AN INVESTIGATION INTO TEACHERS' JOB PERFORMANCE IN BASIC EDUCATION HIGH SCHOOLS

Nan Kyu Kyu Win[1] and Phyu Zar Zar Theint[2]

Abstract

The main objective of this research was to investigate teachers' job performance in Basic Education High Schools. Quantitative and qualitative methods were explored in this study. Participants involved in this study were 210 teachers from Basic Education High Schools in Hlaing Bwe Township, Kayin State, using the proportional stratified sampling method. The questionnaires, including demographic data and teachers' job performance were used for a quantitative study, and interview questions were used for a qualitative study. The internal consistency of the Cronbach's alpha (∞) of the questionnaire for the level of teachers' job performance was (0.96). Using SPSS (version 23), descriptive statistics, the Independent Samples *t* Test, One-way ANOVA, Games-Howell, and Tukey HSD were used to analyze the collected data. The level of teachers' job performance in this study was very high (Mean=4.37, SD=.56). There was a significant difference in counterproductive work behaviour among the teachers grouped by their current position. Significant differences were found in teachers' job performance among the teachers grouped by school location and school size.

Keyword: Job Performance

Introduction

Education is one of the most important factors in the development of a nation (Oluremi, 2013, as cited in Kanya et al., 2021). Education is the training and instruction designed to give knowledge to children and young people in schools and colleges (Cowie, 1989, as cited in Akram, 2010). The quality and products of educational society are categorically predisposed by the job performance of teachers. Ineffective teacher performance will disbalance the whole educational society. Therefore, for the development of a strong educational system, it is obligatory that teachers possess dynamic job performance; hence, effective job performance by a teacher is essential for the improvement of educational society as a whole (Yusoff et al., 2013, as cited in Bhat & Beri, 2016).

Significance of the Study

Teachers are one of the pillars that determine the success of educational activities in schools (Miranda et al., 2021). Teachers' role has evolved progressively from teacher-centered to student-centered, where teachers are required to be facilitators in the learning environment, spend more time on analyzing the learners' needs, motivating students, ensuring students' interactions, and keep checking the prerequisite knowledge (Jagtap, 2015). In a high-cost, well-equipped school, having uninspired teachers would not be beneficial to teaching and learning. Hence, undoubtedly, teachers must have a prolific skill in determining and molding the students' capabilities in the right direction. The standard of education rests on the efficiency and competency of teachers, because if teachers are not committed to their jobs and without a proper set of values, the whole edifice of the education system would be unstable (Banfield et al., 2006, as cited in Azeem & Omar, 2018).

[1] Department of Educational Studies, Hpa-an Education Degree College.
[2] Department of Educational Theory and Management, Yangon University of Education

Research Objectives

General Objective

- To investigate teachers' job performance in Basic Education High Schools

Specific Objectives

- To investigate the level of teachers' job performance
- To study the variations in the teachers' job performance in terms of their personal factors
- To study the significant variations in the teachers' job performance in terms of their school-related factors

Limitations of the Study

This study was geographically restricted to the teachers' job performance in Basic Education High Schools in Hlaing Bwe Township, Kayin State. In this study, construct validity was not measured due to limited time and cost for a variety of participants.

Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by the following theoretical framework.

Teachers' Job Performance

Task Performance. Task performance of the teachers, regarding in-role behaviour, is the effectiveness and efficiency of the teachers in which they complete a specific or core task referred to in their duties. It describes the quality and quantity of work output and especially measures how well the teachers accomplish their duties and responsibilities in an educational setting within a given timeframe. The task performance of teachers can be evaluated based on classroom management, lesson planning and delivery, content knowledge, assessment and feedback, communication and collaboration, classroom climate, student engagement, and professionalism, etc. (Christian et al., 2011; Cohen & Liu, 2011; Johari & Yahya, 2009; Welbourne et al., 1998; Murphy, 1989; Sonnentag & Frese, 2002; Zhu, 2013). Classroom or learning climate refers to the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical environments in which the students learn (Ambrose et al., 2010). It can be used as a method to enhance students' knowledge (Sriklaub et al., 2015).

Contextual Performance. Contextual performance, also known as organisational citizenship behaviour, refers to the extra-role behaviours exhibited by employees that contribute to the overall functioning and effectiveness of an organisation. It is defined as the degree to which individuals engage in self-starting, personal initiative, a smart approach for taking on challenging work tasks, and future-oriented activity to alter their own workplace circumstances, their specific job positions, or themselves. In the case of teachers, contextual performance refers to the additional efforts and contributions they make beyond their core teaching responsibilities. These behaviours are not directly part of their job description but positively impact the school community and its functioning. Volunteering for additional duties, providing individualized support, collaboration with colleagues, engaging with parents and the community, continuous professional development, etc. are contextual performances (Borman & Modowidlo, 1993; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Griffin et al., 2000; Organ, 1990; Robbins & Judge, 2012; Witt et al., 2002).

