Investigating the Applicability of Maslow's Theory of Hierarchy of Needs on Selected Filipino Teachers

Dr. Frederick Edward T. Fabella

FEU Roosevelt, Cainta, Rizal, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This research attempted to confirm the applicability of the Theory on Hierarchy of Needs by Abraham Maslow on thirty (30) Filipino teachers who volunteered to be the respondents of the study. The Maslow and the Motivation Hierarchy: Measuring Satisfaction of the Needs, a 72-item, 5-point Likert scale questionnaire that measures the five dimensions of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, namely Physiological needs satisfaction, Safety needs satisfaction, Love needs satisfaction, Esteem needs satisfaction and Self-actualization needs satisfaction was administered on the respondents. Based on the findings, the respondents' physiological needs are somewhat satisfied, their safety needs are somewhat satisfied, their love needs are completely satisfied and their esteem needs are completely satisfied. In addition, the respondents somewhat agree that their self-actualization needs are satisfied. The married respondents have significantly higher physiological needs satisfaction. When the respondents' levels of needs satisfaction are ranked, love needs rank first followed by esteem needs, then by safety, next is physiological and last is self-actualization. Comparing the needs satisfaction of the respondents, significant differences were found between physiological and love needs satisfaction wherein love has a higher mean, physiological and esteem needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean, safety and love needs satisfaction wherein love has a higher mean, safety and esteem needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean, love and self-actualization needs satisfaction wherein in love has a higher mean and esteem and self-actualization needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean. Based on the foregoing, it would appear that Maslow's proposition that the five dimensions of needs satisfaction decrease according the sequence of his theory's hierarchy, is not the case for the respondents of the study. Furthermore, significant positive relationships were established between all possible pair-combinations of the respondents' five dimensions of needs satisfaction. This implies that all these dimensions significantly influence each other in a positive direction.

Keywords: Abraham Maslow, Motivation, Hierarchy of Needs

INTRODUCTION

Abraham Maslow's fame derives from his effort to develop a positive theory of motivation that would meet the prevailing theoretical requirements of his time while simultaneously remaining consistent with experimental, clinical and observational data[1]. Maslow's hierarchy of needs is a psychological theory of motivation that includes a five-tier model of human needs that is frequently represented as levels within a pyramid. Physiological needs, safety, love and belonging needs, esteem, and self-actualization are the different levels of this hierarchy and those at the bottom must be met before people can attend to the needs further up[2].

During the height of COVID-19, a study was conducted to explore how the pandemic affected the satisfaction of people's needs. Many countries declared nationwide lockdowns, which even forced the closing of the outpatient wings of large hospitals. As a consequence, patients with other mild to severe ailments were encouraged to seek teleconsultation services so they could identify the right doctor for their particular conditions. Only when those patients' fundamental requirements, such as access to food,

medications, and the internet, had been satisfied, were these other demands met[3].

One article that analyzed the impact of the COVID-19 lockdown states that nearly all of Maslow's needs were adversely affected. Restriction of access to food, increased unemployment, limited access to family and friends and self-worth was questioned due to an uncertain future[4].

But as the pandemic's global impact declines and things slowly return to normal, the applicability of Maslow's theory may once again be reviewed. In one study, 186 college students were conveniently selected from two colleges in Metro Manila and asked to recall a satisfying incident. The next step was for them to describe how they felt the event met their specific needs. The findings showed that the respondents' most fulfilling experiences were when their higher-level needs—self-esteem and self-actualization—were more prominent[5].

With respect to the world of employment, a study was conducted to identify the underlying needs of the working population in the Philippines. Using a mixed method sequential exploratory study, four categories of needs—job-related, career-related, organization-related, and family-related—were identified through interviews and a survey of 302 employees. Based on this study, family is a factor that is not mentioned in Western ideas of work motivation. Employee involvement was highly associated with the significance and existence of each of these four characteristics[6].

Applying Maslow's hierarchy of needs to workplace settings suggests that managers have a duty to first ensure that the deficient needs are satisfied. This often refers to a secure workplace and fair pay. It also entails establishing an environment where workers can reach their maximum potential. Theoretically, failing to do so would increase employee annoyance, which might worsen performance and reduce work satisfaction[7].

