

Volume 1-Number 1-2019-3

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REVISED COMPENSATION AND POSITION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM IN THE GOVERNMENT: THE DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEES IN FOCUS**

**Mark Angelo J. Umali**

*Bulacan State University*

**Dr. Rosalinda D. Marcelino 2**

### **Abstract**

The study assessed the level of employee satisfaction and performance in light of the implementation of the revised Compensation and Position Classification System (CPCS) of the government provided under Executive Order 201 series of 2016. Specifically, it identified the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, nature of job performed, educational attainment, number of years in the organization, salary grade and in-service training. It also identified the level of satisfaction on the components of the revised CPCS in terms of basic pay, mid-year bonus, performance-based bonus, performance enhancement incentive (PEI) and year-end bonus and cash gift. Lastly, the level of employee performance was also determined.

Correlation analysis was utilized to determine the significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and their level of satisfaction as well the significant relationship between the level of satisfaction and level of performance.

The results of this study revealed that there is a significant relationship between the employees' profile in terms of educational attainment and level of satisfaction on basic salary. The same relationship was found between the employees' salary grade and the level of satisfaction on all of the components of the revised CPCS with an exemption to PEI. Moreover, a very significant relationship between all of the components of the revised CPCS and their level of performance was also found.

Findings revealed that the amount of salary and the educational attainment of the employees determined their satisfaction level. Consequently, the same satisfaction level influenced their performance level.

## Introduction

In the public sector, an ideal compensation system is based on four guiding principles: equal pay for work of equal value or pay equity; competitiveness with the private industry, that is to make government compensation comparable to its private counterpart; performance-based, in which employee and the organizational performance are linked to the pay they receive; and fiscal sustainability, in which personnel services costs in the general appropriations law are maintained at manageable levels in proportion to the total expenditure program of the national government.

In view of the above principles, the 1987 Philippine Constitution states that Congress shall provide for the standardization of compensation of government officials and employees, including those in government-owned or controlled corporations with original charters, taking into account the nature of the responsibilities pertaining to and the qualifications required for their positions (Section 5, Article IX-B).

Consequently, the Philippine Congress enacted the Compensation and Position Classification Act of 1989, or the Salary Standardization Law (SSL). The SSL authorized the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) to administer and manage the government's CPCS which includes the grouping of positions across government agencies on the basis of similarity and level of work in order to determine their relative worth and allocate salary grades to distinguish different job levels and recognize gradations in duties and responsibilities, in consideration to the following factors: education and experience required to perform the duties and responsibilities of the positions; the nature and complexity of the work to be done; the level of supervision received; mental and/or physical strain vital in the completion of the work; nature and extent of internal and external relationships; level of supervision exercised; decision-making responsibility; responsibility for accuracy of records and reports; accountability for government funds, properties and equipment; and hardship, hazard and personal risk.

Notwithstanding the implementation of the SSL, the problem, however, was that the salary rates were not benchmarked with the private sector. Government pay is left behind by the private industry. This widened the gap between government and private industry salaries' leads to demoralization, poor performance, and exodus of government employees who leave their posts to seek better opportunities in the private industry and abroad.

To address the above scenario, Presidential Decree (P.D.) 985 also known as A Decree Revising the Position Classification and Compensation Systems in the National Government, mandated the DBM to conduct periodic surveys of departments and agencies to ascertain the facts as to the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of positions therein and to conduct salary and wage surveys in private industry to determine prevailing rates of pay for comparable work in the government. (Section 16 (d) & (e), P.D. 985).

This is further echoed by Congress on its Joint Resolution No. 4 s. 2009, also known as the SSL III, which explicitly mandated the DBM to conduct a periodic review of the government's CPCS every three years, taking into account the changes in skills and competency requirement in the bureaucracy and the relative demand for certain expertise... (Section 1 (e), J.R. No. 4, 2009).

In order for the government to attract, retain and motivate competent civil servants and to further encourage excellent performance and productivity to improve the quality of public service, the need to

revising the CPCS has become inevitable, in accordance with the above-cited laws and anchored on the basic principle of equal pay for work of equal value that will consequently promote fairness, integrity, efficiency, higher productivity, greater accountability and excellence in the public sector.

Anent thereto, the DBM, in partnership with Towers Watson, an international consulting firm, conducted a compensation and benefits study of the government in 2015 to determine the competitiveness of government pay in relation to that in the private sector and crafted a new compensation strategy to bring government pay closer to prevailing rates in the private industry.