Adaptive Performance. Adaptive performance is the ability to adjust when there is a change in work roles or environment. It reflects the extent to which the individuals cope with, respond to, and/or support changes that positively or negatively influence their roles as

individuals, groups, and organisations. The adaptive performance of teachers refers to their ability to adjust and thrive in the dynamic and complex educational landscape. It encompasses their capacity to respond effectively to the diverse needs of students, adapt instructional strategies, and continuously improve their teaching practices. Flexibility, problem-solving, continuous learning, collaboration and teamwork, reflective practice, cultural competence, resilience, etc. are considered adaptive performance (Griffin et al., 2007; Charbonnier-Voirin et al., 2010; Charbonnier-Voirin & Roussel, 2012; Pulakos et al., 2000; Sultana, 2020).

Counterproductive Work Behaviour. Counterproductive work behaviour refers to actions or behaviours of individuals that go against the goals and objectives of an organisation or hinder its productivity. These behaviours are typically detrimental to the work environment, the performance of individuals or teams, and the overall effectiveness of the organisation. While teachers are generally known for their dedication and commitment to their profession, there are instances where some teachers engage in counterproductive work behaviours like chronic absenteeism, lack of preparation, insubordination, lack of collaboration, neglecting students' needs, excessive use of personal technology, etc. (Ozdemir & Demircioglu, 2015; Robbinson & Bennett, 1995; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Sultana, 2020).

Definitions of Key Terms

Job Performance

Job performance is referred to as an act of accomplishing or executing a given task (Griffin, 2012, as cited in Selamat et al., 2013).

Teachers' Job Performance

Teachers' job performance can be defined as the actions they perform in schools in order to achieve educational goals (Hwang et al., 2017, as cited in Li et al., 2018).

Operational Definition

Teachers' Job Performance

Teachers' job performance is defined as the execution of teachers to implement all educational activities related to teaching-learning. It includes task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance, and counterproductive work behaviour. Teachers' job performance will be measured by the mean values. It was found that the higher the mean values, the higher the level of teachers' job performance.

Methodology

Research Method

To collect the required data, mix method was applied.

Sampling

A total of 210 teachers from 14 Basic Education High Schools in Hlaing Bwe Township, Kayin State were selected as participants by using proportional stratified sampling method. The response rate is 93.33%.

Instrumentation

In this study, a questionnaire survey was used to collect the required data concerning the research focus. The questionnaire includes demographic data about teachers, such as gender, age, academic qualifications, current position, and total teaching service.

The set of questionnaires for teachers' job performance was developed based on four dimensions and related literature. It consists of 33 items: 14 items for task performance, 6 items for contextual performance, 8 items for adaptive performance, and 5 items for counterproductive work behaviour. Each item is rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1= never, 2=hardly, 3=sometimes, 4=often, and 5=always).

The internal consistency of the Cronbach's alpha (∞) of the questionnaire for the level of teachers' job performance was (0.96).

Procedure

First of all, the relevant literature for the research and related theories and models were thoroughly studied. Next, the instrument was constructed in order to collect the required data. Then, the instrument was delivered to all experienced teacher educators from the Department of Educational Theory and Management, Yangon University of Education, to obtain its validity. After that, the necessary corrections were made under the guidance of the supervisor in accordance with the suggestions of the teachers. The pilot study was undertaken in the second week of September, 2023.

After the pilot study, the main study was conducted in the first week of October. The questionnaires were distributed to teachers from selected 14 Basic Education High Schools in Hlaing Bwe Township, Kayin State. After three weeks, the questionnaires were recollected, and the response rate was 93.33 %.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, the Independent Samples *t* Test, One-way ANOVA, Games-Howell, and Tukey HSD were used to analyze the collected data.

Research Findings

Quantitative Findings

(1) What is the level of teachers' job performance?