Another article asserts that Maslow's hierarchy of needs can still be useful in today's society if it is seen as a guide for balancing our numerous demands rather than as a rigid hierarchy. The study further states that everyone has different priorities and reasons for placing some needs above others[8].

In attempting to predict a country's Quality of Life, Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory is used. Some confirmation was achieved utilizing a new and larger database. Results demonstrated remarkable agreement with several of Maslow's predictions, including his sequence of need achievement. However, his theory of growth, according to which nations must reduce growth in one sector in order to boost growth in another, was refuted[9].

But according to one study, Maslow's original hierarchy of requirements won't apply to a collectivist culture like China. It was discovered that belonging is a fundamental need. Self-esteem is disregarded and self-actualization is attained through addressing societal development needs[10].

Because the Philippines is regarded as a collectivist society, whether or not Maslow's theory is applicable to Filipinos remains a subject of some debate. In addition, the Filipino character appears to be undergoing a constant state of flux. Filipino identity, distortion and dysfunctionality, multidimensional ambivalence, dissonance, false justification and misuse, cynicism, and a reduction in moral courage are among the problems mentioned in one study on Filipino values. The study further claims that the pre-colonial, colonial, and postcolonial normative paradigms are continually competing and clashing inside the Filipino values system. Filipino values and norms are distorted, conflicted, and dysfunctional, unable to offer useful normative standards. A badly damaged social conscience is the effect of this[11].

Filipino teachers were among the hardest hit professions during the pandemic[12]. Despite this, many still pursue careers in education. A study was conducted involving 31 young Filipino teachers (aged 21 to 30).

They were asked to write narratives explaining their motivation for teaching. The stories were carefully examined to identify themes and key points. Ultimately, ten key themes emerged to summarize the motivations for young instructors' involvement in the classroom. According to the young Filipino educators, their teaching aims include bringing about positive change, preparing students for life, inspiring others, promoting values, transforming lives, teaching out of passion, raising the bar for educational excellence, resolving social issues, imparting knowledge and skills and enabling others' dreams[13].

Another study looked into the motivations of Filipino preservice teachers to enroll in teacher education and connected these motivations to demographic traits. Eight reasons for entering the teaching profession were identified by a factor analysis of the replies from Philippine teacher education institutions. These reasons are idealistic, migratory, developmental, employment security and stability, supremacy, liberating, altruistic, and perpetual[14].

In view of the foregoing, this study explored the applicability of Maslow's Theory of Motivation on Filipino teachers and whether or not his assertion that the hierarchy principle may be typically observed empirically in terms of rising percentages of non-satisfaction as one moves up the hierarchy[1] is true.

Specifically, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the respondents' levels of satisfaction with respect to

- Physiological needs;
- Safety needs;
- Love needs;
- Esteem needs; and
- Self-actualization?

2. Is there a significant difference among the respondents' levels of satisfaction with respect to

- Physiological needs;
- Safety needs;
- Love needs;
- Esteem needs; and
- Self-actualization?

3. Are there significant relationships between the respondents' levels of satisfaction with respect to

- Physiological needs;
- Safety needs;
- Love needs;
- Esteem needs; and
- Self-actualization?

4. Do the respondents' levels of needs satisfaction decrease according to the sequence of the hierarchy as proposed by Maslow's Theory?

METHODOLOGY

Thirty (30) Filipino teachers volunteered to be the respondents of this study. Six (6) of them were males while twenty-three (23) were females. Their ages ranged between 24 to 50 with a mean age of 33. Thirteen (13) worked in private schools while seventeen (17) were employed in government schools. Fourteen (14)

were single while sixteen (16) were married. They were asked to answer the Maslow and the Motivation Hierarchy: Measuring Satisfaction of the Needs instrument, a 72-item, 5-point Likert scale questionnaire that measures the five dimensions of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, namely Physiological needs satisfaction (15 items), Safety needs satisfaction (15 items), Love needs satisfaction (15 items), Esteem needs satisfaction (15 items) and Self-actualization needs satisfaction (12 items). The measures were developed based on their construct and content validity, which were examined using confirmatory factor analysis and the known-groups technique of validity evaluation. The scales were also evaluated for their ability to predict outcomes; specifically, they were compared to the theoretical hierarchy and each need was found to be a statistical predictor of the need that was directly above it[15].