The compensation and benefits study revealed that the government pay was generally 45 percent below of those in the private industry. The salaries of sub-professional employees were found to be competitive since compensation at the lower salary grade levels is at par or even surpasses those of their private industry counterparts. However, the gap between private and public sector pay widens as one moves up the hierarchy since professional-level employees' were found to receive as low as 41 percent below, while the top echelons of the civil service, consists of managers, administrators and executives who are responsible for planning, policy design, higher-level technical services, operations and the day-to-day management of government only received a third of the salary of their private industry counterparts.

In consideration to the results of the compensation and benefits study of the government, the DBM recommended the implementation of the a revised CPCS, and on February 10, 2016, the Office of the President of the Philippines' issued E.O. No. 201, revising the CPCS of the government, with a retroactive application from January 1, 2016.

The revised CPCS under E.O. No. 201 implemented a new compensation framework for the government sector which consists of the following: Basic Pay including Step Increments; Mid-Year Bonus, Enhanced Performance Based Bonus; Performance Enhancement Incentive; Year-End bonus and Cash gift.

## **Statement of the Problem**

The general problem of the study is: How may the level of satisfaction and performance of DBM employees be assessed based on the implementation of the revised Compensation and Position Classification System (CPCS)?

Specifically, the research seeks answers to the following questions:

1. How may the employees be described in terms of:

1.1 age

1.2 sex

1.2 civil status

1.3 nature of work performed

1.4 educational attainment

- 1.5 number of years in the organization
- 1.6 salary grade, and
- 1.7 in-service training?
2. What is the level of satisfaction of the employees on the following components of the revised CPCS?
  - 2.1 basic pay
  - 2.2 mid-year bonus
  - 2.3 enhanced performance based bonus
  - 2.4 performance enhancement incentive, and
  - 2.5 year-end bonus and cash gift?
3. What is the level of performance of the employees when the revised CPCS was implemented?
4. Is there a significant relationship between employees' profile and their level of satisfaction on the implementation of the revised CPCS?
5. Is there a significant relationship between employees' level of satisfaction and their level of performance?

## Methods

The researcher adopted the Quantitative type of research that utilized the descriptive method by using a survey questionnaire as the main instrument for data-gathering. The above-mentioned method is most appropriate to the study since it sought to determine the level of employee satisfaction and performance-based on the implementation of the revised CPCS in terms of basic pay, mid-year bonus, enhanced performance-based bonus, performance enhancement incentive, year-end bonus, and cash gift.

Further, the descriptive method is employed to describe the relationship of the employees' demographic profile and their level of satisfaction on the components of the revised CPCS and the relationship between the level of satisfaction and level of performance. Pearson correlation coefficient was utilized in order to find out the significant relationship between the variables mentioned.

On the other hand, the technique that used in this study is the cluster random sampling. It should be noted that the DBM is a large national government agency which is divided into clusters in accordance to various functions it performs, i.e., office of the secretary, budget preparation and execution, budget policy and strategy, information and communications technology, internal management and organization, and systems improvement. Each cluster is composed of several bureaus and offices with closely related and allied functions.

In light of the above, all of the clusters in the DBM were chosen. However, bureaus and offices within each cluster were randomly selected and employee-respondents' as well. By doing so, each cluster

performing a specific function of the DBM were represented. Hence, findings and inferences from the sample can be generalized with confidence to the entire population.

Through the assistance of the Administrative Officers of each bureau, service, and office, the respondents were taken from the employee master list randomly. As such, every employee had a chance of being chosen as a respondent without an intervention from the researcher.

The respondents' satisfaction and performance level are interpreted using the table below:

<i>Numerical Description</i>	<i>Arbitrary Scale</i>	<i>Verbal Interpretation</i>	
		<i>Satisfaction Level</i>	<i>Performance Level</i>
5	4.51 - 5.00	Very Satisfied	Outstanding
4	3.51 - 4.50	Satisfied	Very Satisfactory
3	2.51 - 3.50	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfactory
2	1.51 - 2.50	Dissatisfied	Unsatisfactory
1	1.00 - 1.50	Very Dissatisfied	Poor

The data and information gathered were analyzed and presented through the use of frequency distribution and percentages table. Further, the hypotheses of significant relationship between the respondents' profile and satisfaction level, and satisfaction level and performance level were tested using the Pearson r two-tailed test. Accordingly, a verbal interpretation of the computed probability values (p-value) were presented as well. These were done through the use of IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences and Microsoft Excel applications for the generalization of accurate findings and results.