Table 1 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Job Performance in Task Performance (N=210)

No.	Items	Mean	SD
1	Preparing for teaching activities.	4.64	.79
2	Teaching every student according to his/her abilities.	4.47	.95
3	Making no injustice in marking students' answer papers/ homework.	4.69	.83
4	Teaching difficult lessons easily.	4.45	.98
5	Using different methods of teaching.	4.27	.99
6	Giving constructive feedback based on students' weakness.	4.00	.94
7	Motivating students to take part in co-curricular activities.	4.00	.87
8	Having a good sense of humor.	4.02	.93
9	Prioritizing the important tasks.	4.67	.77
10	Executing the classroom that is practical, interesting and stimulating.	4.12	.60

No.	Items	Mean	SD
11	Preventing verbal and physical harassment.	4.48	.70
12	Addressing gender, racial and other grounds.	4.59	.55
13	Sharing beliefs, customs, attitudes and expectations.	4.38	.59
14	Making the classroom as a shared learning space.	4.42	.64
Task Performance		**4.37**	**.52**

Scoring Direction: **1.00-1.80=Very Low** **1.81-2.60=Low** **2.61-3.40=Moderate** **3.41-4.20=High** **4.21-5.00=Very High**

In Table 1, the mean values of items 1 to 14 were 4.64, 4.47, 4.69, 4.45, 4.27, 4.00, 4.00, 4.02, 4.67, 4.12, 4.48, 4.59,4.38 and 4.42 respectively. Among them, the highest mean value was 4.69 (SD=.83) and its item was "Making no injustice in marking students' answer papers/ homework". The lowest mean values were 4.00 (SD=.94) and 4.00 (SD=.87). Their associated items were "Giving constructive feedback based on students' weakness" and "Motivating students to take part in co-curricular activities". The overall mean value of task performance was 4.37 (SD=.52). This indicated that the level of teachers' task performance was found to be very high. Again, the mean values and standard deviations of teachers' job performance in the contextual performance are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Job Performance in Contextual Performance (N=210)

No.	Items	Mean	SD
1	Enjoying good relations with colleagues/parents.	4.47	.95
2	Maintaining discipline.	4.70	.81
3	Cooperating with others.	4.35	.90
4	Having self-improvement.	4.27	.89
5	Fulfilling other responsibilities.	3.63	.88
6	Protecting and addressing the school' reputation.	4.36	.86
Contextual Performance		**4.30**	**.65**

Scoring Direction: **1.00-1.80=Very Low** **1.81-2.60=Low** **2.61-3.40=Moderate** **3.41-4.20=High** **4.21-5.00=Very High**

According to Table 2, the mean values of items 1 to 6 were 4.47, 4.70, 4.35, 4.27, 3.63 and 4.36 respectively. Among them, the highest mean value was 4.70 (SD=.81) and its item was "Maintaining discipline". The lowest mean value was 3.63 (SD=.88) and its item was "Fulfilling other responsibilities". The overall mean value of contextual performance was 4.30 (SD=.65). This described that the level of teachers' contextual performance was found to be very high. And then, the mean values and standard deviations of teachers' job performance in adaptive performance are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Job Performance in Adaptive Performance (N=210)

No.	Items	Mean	SD
1	Helping the head in solving problems of school.	4.36	.87

No.	Items	Mean	SD
2	Performing duties according to the requirement.	4.70	.71
3	Consulting with colleagues in solving of class problems.	4.30	.95
4	Keeping job skills up to date.	3.46	.88
5	Adjusting work goals when necessary.	4.04	.91
6	Doing relevant activities (co-curricular activities, domestic-affairs, etc.) in the period.	4.52	.85
7	Showing resiliency.	4.01	.95
8	Adjusting himself/herself if someone changes his/her responsibilities.	4.43	.92
Adaptive Performance		**4.23**	**.60**

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.80=Very Low 1.81-2.60=Low 2.61-3.40=Moderate 3.41-4.20=High 4.21-5.00=Very High

In Table 3, the mean values of adaptive performance in each item were 4.36, 4.70, 4.30, 3.46, 4.04, 4.52, 4.01 and 4.43 respectively. Among them, the highest mean value was 4.70 (SD=.71) and its item was "Performing duties according to the requirement". The lowest mean value was 3.46 (SD=.88) and its item was "Keeping job skills up to date". The overall mean value of adaptive performance was 4.23 (SD=.60). This indicated that the level of teachers' adaptive performance was found to be very high.

Table 4 describes mean values and standard deviations of teachers' job performance in terms of counterproductive work behaviour.