RESULTS

The following are the data gathered and the statistical treatments applied, which are presented in tabular form.

Table 1: Scale of Interpretation for Item Weighted Means of Responses to Physiological, Safety, Love and Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Weighted mean range	Verbal Interpretation
1.000 – 1.800	Completely unsatisfied
1.801 – 2.600	Somewhat unsatisfied
2.601 – 3.400	Neither unsatisfied nor satisfied
3.401 – 4.200	Somewhat satisfied
4.201 – 5.000	Completely satisfied

Table 2: Respondents' Item Weighted Means for Physiological Needs Satisfaction

Item	Item Weighted Mean **Single** *N=14*	Item Weighted Mean **Married** *N=16*	Item Weighted Mean **Combined** *N=30*	Combined Item Weighted Mean **Verbal Interpretation**
1. the quality of the food I eat every day	4.714	4.500	4.600	Completely satisfied
2. the amount of food that I eat every day	4.786	4.625	4.700	Completely satisfied
3. the quality of the water I drink every day	4.715	4.875	4.800	Completely satisfied
4. the amount of water that I drink every day	4.429	4.688	4.567	Completely satisfied
5. the amount of heating I have when the weather is cold	4.286	4.625	4.467	Completely satisfied
6. the amount of cooling I have when the weather is hot	4.143	4.625	4.400	Completely satisfied
7. the quality of the air I breathe every day	4.286	4.688	4.500	Completely satisfied

8. the amount of sex I am having	3.500	4.313	3.933	Somewhat satisfied
9. the quality of sex I am having	3.571	4.438	4.033	Somewhat satisfied
10. every aspect of my physical health	3.714	4.313	4.033	Somewhat satisfied
11. the amount of sleep I get to feel thoroughly relaxed	3.357	4.000	3.700	Somewhat satisfied
12. the quality of sleep I get to feel fully refreshed	3.571	3.938	3.767	Somewhat satisfied
13. the amount of exercise I get to keep me healthy	3.143	3.500	3.333	Neither unsatisfied nor satisfied
14. the type of exercise I get to keep my body toned	3.143	3.500	3.333	Neither unsatisfied nor satisfied
15. my overall physical strength	3.571	4.125	3.867	Somewhat satisfied
Total Item Weighted Means	3.929	4.317	4.136	Somewhat satisfied

Table 3: Respondents' Item Weighted Means for Safety Needs Satisfaction

Item	Item Weighted Mean Single N=14	Item Weighted Mean Married N=16	Item Weighted Mean Combined N=30	Combined Item Weighted Mean Verbal Interpretation
16. the quality of the house/apartment I am living in	4.571	4.688	4.633	Completely satisfied
17. the space available for me in my house/apartment	4.357	4.688	4.533	Completely satisfied
18. How secure I am in my house/apartment	4.714	4.688	4.700	Completely satisfied
19. How safe I am from being physically attacked	4.643	4.563	4.600	Completely satisfied
20. the safety of my neighborhood	4.286	4.438	4.367	Completely satisfied
21. How safe I am from catching any diseases	3.929	4.375	4.167	Completely satisfied
22. How secure I am from disasters	4.000	4.375	4.200	Somewhat satisfied
23. How protected I am from dangers in the environment	4.214	4.500	4.367	Completely satisfied
24. the protection that the police provide for me	3.714	4.188	3.967	Somewhat satisfied
25. the protection that the law provides for me	3.571	4.250	3.933	Somewhat satisfied

26. How safe I am from destructive terrorist acts	4.143	4.188	4.167	Somewhat satisfied
27. How safe I am from acts of war	4.071	4.188	4.133	Somewhat satisfied
28. My financial security	3.571	4.063	3.833	Somewhat satisfied
29. My ability to get money whenever I need it	3.429	4.000	3.733	Somewhat satisfied
30. the money I reserved for me to have a secure retirement	3.071	3.938	3.533	Somewhat satisfied
Total Item Weighted Means	4.019	4.342	4.191	Somewhat satisfied