## Results and Discussion

The general problem of the study is to assess the level of satisfaction and performance of DBM employees based on the implementation of the revised CPCS?

Profile of the respondents were identified, their level of satisfaction level on the components of the revised CPCS, the significant relationship between profile and satisfaction level, and the significant relationship between satisfaction level and performance level.

The Profile of the Respondents is presented and summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Frequency, Percentage Distribution and Descriptive Measures of the Profile of the Respondents*

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Mean	SD
1. Age			33	1.38
20-30 years old	85	42.5		
31-40 years old	39	19.5		
41-50 years old	25	12.5		
51-60 years old	35	17.5		
61-65 years old	16	8		
2. Sex				
Male	53	26.5		
Female	147	73.5		
3. Civil Status				
Single	112	56		
Married	85	42.5		
Widow/er	3	1.5		
4. Work Performed				
Technical	155	77.5		
Administrative Support	45	22.5		
5. Highest Educational Attainment				
High School	3	1.5		
Bachelor's	156	78		
Master's	40	20		
Doctoral	1	.5		
<b>6. Number of Years in the Organization</b>			<b>8.45</b>	<b>1.67</b>
Less than one	11	5.5		
1-5	74	37		
6-10	25	12.5		
11-15	30	15		
16-20	17	8.5		
21 and above	43	21.5		
7. Salary Grade			14	1.21
Below 11	37	18.5		
11-15	65	32.5		
16-19	59	29.5		
20-23	19	9.5		
24 and above	20	10		
8. In-Service Training				
DBM-Conducted Training	135	67.5		
Local Training with Institutional Partners	61	30.5		
International Training	4	2		

Majority of the respondents were young professionals, female, single, appointed to technical positions, bachelor's degree holders, with one to five years of service in the organization, within the salary grade bracket of 11-15 and completed a DBM-conducted training.

## Respondents' Level of Satisfaction

**Table 2**

*Descriptive Measures of Respondents' Satisfaction Level in terms of Basic Salary (BS)*

Aspects of BS	Frequency					Mean	Verbal Interpretation
	5 (VS)	4 (S)	3 (MS)	2 (D)	1 (VD)		
a. The amount of my BS	30	84	52	19	15	3.48	Moderately Satisfied
b. The time which I receive my BS	108	63	17	4	8	4.30	Satisfied
c. The fairness of my BS in terms of work magnitude	34	80	48	23	15	3.48	Moderately Satisfied
d. The competitiveness of BS in relation to salaries of employees performing the same job in the private industry	27	74	62	16	21	3.35	Moderately Satisfied
e. The sufficiency of my BS to cover my expenses	21	64	60	34	21	3.15	Moderately Satisfied
f. The substantial differences among salary grade levels	22	64	71	27	16	3.25	Moderately Satisfied
g. The objectivity of the salary grade system	21	72	68	23	16	3.30	Moderately Satisfied
	<b>Total Mean</b>					<b>3.47</b>	<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>

With exemption to the “the time which I receive my basic salary” which obtained a “satisfied” rating, all of the remaining aspects of the basic pay received a “moderately satisfied” rating. Consequently, the basic salary obtained an overall satisfaction level of “moderately satisfied”.

**Table 3**

*Descriptive Measures of Respondents’ Satisfaction Level in terms of Mid-Year Bonus (MYB)*

Aspects of MYB	Frequency					Mean	Verbal Interpretation
	5 (VS)	4 (S)	3 (MS)	2 (D)	1 (VD)		
a. The amount of my MYB	67	81	34	5	13	3.92	Satisfied
b. The time which I receive my MYB	99	66	21	7	7	4.22	Satisfied
c. The sufficiency of MYB to cover mid-year expenses	54	67	48	15	16	3.64	Satisfied
d. The competitiveness of MYB in relation to other bonuses in the private industry	58	60	42	23	17	3.60	Satisfied
Total Mean						3.85	Satisfied

All of the aspects of MYB received a “satisfied” rating. Hence, the overall satisfaction level for MYB is “satisfied”

**Table 4**

*Descriptive Measures of Respondents’ Satisfaction Level in terms of Performance-Based Bonus (PBB)*