Table 4 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Job Performance in Counterproductive Work Behaviour (N=210)

No.	Items	Mean	SD
1	Performing positively without displaying excessive negativity when experience with other events. (R)	4.35	.94
2	Maintaining the school' issues secretly without telling any others. (R)	4.72	.82
3	Collaborating and adjusting the employment with co-workers or supervisor without argument. (R)	4.50	.90
4	Getting permit from school' principal when encountering with other important matter. (R)	4.60	.89
5	Using school' prosperity respectfully as himself/herself. (R)	4.71	.84
Counterproductive Work Behaviour		**4.58**	**.69**

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.80=Very Low 1.81-2.60=Low 2.61-3.40=Moderate 3.41-4.20=High 4.21-5.00=Very High

Noted: R=Reversed Item

According to Table 4, the higher the mean value is, the less counterproductive work behaviour the teachers have. The mean values of items 1 to 5 were 4.35, 4.72, 4.50, 4.60 and 4.71 respectively. Among them, the highest mean value was 4.72 (SD=.82) and its item was "Maintaining the school' issues secretly without telling any others". The lowest mean value was

4.35 (SD=.94) and its item was "Performing positively without displaying excessive negativity when experience with other events". The overall mean value of counterproductive work behaviour was 4.58 (SD=.69). This indicated that the level of teachers' counterproductive work behaviour was found to be very high.

Mean values and standard deviations of level of teachers' job performance are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Level of Teachers' Job Performance (N=210)

No.	Dimensions	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Task Performance	4.37	.52	Very High
2.	Contextual Performance	4.30	.65	Very High
3.	Adaptive Performance	4.23	.60	Very High
4.	Counterproductive Work Behaviour	4.58	.69	Very High
Teachers' Job Performance		**4.37**	**.56**	**Very High**

Scoring Direction: 1.00-1.80=Very Low 1.81-2.60=Low 2.61-3.40=Moderate 3.41-4.20=High 4.21-5.00=Very High

According to the responses, the mean values of each of the dimensions indicate the level of teachers' job performance. The overall mean value of teachers' job performance was 4.37 (SD=.56). This indicated that the level of teachers' job performance was found to be very high.

(2) Are there any variations in the teachers' job performance in terms of their personal factors?

Table 6 The Results of Independent Samples *t* Test for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by Gender (N=210)

Dimensions	Gender	N	*t*	*df*	*p*
Task Performance	Male	11	-.392	208	n.s
	Female	199			
Contextual Performance	Male	11	-.922	208	n.s
	Female	199			
Adaptive Performance	Male	11	.157	208	n.s
	Female	199			
Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Male	11	.291	208	n.s
	Female	199			
Teachers' Job Performance	**Male**	**11**	**-.251**	**208**	**n.s**
	Female	**199**			

Note: n.s=no significance

According to Table 6, there were no significant differences in all dimensions of teachers' job performance between two groups of male and female teachers.

Table 7 One-way ANOVA Results for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by Age (N=210)

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*
Task Performance	Between Groups	.249	2	.125	.462	n.s
	Within Groups	55.871	207	.270		
	Total	56.120	209			
Contextual Performance	Between Groups	.362	2	.181	.432	n.s
	Within Groups	86.818	207	.419		
	Total	87.180	209			
Adaptive Performance	Between Groups	.126	2	.063	.172	n.s
	Within Groups	75.653	207	.365		
	Total	75.779	209			
Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Between Groups	.204	2	.102	.211	n.s
	Within Groups	100.007	207	.483		
	Total	100.210	209			
Teachers' Job Performance	**Between Groups**	**.207**	**2**	**.103**	**.329**	**n.s**
	Within Groups	**65.096**	**207**	**.314**		
	Total	**63.303**	**209**			

Note: n.s=no significance

As presented in Table 7, it was found that there were no significant differences in all dimensions of teachers' job performance among teachers grouped by age.

Table 8 The Results of Independent Samples *t* Test of Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by Their Academic Qualifications (N=210)

Dimensions	Academic Qualifications	N	*t*	*df*	*p*
Task Performance	Techers with Education Degree or Certificate	131	.094	208	n.s
	Teachers with no Education Degree or Certificate	79			
Contextual Performance	Techers with Education Degree or Certificate	131	-.208	208	n.s
	Teachers with no Education Degree or Certificate	79			
Adaptive Performance	Techers with Education Degree or Certificate	131	-.046	208	n.s
	Teachers with no Education Degree or Certificate	79			
Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Techers with Education Degree or Certificate	131	-.782	208	n.s
	Teachers with no Education Degree or Certificate	79			

Dimensions	Academic Qualifications	N	*t*	*df*	*p*
Teachers' Job Performance	**Techers with Education Degree or Certificate**	**131**	**-.293**	**208**	**n.s**
	Teachers with no Education Degree or Certificate	**79**			

Note: n.s=no significance

According to Table 8, there were no significant differences in all dimensions teachers' job performance grouped by their academic qualifications.