Table 4: Respondents' Item Weighted Means for Love Needs Satisfaction

Item	Item Weighted Mean **Single** *N=14*	Item Weighted Mean **Married** *N=16*	Item Weighted Mean **Combined** *N=30*	Combined Item Weighted Mean **Verbal Interpretation**
31. the amount of rapport I share with the people I know	4.357	4.500	4.433	Completely satisfied
32. the quality of the relationships I have with my friends	4.500	4.625	4.567	Completely satisfied
33. the love I receive from my spouse/partner	4.143	4.688	4.433	Completely satisfied
34. the intimacy I share with my immediate family	4.357	4.563	4.467	Completely satisfied
35. the camaraderie I share with my colleagues	4.357	4.250	4.300	Completely satisfied
36. how much I am welcomed in my community	4.286	4.438	4.367	Completely satisfied
37. the warmth I share with my relatives	3.857	4.438	4.167	Somewhat satisfied
38. the emotional support I receive from my friends	4.571	4.375	4.467	Completely satisfied
39. the feeling of togetherness I have with my family	4.143	4.750	4.467	Completely satisfied
40. how much I am cared for by my spouse/partner	4.071	4.688	4.400	Completely satisfied
41. the happiness I share with my companions	4.500	4.688	4.600	Completely satisfied
42. the sympathy I receive from my confidants	4.643	4.500	4.567	Completely satisfied
43. the enjoyment I share with associates	4.429	4.438	4.433	Completely satisfied

44. the affection shown to me by my friends	4.500	4.250	4.367	Completely satisfied
45. the closeness I feel with my associates	4.286	4.313	4.300	Completely satisfied
Total Item Weighted Means	4.333	4.500	4.422	Completely satisfied

Table 5: Respondents' Item Weighted Means for Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Item	Item Weighted Mean **Single** *N=14*	Item Weighted Mean **Married** *N=16*	Item Weighted Mean **Combined** *N=30*	Combined Item Weighted Mean **Verbal Interpretation**
46. the admiration given to me by others	4.357	4.250	4.300	Completely satisfied
47. the honor that many people give me	4.286	4.250	4.267	Completely satisfied
48. how much other people respect me as a person	4.286	4.375	4.333	Completely satisfied
49. the prestige I have in the eyes of other people	4.143	4.438	4.300	Completely satisfied
50. how highly other people think of me	4.214	4.313	4.267	Completely satisfied
51. the high esteem that other people have for me	4.286	4.438	4.367	Completely satisfied
52. the recognition I receive from variouspeople	4.357	4.313	4.333	Completely satisfied
53. the high regard that other people have for me	4.286	4.313	4.300	Completely satisfied
54. How much I like the person that I am	4.500	4.500	4.500	Completely satisfied
55. How sure I am of myself	4.214	4.625	4.433	Completely satisfied
56. How much respect I have for myself	4.571	4.625	4.600	Completely satisfied
57. All the good qualities I have as a person	4.214	4.563	4.400	Completely satisfied
58. My sense of self-worth	4.571	4.625	4.600	Completely satisfied
59. the amount of esteem I have for myself	4.357	4.625	4.500	Completely satisfied
60. How positive I feel about myself as a person	4.429	4.625	4.533	Completely satisfied
Total Item Weighted Means	4.338	4.458	4.402	Completely satisfied

Table 6: Scale of Interpretation for Item Weighted Means of Responses to Self-Actualization

Weighted mean range	Verbal Interpretation
1.000 – 1.800	Strongly disagree
1.801 – 2.600	Somewhat disagree
2.601 – 3.400	Neither disagree nor agree
3.401 – 4.200	Somewhat agree
4.201 – 5.000	Strongly agree

Table 7: Respondents' Item Weighted Means for Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Item	Item Weighted Mean **Single** *N=14*	Item Weighted Mean **Married** *N=16*	Item Weighted Mean **Combined** *N=30*	Combined Item Weighted Mean **Verbal Interpretation**
61. I am totally comfortable with all facets of my personality.	4.143	4.313	4.233	Strongly agree
62. I feel that I am completely self-fulfilled.	3.643	4.250	3.967	Somewhat agree
63. I am now being the person I always wanted to be.	3.786	3.938	3.867	Somewhat agree
64. I am finally realizing all of my innermost desires.	4.000	4.125	4.067	Somewhat agree
65. I indulge myself as much as I want.	3.643	4.125	3.900	Somewhat agree
66. I am now enjoying everything I ever wanted from my life.	3.571	4.188	3.900	Somewhat agree
67. I completely accept all aspects of myself.	4.214	4.250	4.233	Strongly agree
68. my actions are always according to my own values.	4.429	4.375	4.400	Strongly agree
69. I am living my life the way I want.	3.714	4.063	3.900	Somewhat agree
70. I do the things I like to do whenever I want.	3.500	3.938	3.733	Somewhat agree
71. I am actually living up to all my capabilities.	3.929	4.125	4.033	Somewhat agree
72. I am living my life to the fullest.	3.571	4.313	3.967	Somewhat agree
Total Item Weighted Means	3.845	4.167	4.017	Somewhat agree