Aspects of PBB	Frequency					Mean	Verbal Interpretation	
	5 (VS)	4 (S)	3 (MS)	2 (D)	1 (VD)			
a. The amount of my PBB	16	46	81	27	30	2.96	Moderately Satisfied	
b. The time which I receive my PBB	16	38	64	56	26	2.81	Moderately Satisfied	
c. The fairness between accomplishments done and PBB received	12	32	76	49	31	2.73	Moderately Satisfied	
d. The objectivity in PBB rating	11	30	84	45	30	2.74	Moderately Satisfied	
e. The linkage between individual and office performance	13	33	78	45	31	2.76	Moderately Satisfied	
f. The competitiveness of PBB in relation to other performance related pay in the private industry	11	30	75	46	38	2.65	Moderately Satisfied	
						<b>Total Mean</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>

Every aspect of the PBB received a moderately satisfied rating which consequently contributed to the overall assessment for PBB of “moderately satisfied”.

**Table 5**

*Descriptive Measures of Respondents’ Satisfaction Level in terms of Year-End Bonus and Cash Gift (YEB)*

Aspects of YEB	Frequency					Mean	Verbal Interpretation	
	5 (VS)	4 (S)	3 (MS)	2 (D)	1 (VD)			
a. The amount of my YEB	69	73	35	6	17	3.86	Satisfied	
b. The time which I receive my YEB	86	74	25	7	8	4.12	Satisfied	
c. The sufficiency of YEB to cover expenses during holidays	56	59	40	26	19	3.54	Satisfied	
d. The competitiveness of YEB in relation to other year-end bonuses in the private industry	52	55	47	24	22	3.46	Moderately Satisfied	
						<b>Total Mean</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>

The employees assessed the YEB with a “satisfied” rating excluding “the competitiveness of YEB in relation to another year-end bonuses in the private industry” which received a “moderately satisfied” rating. Still, the general assessment for YEB is “satisfied”

**Table 6**

*Descriptive Measures of Respondents’ Satisfaction Level in terms of Performance Enhancement Incentive (PEI)*

Aspects PEI	Frequency					Mean	Verbal Interpretation
	5 (VS)	4 (S)	3 (MS)	2 (D)	1 (VD)		
a. The amount of my PEI	-	9	90	16	85	2.12	Dissatisfied
b. The time which I receive my PEI	36	61	50	14	39	3.21	Moderately Satisfied
c. The sufficiency of PEI to cover expenses during holidays	-	8	75	31	86	2.03	Dissatisfied
d. The competitiveness of PEI in relation to other year-end bonuses in the private industry	1	7	69	34	89	1.99	Dissatisfied
						<b>Total Mean</b>	<b>2.34</b>
							<b>Dissatisfied</b>

All aspects of the PEI received a dissatisfied rating except for “the time which I receive my PEI” which obtained a “moderately satisfied” rating. Nevertheless, the overall employee assessment for PEI is “dissatisfied”.

**Table 7**

*Descriptive Measures and Summary of Respondents’ Overall Satisfaction Level on the revised CPCS*

Components	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Basic Salary (BS)	3.47	Moderately Satisfied
Mid-Year Bonus (MYB)	3.85	Satisfied
Performance-Based Bonus (PBB)	2.78	Moderately Satisfied
Year-End Bonus and Cash Gift (YEB)	3.74	Satisfied
Performance Enhancement Incentive (PEI)	2.34	Dissatisfied
<b>Total Mean</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>

Two components, MYB, and YEB obtained satisfied ratings of 3.85 and 3.74 respectively. While the other two, BS and PBB received a moderately satisfied rating of 3.47 and 2.78. Noteworthy of attention is the PEI which obtained a dissatisfied rating value of 2.34. In view of the diverse level of satisfaction on the various components of the revised CPCS, the overall satisfaction level is “moderately satisfied”.

## Respondents’ Level of Performance

**Table 8**

*Descriptive Measures of Respondents’ Level of Performance as provided by their Individual Performance Accomplishment Report*

Rating Score	Frequency	Percent	Level of Performance Verbal Interpretation
5	25	12.5	Outstanding
4	102	51	Very Satisfactory
3	72	36	Satisfactory
2	1	0.5	Unsatisfactory
1	-	-	Poor
Mean Performance	3.76		Very Satisfactory

In general, the overall level of employee performance when the revised CPCS was implemented is “very satisfactory”.