Table 9 One-way ANOVA Results for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by Their Current Position (N=210)

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*
Task Performance	Between Groups	.806	2	.403	1.508	n.s
	Within Groups	55.314	207	.267		
	Total	56.120	209			
Contextual Performance	Between Groups	.770	2	.385	.923	n.s
	Within Groups	86.410	207	.417		
	Total	87.180	209			
Adaptive Performance	Between Groups	.608	2	.304	1.205	n.s
	Within Groups	75.170	207	.313		
	Total	75.779	209			
Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Between Groups	3.163	2	1.581	3.373	.036*
	Within Groups	97.047	207	.469		
	Total	100.210	209			
Teachers' Job Performance	**Between Groups**	**1.061**	**2**	**.530**	**1.709**	**n.s**
	Within Groups	**64.242**	**207**	**.310**		
	Total	**65.303**	**209**			

Note: *p< .05 and n.s=no significance

Table 9 indicates that a significant difference was found in counterproductive work behaviour (df=2, F=3.373, p< .05). However, there were no significant differences in task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance and overall teachers' job performance.

Table 10 One-way ANOVA Results for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by Their Total Teaching Service (N=210)

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*
Task Performance	Between Groups	.148	2	.074	.273	n.s
	Within Groups	55.973	207	.270		
	Total	56.120	209			

Dimensions		**Sum of Squares**	***df***	**Mean Square**	***F***	***p***
Contextual Performance	Between Groups	.757	2	.379	.907	n.s
	Within Groups	86.423	207	.418		
	Total	87.180	209			
Adaptive Performance	Between Groups	.281	2	.141	.385	n.s
	Within Groups	75.497	207	.365		
	Total	75.779	209			
Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Between Groups	.321	2	.161	.333	n.s
	Within Groups	99.889	207	.483		
	Total	100.210	209			
Teachers' Job Performance	**Between Groups**	**.304**	**2**	**.152**	**.484**	**n.s**
	Within Groups	**64.999**	**207**	**.314**		
	Total	**65.303**	**209**			

Note: n.s=no significance

As presented in Table 10, it was found that there were no significant differences in all dimensions of teachers' job performance according to their total teaching service.

(3) Are there any significant variations in the teachers' job performance in terms of their school-related factors?

Table 11 One-way ANOVA Results for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by School Location (N=210)

Dimensions		**Sum of Squares**	***df***	**Mean Square**	***F***	***p***
Task Performance	Between Groups	1.096	2	.548	2.061	n.s
	Within Groups	55.024	207	.266		
	Total	56.120	209			
Contextual Performance	Between Groups	4.898	2	2.499	6.161	.003**
	Within Groups	82.282	207	.397		
	Total	87.180	209			
Adaptive Performance	Between Groups	6.787	2	3.394	10.182	.000***
	Within Groups	68.991	207	.333		
	Total	75.779	209			
Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Between Groups	3.848	2	1.924	4.133	.017*
	Within Groups	96.363	207	.466		
	Total	100.210	209			
Teachers' Job Performance	**Between Groups**	**3.798**	**2**	**1.899**	**6.391**	**.002****
	Within Groups	**61.505**	**207**	**.297**		
	Total	**65.303**	**209**			

Note: *p< .05, **p< .01, ***p< .001 and n.s=no significance

As presented in Table 11, it was found that there was no significant difference in the dimension of task performance among teachers grouped by school location. However, there were statistically significant differences in contextual performance (*df*=2, *F*=6.161, *p*< .01), adaptive performance (*df*=2, *F*=10.182, *p*< .001), counterproductive work behaviour (*df*=2, *F*=4.133, *p*< .05), and overall teachers' job performance (*df*=2, *F*=6.391, *p*< .01).

To find out the significant differences in teachers' job performance according to school location, Games-Howell Test was conducted. The results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12 Games-Howell Results for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by School Location (N=210)

Dependent Variables	(I) School Location	(J) School Location	Mean Difference (I-J)	*P*
Contextual Performance	Group A	Group B	-.281*	.034*
		Group C	-.349*	.003**
Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Group A	Group C	-.303*	.024*
Teachers' Job Performance	**Group A**	**Group B**	**-.240***	**.037***
		Group C	**-.312***	**.002****

Note: *p< .05, **p< .01

Note: Group A= located within 15 miles from Township Education Office
Group B= located between 15 miles and 30 miles from Township Education Office
Group C= located above 30 miles from Township Education Office

In contextual performance, Group A teachers differed significantly from that of Group B teachers (*p*< .05, effect size d= -0.41), and Group C teachers (*p*< .01, effect size d=-0.54). Games-Howell results revealed that Group A teachers had less contextual performance than that of Group B and Group C teachers.