Table 8: Ranking of Needs Satisfaction

	Ranking of the Need Satisfaction by **Single** Respondents *N=14* Total item weighted mean (rank)	Ranking of the Need Satisfaction by **Married** Respondents *N=16* Total item weighted mean (rank)	Ranking of the Need Satisfaction by all Respondents **Combined** *N=30* Total item weighted mean (rank)
Physiological	3.929 (4)	4.317 (4)	4.136 (4)
Safety	4.019 (3)	4.342 (3)	4.191 (3)
Love	4.333 (2)	4.500 (1)	4.422 (1)
Esteem	4.338 (1)	4.458 (2)	4.402 (2)
Self-Actualization	3.845 (5)	4.167 (5)	4.017 (5)

Table 9: Comparison of Single and Married Responses to Physiological Needs Satisfaction

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Single	Married
Mean	3.92857142857	4.31666666675
SD	0.43083245655	0.47919685895
SEM	0.11514481739	0.11979921474
N	14	16

$t = 2.3356$

$df = 27$

standard error of difference = 0.166

P value and statistical significance:

The two-tailed P value equals 0.0272

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Single minus Married equals -0.38809523818

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.72903389642 to -0.04715657994

Table 10: Comparison of Single and Married Responses to Safety Needs Satisfaction

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Single	Married
Mean	4.01904761907	4.34166666669

SD	0.53743841394	0.47383385126
SEM	0.14363645796	0.11845846281
N	14	16

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 1.7328

df = 26

standard error of difference = 0.186

The two-tailed P value equals 0.0950

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not quite statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Single minus Married equals -0.32261904762

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.70532200471 to 0.06008390947

Table 11: Comparison of Single and Married Responses to Love Needs Satisfaction

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Single	Married
Mean	4.33333333336	4.50000000000
SD	0.44912069839	0.47077556173
SEM	0.12003255562	0.11769389043
N	14	16

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 0.9914

df = 27

standard error of difference = 0.168

The two-tailed P value equals 0.3303

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant. Confidence interval:

The mean of Single minus Married equals -0.1666666666495% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.51159203477 to 0.17825870148

Table 12: Comparison of Single and Married Responses to Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Single	Married
Mean	4.33809523807	4.45833333325

SD	0.56172158179	0.41231056257
SEM	0.15012640756	0.10307764064
N	14	16

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 0.6603

df = 23

standard error of difference = 0.182

The two-tailed P value equals 0.5156

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Single minus Married equals -0.12023809518

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.49695498898 to 0.25647879862

Table 13: Comparison of Single and Married Responses to Self-Actualization

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Single	Married
Mean	3.84523809536	4.16666666669
SD	0.73150788450	0.39086797999
SEM	0.19550370568	0.09771699500
N	14	16

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 1.4706

df = 19

standard error of difference = 0.219

The two-tailed P value equals 0.1578

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Single minus Married equals -0.32142857133

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.77888886280 to 0.13603172014

Table 14: Analysis of Variance between Responses to All Five Needs Satisfaction

Summary of Data						
	Treatments					
	Physiological	Safety	Love	Esteem	Self Actualization	Total
N	30	30	30	30	30	150
$\sum X$	124.0667	125.7333	132.6667	132.0667	120.5	635.0333
Mean	4.1356	4.1911	4.4222	4.4022	4.0167	4.234
$\sum X^2$	520.0667	534.8622	592.8356	588.1467	494.0278	2729.9389
S.D.	0.4907	0.5219	0.4607	0.4828	0.5878	0.5277
Result Details						
Source		SS	df	MS		
Between-treatments		3.6747	4	0.9187	$F = 9.21182$	
Within-treatments		37.8153	145	0.2608		
Error		11.5684	116	0.0997		
The F-ratio value is 9.21182. The p-value is < .00001. The result is significant at p < .05.						

