951220222888)
75. Ogundare, P., & Omotosho, B. J. (2022). The relevance of expectancy theory in explaining employee performance and productivity. Available at SSRN 4553246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4553246>
76. Onyekwelu, R. A. (2024). Perceived influence of welfare packages on teachers job performance in public secondary schools in Anambra State. *Int'l Journal of Education Research and Scientific Development*, 5(3), 14-14. <https://doi.org/10.59795/ijersd.v5i3.72>
77. Ortagus, J. C., Rosinger, K., Kelchen, R., Voorhees, N., Chu, G., & Allchin, H. (2023). A national analysis of the impact of performance-based funding on completion outcomes among underserved students.
78. Quines, L. A., & Arendain, E. I. (2023). Job satisfaction, organizational culture and work-life balance: Structural equation model of organizational commitment among public school teachers. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(9). <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v10i9.4971>
79. Quines, L. A., & Maguan, M. P. (2025). *The combined mediating effects of supervisory relationship and leader-subordinate empowerment on the relationship between paternalistic leadership of school heads and quality of work life of public school teachers*. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 12(2). <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/5843>
80. Quines, L. A., & Pablo Jr., R. V. (2023). *The mediating effect of general self-efficacy on the relationship between transformational leadership of school heads and organizational commitment of teachers*. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(5). <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/4771>



81. Quines, L. A., & Piñero, M. Y. (2022). *The mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between team work skills and work values of teachers*. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 9(11). <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/4520>
82. Ra, E., Kim, J., Hong, J., & DesJardins, S. L. (2023). Functioning or dysfunctioning? The effects of performance-based funding. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 45(1), 79-107. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737221094563>
83. Rafique, M. U., Kanwal, S., Iftikhar, T., & Amjad, S. (2024). Exploring the impact of teacher performance evaluation systems: A comparative analysis of public VS private secondary schools and their role in shaping educational quality. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 13(4), 391-401. <https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.4.32>
84. Research in Business and Social Sciences, 15(4), 1636-1655. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v15-i4/25311>
85. Richard, C., Urick, B. Y., Pathak, S., Jackson, J., & Livet, M. (2021). Performance-based pharmacy payment models: key components and critical implementation considerations for successful uptake and integration. *Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy*, 27(11), 1568-1578. <https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2021.27.11.1568>
86. Ryu, S., & Jinnai, Y. (2021). Effects of monetary incentives on teacher turnover: A longitudinal analysis. *Public Personnel Management*, 50(2), 205-231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026020921414>
87. Saro, J. M., Apat, J. Q., & Pareja, M. S. (2023). A descriptive-correlational study of the teachers' motivation, competences, and perceptions in writing action research. *J Adv Educ Philos*, 7(1), 14-24. <https://doi.org/10.36348/jaep.2023.v07i01.003>
88. Shi, H., & Wang, D. (2024). Why Merit Pay Fails: Comparison of public and private school practices in Shenzhen, China. *ECNU Review of Education*, 7(3), 809-832. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311221144461>
89. Shin, J. C., Shim, H. K., Kim, S. J., & Lee, P. G. (2024). A systematic review of the impact of performance-based funding in the US. *Higher Education Policy*, 37(2), 392-417. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-023-00309-0>
90. Suelto-cordovilla, R. V., & Cruz, R. O. D. (2021). Performance-based bonus on the efficacy of public high school teachers in the Philippines. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(1), 236-247. <https://doi.org/10.17556/erziefd.779942>
91. Sumanasena, M. L. H., & Mohamed, N. F. (2022). Teacher job satisfaction: A review of the literature. *Muallim Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.33306/mjssh/209>
92. Swann, C., Rosenbaum, S., Lawrence, A., Vella, S. A., McEwan, D., & Ekkekakis, P. (2021). Updating goal-setting theory in physical activity promotion: A critical conceptual review. *Health Psychology Review*, 15(1), 34-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2019.1706616>
93. The Review of Higher Education, 46(4), 415-452. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2023.a900568>
94. Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. (2021). Performance-based bonus on the efficacy of public high school teachers in the Philippines. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5934657>
95. Torneo, A., & Mojica, B. (2019). Performance-based management in the Philippine bureaucracy. Torneo, Ador R. and Mojica, Brian C, 1-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3851462>
96. Ward, J., & Ost, B. (2021). The effect of large-scale performance-based funding in higher education. *Education Finance and Policy*, 16(1), 92-124. [https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp\\_a\\_00300](https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00300)
96. Weisbrod, B. A. (2025). Incentives in k-12 education-the perils of not just measuring performance by standardized tests, but financially rewarding it working paper 2 in the series: The perils of pay for performance in public service industries. Northwestern University Institute for Public Policy Research, Working Papers. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5199295>



97. Xiaoqian, G., & Sermisri, N. (2025). Developing an incentive mechanism management model of enhancing the quality of work life of primary school teachers: Case study of Changchun, China. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER), (115). <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2025.115.06>