### Significant Relationship between Respondents’ Profile and Level of Satisfaction

**Table 9**

*Correlation Analysis between the Respondents' Profile and Level of Satisfaction on the Components of the revised CPCS*

Profile of the Respondents		Basic Salary	Mid-Year Bonus	Performance-Based Bonus	Year-End Bonus	Performance Enhancement Incentive
Age	Pearson Correlation	0.129	0.007	0.055	0.006	0.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.068	0.916	0.441	0.932	0.702
Sex	Pearson Correlation	0.033	0.018	0.16	-0.013	0.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.641	0.8	0.064	0.852	0.983
Civil Status	Pearson Correlation	0.027	-0.09	0.099	-0.034	-0.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.708	0.203	0.161	0.634	0.762
Work Performed	Pearson Correlation	0.106	0.047	0.127	0.117	0.101
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.134	0.512	0.073	0.099	0.154
Salary Grade	Pearson Correlation	.588**	.380**	.243**	.337**	0.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0.001	0	0.072
Recent In-Service Training	Pearson Correlation	0.118	0.069	0.058	0.088	0.071
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.096	0.334	0.415	0.215	0.319

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The respondents’ profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, work performed, number of years in the organization and recent in-service training are associated with their level of satisfaction on all of the components of the revised CPCS. This is supported by their probability values that are greater than the established significance level of .01 ( $p > .01$ ) which explicitly tells that there is no significant relationship exist among the variables mentioned.

However, highest educational attainment is found to be positively associated with the satisfaction level on basic salary (.288) with a p-value of .000 ( $p < .01$ ) which evidently demonstrates a significant relationship.

Noteworthy of attention is the salary grade which is positively correlated ( $p < .01$ ) with nearly all of the components of the revised CPCS in terms of basic salary (.558), mid-year bonus (.380), performance-based-bonus (.243) and year-end bonus (.337). With one exception, it has no association with performance enhancement incentive (.128) as supported by ( $p > .01$ ). This is due to the fact that the salary grade determines the amount of all the components of the CPCS that an employee will receive, except for the fixed amount of PEI which is given across the board, regardless of salary grade. As such, the first alternative hypothesis of significant relationship between the employees' profile and satisfaction level in the components of the revised CPCS is supported.

The above results are supported by the study of Gurbuz (2009) which established a significant relationship between education level and salary satisfaction and concluded that a person with a higher education level can easily find a better job and salaries since educational attainment contributes to a higher level of income and faster promotions which makes individuals with a higher education attainment more prone to be satisfied with their pay. While, Unzicker (2012) concluded in his study that among the variables that describe the demographic profile of an individual, the salary was the only variable that appeared to have any level of significance. The variable with the highest correlation to the employees' satisfaction was salary. Hence, according to his study, salary is a significant predictor of satisfaction.

Finally, since the above shows a positive correlation, it demonstrates that as the one variable increases, the other also increases. Likewise, if the one variable decreases, the other also decreases. These findings suggest that when it comes to education, the higher level attained, the higher satisfaction on basic salary and vice versa. This is also true with salary grade, the higher salary grade, the higher satisfaction on basic salary, mid-year bonus, performance-based bonus and year-end bonus, and vice versa.

## **Significant Relationship between Level of Satisfaction and Level of Performance**

### **Table 10**

*Correlation Analysis between Level of Satisfaction on the Components of the Revised CPCS and Level of Performance*

Level of Satisfaction on the Components of the revised CPCS		Level of Employee Performance	Interpretation
Basic Salary	Pearson Correlation	.340**	Highly Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	
Mid-Year Bonus	Pearson Correlation	.296**	Highly Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	
Performance-Based Bonus	Pearson Correlation	.359**	Highly Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	
Year-End Bonus	Pearson Correlation	.252**	Highly Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	
Performance Enhancement Incentive	Pearson Correlation	.199**	Highly Significant
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.005	

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

As reflected in table 9, the level of satisfaction on all of the components of the revised CPCS is statistically correlated with the level of employee performance. This is supported by their computed probability values that are lesser than the value of significance level of .01 ( $p < .01$ ) which indicates a highly significant relationship between the variables above. As such, level of satisfaction in every component of the revised CPCS is a predictor of the level of performance. This supports the second alternative hypothesis of significant relationship between level of satisfaction on the components of the revised CPCS and level of performance.

Moreover, since the above figures demonstrate a positive correlation, it revealed that if there is a higher satisfaction level on all of the components of the revised CPCS, there would be a higher level of performance. Conversely, if there is a low level of satisfaction on the same components, a low-performance level of performance would be observed.