Table 15: Comparison of Responses to Physiological and Safety Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Physiological	Safety
Mean	4.13555560	4.19111113
SD	0.49067422	0.52192787
SEM	0.08958445	0.09529056
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 0.6574

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.085

The two-tailed P value equals 0.5161

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Physiological minus Safety equals -0.05555553

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.22840611 to 0.11729505

Table 16: Comparison of Responses to Physiological and Love Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Physiological	Love
Mean	4.13555560	4.42222223
SD	0.49067422	0.46066192
SEM	0.08958445	0.08410497
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 5.7047

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.050

The two-tailed P value is less than 0.0001

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Physiological minus Love equals -0.28666663

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.38944147 to -0.18389180

Table 17: Comparison of Responses to Physiological and Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Physiological	Esteem
Mean	4.13555560	4.40222217
SD	0.49067422	0.48280255
SEM	0.08958445	0.08814728
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 3.3668

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.079

The two-tailed P value equals 0.0022

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be very statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Physiological minus Esteem equals -0.26666657

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.42865743 to -0.10467570

Table 18: Comparison of Responses to Physiological Needs and Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Physiological	Self-Actualization
Mean	4.13555560	4.01666673
SD	0.49067422	0.58779083
SEM	0.08958445	0.10731543
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 1.3669

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.087

The two-tailed P value equals 0.1822

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Physiological minus Self Actualization equals 0.11888887

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.05899871 to 0.29677645

Table 19: Comparison of Responses to Safety and Love Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Safety	Love
Mean	4.19111113	4.42222223
SD	0.52192787	0.46066192
SEM	0.09529056	0.08410497
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 2.6913

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.086

P value and statistical significance:

The two-tailed P value equals 0.0117

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Safety minus Love equals -0.23111110

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.40673952 to -0.05548268

Table 20: Comparison of Responses to Safety and Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Safety	Esteem
Mean	4.19111113	4.40222217
SD	0.52192787	0.48280255
SEM	0.09529056	0.08814728
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 2.2560

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.094

The two-tailed P value equals 0.0318

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Safety minus Esteem equals -0.21111103

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.40250043 to -0.01972164

Table 21: Comparison of Responses to Safety Needs and Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Safety	Self-Actualization
Mean	4.19111113	4.01666673
SD	0.52192787	0.58779083
SEM	0.09529056	0.10731543
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 1.8006

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.097

The two-tailed P value equals 0.0822

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not quite statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Safety minus Self Actualization equals 0.17444440

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.02370210 to 0.37259090

Table 22: Comparison of Responses to Love and Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Love	Esteem
Mean	4.42222223	4.40222217
SD	0.46066192	0.48280255
SEM	0.08410497	0.08814728
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 0.3172

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.063

The two-tailed P value equals 0.7534

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Love minus Esteem equals 0.02000007

95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.10896285 to 0.14896298

Table 23: Comparison of Responses to Love Needs and Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Love	Self-Actualization
Mean	4.42222223	4.01666673
SD	0.46066192	0.58779083
SEM	0.08410497	0.10731543
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 4.9312

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.082

The two-tailed P value is less than 0.0001

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Love minus Self Actualization equals 0.40555550

95% confidence interval of this difference: From 0.23734925 to 0.57376175

Table 24: Comparison of Responses to Esteem Needs and Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Paired T-test computation		
Group	Esteem	Self-Actualization
Mean	4.40222217	4.01666673
SD	0.48280255	0.58779083
SEM	0.08814728	0.10731543
N	30	30

Intermediate values used in calculations:

t = 4.7026

df = 29

standard error of difference = 0.082

The two-tailed P value is less than 0.0001

By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be extremely statistically significant.