In counterproductive work behaviour, Group C teachers differed significantly from that of Group A teachers (*p*< .05, effect size d= -0.44). This revealed that Group C teachers had more counterproductive work behaviour than that of Group A teachers.

To sum up, Group A teachers differed significantly from that of Group B teachers (*p*< .05, effect size d= -0.15) and Group C teachers (*p*< .01, effect size d= -0.56). Games-Howell results revealed that Group B and Group C teachers performed job better than that of Group A teachers in overall teachers' job performance.

Tukey HSD results in Table 13 shows the significantly differences of teachers' job performance according to their school location.

Table 13 Tukey HSD Results for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by School Location (N=210)

Dependent Variables	(I) School Location	(J) School Location	Mean Difference (I-J)	*P*
Adaptive Performance	Group A	Group B	-.283*	.008**
		Group C	-.435*	.000***

Note: **p< .01, ***p< .001

Note: Group A= located within 15 miles from Township Education Office
Group B= located between 15 miles and 30 miles from Township Education Office
Group C= located above 30 miles from Township Education Office

According to the Table 13, there was a statistically significant difference between Group B and Group A teachers in adaptive performance ($p< .01$, effect size d= -0.49). It was found that Group B teachers adapted to their job performance more than that of Group A teachers. Then, Group C teachers differed significantly from Group A teachers ($p< .001$, effect size d= -0.75). This indicated that Group C teachers had more adaptive performance than that of Group A teachers.

Table 14 One-way ANOVA Results for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by School Size (N=210)

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*
Task Performance	Between Groups	.543	2	.272	1.012	n.s
	Within Groups	55.577	207	.268		
	Total	56.120	209			
Contextual Performance	Between Groups	5.890	2	2.945	7.500	.001**
	Within Groups	81.290	207	.393		
	Total	87.180	209			
Adaptive Performance	Between Groups	4.317	2	2.158	6.252	.002**
	Within Groups	71.462	207	.345		
	Total	75.779	209			
Counterproductive Work Behaviour	Between Groups	1.176	2	.588	1.229	n.s
	Within Groups	99.034	207	.478		
	Total	100.210	209			
Teachers' Job Performance	**Between Groups**	**2.353**	**2**	**1.176**	**3.869**	**.022***
	Within Groups	**62.950**	**207**	**.304**		
	Total	**65.303**	**209**			

Note: *$p< .05$, **$p< .01$ and n.s=no significance

As presented in Table 14, it was found that there was no significant difference in the dimension of task performance and counterproductive work behaviour among teachers grouped by school size. However, there were statistically significant differences in contextual performance (df=2, F=7.500, $p< .01$), adaptive performance (df=2, F=6.252, $p< .01$), and overall teachers' job performance (df=2, F=3.869, $p< .05$).

To find out the differences in teachers' job performance according to school size, Tukey HSD was conducted. The results are shown in Table 15.

Table 15 Tukey HSD Results for Teachers' Job Performance Grouped by School Size (N=210)

Dependent Variables	(I) School Size	(J) School Size	Mean Difference (I-J)	*P*
Contextual Performance	Group A	Group B	.386*	.001**
Adaptive Performance	Group A	Group B	.334*	.001**
Teachers' Job Performance	**Group A**	**Group B**	**.245***	**.017***

Note: *$p< .05$, **$p< .01$

Note: Group A= below 400 students

Group B= between 400 and 600 students

Group C= above 600 students

In contextual performance, there was a statistically significant difference between Group A teachers and Group B teachers ($p< .01$, effect size d=0.63). Tukey HSD revealed that Group A teachers had more contextual performance than that of Group B teachers.

In adaptive performance, there was a statistically significant difference between Group A teachers and Group B teachers ($p< .01$, effect size d=0.05). Tukey HSD revealed that Group A teachers had more adaptive performance than that of Group B teachers.

In overall teachers' job performance, there was a statistically significant difference between Group A teachers and Group B teachers ($p< .05$, effect size d=0.48). Tukey HSD revealed that Group A teachers performed job more than that of Group B teachers.

Conclusion and Discussion

This study indicated that the level of teachers' job performance was found to be very high and this finding is consistent with the literature of Amin et al. (2013) and Limon and Sezgin-Nartgun (2020), who found that teachers' job performance as expressed by themselves was good and its level was high. This study also investigated that there were no significant differences in teachers' job performance in terms of their personal factors. However, statistically significant differences were found in teachers' job performance in terms of their school related factors.