The foregoing results as reflected above is supported and further strengthened by the propositions of Shahzad (2011), Thomas (2012), Khan and Muneer (2017) that compensation policies and practices are a determinant of employee performance. The above researchers also mentioned that if there is an increase in the employee salary and other monetary compensation it can motivate them, consequently would increase the service quality and employee performance as well. Finally, they mentioned that management can make use of various strategies and policies to satisfy employees, however, it is through the use of compensation that they can truly influence the performance of employees. The more employees are satisfied with their compensation, the more they perform better.

## Recommendations

In view of the foregoing findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are offered for consideration:

1. To improve the moderate satisfaction on basic salary, the DBM should review and evaluate the present salary grade table which prescribes the basic salary and provide the necessary adjustments particularly

to the lower salary grade levels to promote equity and lessen the gap between the rank and file and executives' salary subject to the principle of pay for work of equal value and current prevailing rates in the private industry. This will ensure that rank and file employees can sustain their daily living in view of the price increases in major commodities like food, fuel, and transport.

2. In order to sustain and further strengthen the satisfied rating for MYB and YEB, the government and the DBM in particular should closely monitor and examine the prevailing mid-year bonus and year-end bonus given by the private industry and ensure that there is parity between these incentives and promptly adopt development trends pertaining thereto so as to enhance and bolster performance of employees.

3. In view of the moderate satisfaction on the PBB, the DBM shall conduct a specific study on performance-related pay schemes that are being applied by the private industry and incorporate significant findings thereon to the current PBB system in the government. Because it is important not only to benchmark fixed salaries to private industry counterparts, but also those incentives contingent on employee performance.

4. To further promote fairness and objectivity in the PBB rating, creation of a performance evaluation committee is recommended that will be responsible for the evaluation and contribution of each unit or office achievements to that of the organization as a whole and the same committee shall promote transparency in evaluation rating and assessment of performance to avoid possible subjectivity or bias in the PBB rating.

5. Since the PEI is intended to bolster employee performance, the amount of PEI should be increased accordingly in view of the principle of comparability which contends that public sector employees should receive the same incentives with those in the private sector. This is also to support the employees to catch up the rising prices of commodities during the holidays and festive season.

6. It was a previous practice to give additional year-end bonuses to the government employees on top of the YEB and PEI. However, the same is not established or provided in the revised CPCS. As such, a new component similar to the aforementioned may be considered by the government subject to the generated savings within the end of the fiscal year and will be given only if targets are fully met or exceeded. This will help to improve the economic welfare of civil servants and in recognition to their contribution to public service which will eventually make them feel valued by the government as their employer.

7. Finally, all of these efforts in the government's compensation system should be institutionalized. As such, the passage of the SSL IV or the revised CPCS should be a top priority of the Congress. Although the implementation of the revised CPCS through an EO is allowed by the existing laws that determine the government's compensation system, the fact remains that an EO is not a law and can be easily modified or reversed.