Confidence interval:

The mean of Esteem minus Self Actualization equals 0.38555543

95% confidence interval of this difference: From 0.21787084 to 0.55324003

Table 25: Summary of Significant Differences between Respondents' Needs Satisfaction

	Physiological	Safety	Love	Esteem	Self-Actualization
Physiological	Not applicable	None	Extremely statistically significant Love has higher mean	Very statistically significant Esteem has higher mean	None
Love	Extremely statistically significant Love has higher mean	Statistically significant Love has higher mean	Not applicable	None	Extremely statistically significant Love has higher mean

Self-Actualization	None	None	Extremely statistically significant	Extremely statistically significant	Not applicable
			Love has higher mean	Esteem has higher mean	
Safety	None	Not applicable	Statistically significant	Statistically significant	None
			Love has higher mean	Esteem has higher mean	
Esteem	Very statistically significant	Statistically significant	None	Not applicable	Extremely statistically significant
	Esteem has higher mean	Esteem has higher mean			Esteem has higher mean

Table 26: Relationship between Responses to Physiological and Safety Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 124.067 Mean = 4.136 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 6.982 Y Values ∑ = 125.733 Mean = 4.191 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 7.9	X and Y Combined N = 30 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 4.334 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 4.334 / √((6.982)(7.9)) = 0.5836 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.5836
The P-Value is .000711. The result is significant at p < .05.	

Table 27: Relationship between Responses to Physiological and Love Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 124.067 Mean = 4.136 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 6.982 Y Values ∑ = 132.667 Mean = 4.422 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 6.154	X and Y Combined N = 30 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 5.47 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 5.47 / √((6.982)(6.154)) = 0.8344 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.8344
The P-Value is < .00001. The result is significant at p < .05.	

Table 28: Relationship between Responses to Physiological Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 124.067	N = 30
Mean = 4.136	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 4.142
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 6.982	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 132.067	r = 4.142 / √((6.982)(6.76)) = 0.6029
Mean = 4.402	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 6.76	r = 0.6029
The P-Value is .000422. The result is significant at p < .05.	

Table 29: Relationship between Responses to Physiological and Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 124.067	N = 30
Mean = 4.136	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 5.21
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 6.982	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 120.5	r = 5.21 / √((6.982)(10.019)) = 0.6229
Mean = 4.017	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 10.019	r = 0.6229
The P-Value is .000237. The result is significant at p < .05.	

Table 30: Relationship between Responses to Safety and Love Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 125.733	N = 30
Mean = 4.191	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 3.819
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 7.9	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 132.667	r = 3.819 / √((7.9)(6.154)) = 0.5478
Mean = 4.422	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 6.154	r = 0.5478
The P-Value is .001727. The result is significant at p < .05.	

Table 31: Relationship between Responses to Safety and Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 125.733 Mean = 4.191 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 7.9 Y Values ∑ = 132.067 Mean = 4.402 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 6.76	X and Y Combined N = 30 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 3.521 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 3.521 / √((7.9)(6.76)) = 0.4818 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.4818
The P-Value is .00702. The result is significant at $p < .05$.	

Table 32: Relationship between Responses to Safety and Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 125.733 Mean = 4.191 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 7.9 Y Values ∑ = 120.5 Mean = 4.017 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 10.019	X and Y Combined N = 30 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 4.877 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 4.877 / √((7.9)(10.019)) = 0.5481 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.5481
The P-Value is .001715. The result is significant at $p < .05$.	

Table 33: Relationship between Responses to Love and Esteem Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values ∑ = 132.667 Mean = 4.422 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 6.154 Y Values ∑ = 132.067 Mean = 4.402 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 6.76	X and Y Combined N = 30 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 4.727 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 4.727 / √((6.154)(6.76)) = 0.7329 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.7329
The P-Value is < .00001. The result is significant at $p < .05$.	

Table 34: Relationship between Responses to Love and Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 132.667	N = 30
Mean = 4.422	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 5.144
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 6.154	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 120.5	r = 5.144 / √((6.154)(10.019)) = 0.6551
Mean = 4.017	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 10.019	r = 0.6551
The P-Value is .000085. The result is significant at p < .05.	

Table 35: Relationship between Responses to Esteem and Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction

Pearson r computation	
X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 132.067	N = 30
Mean = 4.402	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 5.466
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 6.76	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 120.5	r = 5.466 / √((6.76)(10.019)) = 0.6641
Mean = 4.017	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 10.019	r = 0.6641
The P-Value is .000063. The result is significant at p < .05.	