There were significant differences in contextual performance (p<.01), adaptive performance (***p<.001), counterproductive work behaviour (*p<.05), and overall teachers' job performance (**p<.01) according to their school location.** This result was contrary to Ali and Haider (2017), and Akiri and Ugborugbo (2008), who described that there is no considerable difference between the locations of teachers regarding performance. In this study, it can be concluded that the teachers whose school is located far away from the Township Education Office performed their job better than the teachers whose school is nearby.

There were significant differences in contextual performance (p<.01), adaptive performance (**p<.01), and overall teachers' job performance (*p<.05) according to school size.** It can be concluded that teachers whose schools had minimum and maximum students performed job better than teachers whose schools had medium students.

Recommendations

In light of this conclusion, the following recommendations are at this moment suggested:

- Teachers should keep their job skills up-to-date by skillfully using modern technologies such as computers, laptops, telephones, etc.
- Principals should offer ongoing training and workshops to keep teachers updated on effective teaching methods, technologies, etc.
- It was found that the mean values of male teachers are lowest in contextual performance. Therefore, male teachers should increase their teaching skills and collaborate with students, parents, and colleagues to improve their performance.
- It was found that the mean values of female teachers are lowest in adaptive performance. So, female teachers should emphasize fostering a culture of sharing ideas and best practices and adjusting with others to achieve organisational goals.
- Principals should encourage teachers to participate in professional development activities to improve their job performance.

- It was found that the mean value of the older age group of teachers was the lowest among the three groups. Thus, the older teachers should try to cope with the new trends in education as much as possible.
- Principals should provide clear guidelines and expectations, enabling these teachers to understand their roles and responsibilities, etc.
- It was found that the mean values of teachers with an education degree or certificate are the lowest in adaptive performance. Therefore, teachers with an education degree or certificate should increase their work productivity, identify and nurture their talents, enhance their technology skills, etc.
- It was found that the mean value of teachers with no education degree or certificate is the lowest in adaptive performance. So, teachers with no education degree or certificate should increase their capacity to be persistent, flexible, and innovative in new teaching approaches, prepare in the case of failure, etc.
- Principals should create collaboration and mutual support with teachers to improve the ability of teachers to be confident and personal growth in order to achieve organisational and individual goals.
- It was found that the mean values of junior teachers are the lowest in adaptive performance. Thus, junior teachers should perform well in the overall job by carrying out tasks as expected, having the important responsibility of moderating the teaching-learning process and learning environment, consulting with primary teachers, senior teachers, and their colleagues in solving classroom problems, etc.
- Principals should encourage teachers' engagement in daily routine activities to achieve instructive objectives.
- It was found that the mean value of teachers who have more total teaching service is the lowest in teachers' job performance. So, teachers who have more total teaching service should practice their teaching by attending teaching trainings, studying online, using various teaching methods, etc.
- Principals should always make an effort to support the pedagogical content knowledge of these teachers to keep up with the current trend in education.
- It was found that the mean value of teachers whose school is located near the Township Education Office is the lowest. Therefore, these teachers should invest their time and energy in teaching, follow the school's discipline, carry out their duties to accomplish the school's objectives, etc.
- Principals should support specific instructions, set clear goals, give appropriate supervision, etc.
- It was found that the mean value of teachers who have medium school sizes is the lowest in teachers' job performance. Thus, these teachers should plan and manage their work effectively, improve their teaching methodology by consulting internet media, use new informatory literature to bring innovation to their teaching methodology, etc.
- Principals should encourage teachers to do self-study continuously and reflect on their teaching practice regularly, etc.

Need for Further Study

This study tried to investigate teachers' job performance in Basic Education High Schools, Hlaing Bwe Township, Kayin State. Therefore, the need for further research should be explored for schools in other states or regions. Moreover, future research should also be investigated in Basic Education Primary, Middle, and Branch High Schools. Since the data were collected based on the perceptions of teachers, further research should be conducted on the perceptions of both principals and students. As further researchers, qualitative research methods such as field observation and interviews should be conducted, and the data obtained will be more diversified.

Acknowledgements

We would like to offer respectful appreciation to Dr. Kay Thwe Hlaing, Rector of Yangon University of Education, Dr. Nyo Nyo Lwin, Dr. May Myat Thu and Dr. Khin Khin Oo, Pro-rectors of Yangon University of Education). We are grateful to Dr. Khin Mar Ni (Professor and Head of Department, Department of Educational Theory and Management, Yangon University of Education) and our external examiner, Dr. Zin Nwe Than (Professor and Head of Department, Department of Educational Theory and Management, Sagaing University of Education) . Finally, we would like to acknowledge all the participants for their cooperation for this study.