## Conclusion

## References

- Abiodun, G. (2012). Job Satisfaction Status of Primary School Teachers in OTA, Nigeria. *European Journal of Educational Studies*. Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournal.org/iosrjhss/papers/Vol15issue2/J01526874.pdf?id=7210><sup>1</sup>
- Agburu, J. (2012). Recent Trends in Wage and Salary Administration in Nigeria: A Synopsis on Theoretical and Empirical Challenges. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Science*. Retrived from <https://www.scribd.com/document/121570721/Recent-Trends-in-Wage-andSalary-Administration-in-Nigeria-A-Synopsis-onTheoretical-and-EmpiricalChallenges>
- Al-Zawahreh, A., Faisal, M. (2012). The Utility of Equity Theory in Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*. Retrieved from <https://eis.hu.edu.jo/deanshipfiles/pub105362403.pdf>
- Angeles, V., Saludo, A. (2015). Job Satisfaction and Performance Level of Employees of Ajinomoto Philippines Corporation Lucena Branch. *LPU- Laguna Business and Accountancy Journal*. Retrieved from <http://lpulaguna.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Job-Satisfaction-And-Performance-Level-OfEmployeesOfAjinomoto-Philippines-Corporation-Lucena-Branch.pdf>
- Bender, K., Heywood, J. (2010). *Comparing Public and Private Sector Compensation over 20 Years*. Retrieved from [https://slge.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Out-ofBalanceFIN\\_ALREPORT\\_10-183.pdf](https://slge.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Out-ofBalanceFIN_ALREPORT_10-183.pdf)<sup>2</sup>
- Calvin, O. (2017). The Impact of Renumeration on Employees' Performance: A Study of Abdul Gusau Polytechnic, Talate-mafara and State College of Education Maru, Zamfara State. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*. Retrieved from [https://www.arabianjbmr.com/pdfs/NG\\_VOL\\_4\\_2/4.pdf](https://www.arabianjbmr.com/pdfs/NG_VOL_4_2/4.pdf)<sup>3</sup>
- Executive Order (EO) No. 25 s. 1936. *An Act Creating the Budget Commission*. Retrieved from <http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1936/04/25/executive-order-no-25-s-1936>
- EO No. 201 series of 2016. *Modifying the Salary Schedule for Civilian Government Personnel and Authorizing the Grant of Additional Benefits*. Retrieved from <http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2016/02/19/executive-order-no-201-s-2016/>
- Gurbuz, A. (2007). *An Assessment on the Effect of Education Level on the Job Satisfaction from the Tourism Point of View*. Retrieved in 2007 from [journal.dogus.edu.tr/index.php/duj/article/download/97/pdf\\_agurbuz](http://journal.dogus.edu.tr/index.php/duj/article/download/97/pdf_agurbuz)

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosrjhss/papers/Vol15issue2/J01526874.pdf?id=7210>

<sup>2</sup>[https://slge.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Out-ofBalanceFINALREPORT\\_10-183.pdf](https://slge.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Out-ofBalanceFINALREPORT_10-183.pdf)

<sup>3</sup>[https://www.arabianjbmr.com/pdfs/NG\\_VOL\\_4\\_2/4.pdf](https://www.arabianjbmr.com/pdfs/NG_VOL_4_2/4.pdf)

Khan, A. (2016). *Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction: A Study of Telecom Sector of Pakistan*. Retrieved on July 7, 2016 from <http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/bms/article/viewFile/9024/7581><sup>4</sup>

Lai, H. (2011). The Influence of Compensation System Design on Employee Satisfaction. *African Journal of Business Management*. Retrieved from [http://www.academicjournals.org/article/article13850532520\\_Lai.pdf](http://www.academicjournals.org/article/article13850532520_Lai.pdf)<sup>5</sup>

Leong, T., Rashad, Y. (2014). The impact of Positive Reinforcement on Employees' Performance in Organizations. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*. Retrieved from [https://file.scirp.org/pdf/AJIBM\\_2014011309335174.pdf](https://file.scirp.org/pdf/AJIBM_2014011309335174.pdf)

Maqbool, F. (2015). Impact of Extrinsic Rewards on Job Satisfaction of Banking Sector Employees of Karachi Pakistan. *Journal of Business and Management*. Retrieved from <http://iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm/papers/Vol17-issue11/Version 2/I0171126574.pdf>

Motshegwa, B. (2011). Comparative Analysis of Teachers' Perception of Equity, Pay Satisfaction, Affective Commitment and Intention to Turnover in Botswana. *Journal of Management Research*. Retrieved from [www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jmr/article/download/501/383](http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jmr/article/download/501/383)<sup>6</sup>

Muna, K. (2011). Human Resource Strategy: A Tool of Managing Change for Organizational Excellence. *International Journal of Business and Management*. Retrieved from [www.ccsenet.org/ijbm](http://www.ccsenet.org/ijbm)<sup>7</sup>

Muneer, R. (2017). Impact of Rewards (Intrinsic and extrinsic) on Employee Performance: With Special Reference to Courier Companies of City Faisalabad, Pakistan. *International Journal of Management Excellence*. Retrieved from [iste.org/Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/viewFile/32894/33789](http://iste.org/Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/viewFile/32894/33789)

ile/32894/33789

Musyoki, M. (2012). *The Relationship between Rewards and Job Satisfaction*. (Masters thesis, University of Nairobi) Retrieved from [http://erepository](http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/13384/Musyoki_The%20relationship%20between%20rewards%20and%20job%20satisfaction.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y)

[http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/13384/Musyoki\\_The%20relationship%20between%20rewards%20and%20job%20satisfaction.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y](http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/13384/Musyoki_The%20relationship%20between%20rewards%20and%20job%20satisfaction.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y)

Mwangi, A. (2014). *The Effect of Compensation on Employee Motivation*. Retrieved from <http://erepo.usiu.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11732/161/Patrick%20Mwangi.pdf?sequence=1><sup>8</sup>

National Economic Development Authority. (2018). *Summary Inflation Report Consumer Price Index for September 2018*. Retrieved from <http://www.psa.gov.ph/statistics/survey/price/summary-inflation-report-consumer-price-index-2012100-september-2018>

ics/survey/price/summary-inflation-report-consumer-price-index-2012100-september-2018

---

<sup>4</sup><http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/bms/article/viewFile/9024/7581>

<sup>5</sup><http://www.academicjournals.org/article/article138>

<sup>6</sup><http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jmr/article/download/501/383>

<sup>7</sup><http://www.ccsenet.org/ijbm>

<sup>8</sup>[http://erepo.usiu.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11732/161/Patrick Mwangi.pdf?sequence=1](http://erepo.usiu.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11732/161/Patrick%20Mwangi.pdf?sequence=1)

Onabanjo, S. (2015). *Wages and salaries as a motivational tool for enhancing organizational performance. A survey of selected Nigerian workplace.* Retrieved from <http://journals.univdanubius.ro/index.php/euroeconomica/article/view/2466/2533>

Organization for Economic Development (2013). *Public Governance and Territorial Development.* Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/gov/budgeting/Recommendation-of-the-Council-onBudgetaryGovernance.pdf>

Republic Act (RA) No. 6758. Salary Standardization Law. *An Act Prescribing a Revised Compensation and Position Classification System in the Government and Other Purposes.* Retrieved from <http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1989/08/21/republic-act-no-6758/>

RA No. 6686. *An Act Authorizing Annual Christmas Bonus to all National and Local Government Officials and Employees.* Retrieved from <http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1988/12/14/republic-act-no-6686/><sup>9</sup>

RA No. 8441. *An Act Increasing the Cash Gift to Five Thousand Pesos (P5,000.00) and for Other Purposes.* Retrieved from <http://www.dbm.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/RA-8441.pdf>

Richa, P. (2014). Equity Sensitivity. *International Journal of Business Management.* Retrieved from <http://theijbm.com/june2014/34.BM1406-057.pdf>

Sharma, J. (2011). Salary Satisfaction as an Antecedent of Job Satisfaction: Development of a Regression Model to Determine the Linearity between Salary Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction in a Public and a Private Organization. *European Journal of Social Sciences.* Retrieved from <http://www.isihome.ir/freearticle/ISIHome.ir-21009.pdf>

Sinha, J. (2013). Job Satisfaction in Organizational Executives. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications.* Retrieved from <http://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-0413/ijsrp-p16101.pdf>

Tirimba, I., Edwin, O. (2015). Analysis of Extrinsic Rewards and Employee Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business Management and Economic Research.* Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ibrahim\\_Ondabu2/publication/285576218\\_Analysis\\_of\\_Extrinsic\\_Rewards\\_and\\_Employee\\_Satisfaction\\_Case\\_of\\_Somtel\\_Company\\_in\\_Somaliland/links/565f082f08aefe619b27be69/Analysis-of-Extrinsic-Rewards-and-Employee-Satisfaction-Case-of-Somtel-Company-in-Somaliland.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ibrahim_Ondabu2/publication/285576218_Analysis_of_Extrinsic_Rewards_and_Employee_Satisfaction_Case_of_Somtel_Company_in_Somaliland/links/565f082f08aefe619b27be69/Analysis-of-Extrinsic-Rewards-and-Employee-Satisfaction-Case-of-Somtel-Company-in-Somaliland.pdf)

Unzicker, T. (2012). *A Study of Job Satisfaction of Nebraska School Superintendents.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska – Lincoln). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1111&context=cehsedaddiss>

Wayan, S. (2016). Performance-Based Compensation Effect on Employee Motivation, Satisfaction of Employees and Performance. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law.* Retrieved from <http://ijbel.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/BUS-215.pdf>

---

<sup>9</sup><http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1988/12/14/republic-act-no-6686/>

Yunus, H., Margono, S. (2011). Organizational Culture, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, the Effect on Lecturer Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*. Retrieved from [http://www.ijbmi.org/papers/Vol\(2\)12/Version-2/C021202021030.pdf](http://www.ijbmi.org/papers/Vol(2)12/Version-2/C021202021030.pdf)