References

Akiri, A. A., & Ugborugbo, N. M. (2008). An examination of gender's influence on teachers' productivity in secondary schools. *Journal of Social Science, 17*(3), 185-191.

Akram, M. J. (2010). *Factors affecting the performance of teacher at higher secondary level in Punjab*. [Doctoral Thesis, Pir Mehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University]. Sematic Scholar.

Ali, A., & Haider, S. Z. (2017). Developing a validated instrument to measure teachers' job performance: Analyzing the role of background variables. *Journal of Educational Research, 20*(1), 21-35.

Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietero, M., & Lovett, M. C. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principals for smart teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Amin, M., Shah, R., Ayaz, M., & Atta, M. A. (2013). Teachers' job performance at secondary level in Khyber Pakhyunkhwa, Pakistan. *Gomal University Journal of Research, 29*(2), 100-104.

Azeem, N., & Omar, M. K. (2018). Exploring teacher performance: A review of concepts and approaches. *Graduate research in education seminar*, 108-118.

Bhat, S. A., & Beri, A. (2016). Development and validation of teachers perceived job performance scale (TPJP) in higher education. *Man in India. 96*(4), 935-944.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). *Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance*. *In personal selection of organisations*. San Franciso: Joddey-Bass.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organisational behaviours. *Academy of management Review, 11*(4), 710-725. http://www.jstor.org/stable/258391

Charbonnier-Voirin, A., & Roussel, P. (2012). Adaptive performance: A new scale to measure individual performance in organisations. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 29*, 280-293. https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.232

Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel psychology, 64*(1), 89-136. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/211384078

Cohen, A., & Liu, Y. (2011). Relationships between in-role performance and individual values, commitment, and organisational citizenship behaviour among Israeli teachers. *International Journal of Psychology, 46*(4), 271-287. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2010.539613

Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Neale, M. (2000). The contribution of task performance and contextual performance to effectiveness: Investigating the role of constraints. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49*(3), 517-533. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00029

Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behaviour in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(2), 327-347. https://doi.ory/10.5465/amj.2007.24634438

Jagtap, P., (2015). Teacher role as facilitator in learning. *Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science and English Language, 3*(17), 3903-3905.

Johari, J., & Yahya, K. K. (2009). Linking organisational structure, job characteristics, and job performance constructs: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Business and Management, 4*(3), 145-152. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v4n3p145

Kanya, N., Fathoni, A. B., & Ramdani, Z. (2021). Factors affecting teacher performance. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 10*(4), 1462-1468. doi:10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21693

Li, M., Perez-Diaz, P. A., Mao, Y., & Petrides, K. V. (2018). A multilevel model of teachers' job performance: Understanding the effects of trait emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, and organisational trusts. *Frontier in Psychology*, 9, Article 2420. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02420

Limon, I., & Sezgin-Nartgun, S. (2020). Development of teacher job performance scale and determining teachers' job performance level. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science, 13*(3), 564-590.

Miranda, M., Syahza, A., & Sumarno. (2021). Analysis of factors affecting teacher performance in state junior high school learning in Bengkalis Regency. *Journal of Educational Sciences, 5*(3), 464-478. https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.5.3.p.464-478

Murphy, K. R. (1989). Is the relationship between cognitive ability and job performance stable over time? *Human performance, 2*(3), 183-200. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233160787

Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organisational citizenship behaviour. *Research in Organisational Behaviour, 12*, 43-72.

Ozdemir, M., & Demircioglu, E. (2015). The relationship between counterproductive work behaviours and psychological contracts in public high schools. *Faculty of Education Journal, 44*(1), 41-60.

Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donavan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 612-624.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Organisational behaviour*. Essex: Pearson.

Robbinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(2), 555-564. http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 66-80.

Selamat, N., Samsu, N. Z., & Kamalu, N. S. M. (2013). The impact of organisational climate on teachers' job performance. *Educational Research Journal, 2*(1), 71-82.

Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. *Psychological Management of Individual Performance, 23*(1), 3-25. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291062476

Sriklaub, K., Wongwanich, S., & Wiratchi, N. (2015). Development of the classroom climate measurement model. *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences, 171*, 1353-1359.

Sultana, A. (2020). Multidimensionality of job performance: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online, 19* (4), 2467-2483

Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of management journal, 41*(5), 540-555. https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrswp/147

Witt, L., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., & Zivnuska, S. (2002). Interactive effects of personality and organisational politics on contextual performance. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 23*, 911-926. https://doi.ory/10.1002/job.172

Zhu, Y. (2013). Individual behaviour: In-role and extra-role. *International Journal of Business Administration, 4*(1), 23-27. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v4n1p23