Table 36: Summary of Significant Relationships between Respondents' Needs Satisfaction

	Physiological	Safety	Love	Esteem	Self-Actualization
Physiological	Not applicable	r = 0.5836 The P-Value is .000711 Significant	r = 0.8344 The P-Value is < .00001 Significant	r = 0.6029 The P-Value is .000422 Significant	r = 0.6229 The P-Value is .000237 Significant
Safety	r = 0.5836 The P-Value is .000711 Significant	Not applicable	r = 0.5478 The P-Value is .001727 Significant	r = 0.4818 The P-Value is .00702 Significant	r = 0.5481 The P-Value is .001715 Significant

Love	r = 0.8344 The P-Value is < .00001 Significant	r = 0.5478 The P-Value is .001727 Significant	Not applicable	r = 0.7329 The P-Value is < .00001 Significant	r = 0.6551 The P-Value is .000085 Significant
Esteem	r = 0.6029 The P-Value is .000422 Significant	r = 0.4818 The P-Value is .00702 Significant	r = 0.7329 The P-Value is < .00001 Significant	Not applicable	r = 0.6641 The P-Value is .000063 Significant
Self-Actualization	r = 0.6229 The P-Value is .000237 Significant	r = 0.5481 The P-Value is .001715 Significant	r = 0.6551 The P-Value is .000085 Significant	r = 0.6641 The P-Value is .000063 Significant	Not applicable

Table 37. Ranking of significant relationships between dimensions

Rank in terms of strength of the relationship	Paired Dimensions	Computed r value
1	Physiological and Love	0.8344
2	Love and Esteem	0.7329
3	Esteem and Self-Actualization	0.6641
4	Love and Self-Actualization	0.6551
5	Physiological and Self-Actualization	0.6229
6	Physiological and Esteem	0.6029
7	Physiological and Safety	0.5836
8	Safety and Self-Actualization	0.5481
9	Safety and Love	0.5478
10	Safety and Esteem	0.4818

DISCUSSION

Tables 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 present the item weighted means for each of the five dimensions of needs satisfaction as well as their total item weighted means and their verbal interpretations. Physiological Needs Satisfaction responses are presented in Table 2. A combined total item weighted mean of 4.136 was obtained, which has a verbal interpretation of somewhat satisfied. Table 3 presents the responses to Safety Needs Satisfaction. A combined total item weighted mean of 4.191 was computed, which has a verbal interpretation of somewhat satisfied. The responses to Love Needs Satisfaction are shown in Table 4. A combined total item weighted mean of 4.422 was obtained, which has a verbal interpretation of completely satisfied. Table 5 presents the responses to Esteem Needs Satisfaction. A combined total item weighted mean of 4.402 was computed, which has a verbal interpretation of completely satisfied. The responses to Self-Actualization Needs Satisfaction are shown in Table 7. A combined total item weighted mean of 4.017 was obtained, which has a verbal interpretation of somewhat agree.

In Table 8, the ranking of the five needs satisfaction is presented for both single respondents, married respondents and for all respondents based on the total item weighted means. It is noteworthy that for single respondents, the dimension with the highest degree of satisfaction is Esteem, while for married respondents, the dimension with the highest degree is love. When combined, the dimension with the highest degree of satisfaction is love needs.

Tables 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 present the comparison of the degrees of satisfaction for the five dimensions between the single and married respondents using Welch's t-tests. Although the total item weighted means for the married respondents are higher than that of the single respondents in all five dimensions, a significant difference was found only in the physiological needs satisfaction. And because the mean is higher for the married respondents, it can be inferred that physiological needs satisfaction is significantly higher for married respondents than for single respondents.

The analysis of variance computation of the five dimensions of Physiological needs satisfaction, Safety needs satisfaction, Love needs satisfaction, Esteem needs satisfaction and Self-actualization needs satisfaction of the respondents are presented in Table 14. The F-ratio of 9.21182 was obtained and with a p-value less than .00001, this implies that there is a significant difference among the five dimensions.

Tables 18 to 24 present the paired t-test computations between all dimensions of needs satisfaction of the respondents. The results of the paired t-tests are summarized in Table 25. No significant difference was found between the respondents' physiological and self-actualization needs satisfaction, physiological and safety needs satisfaction, safety and self-actualization needs satisfaction, love and esteem needs satisfaction and safety and self-actualization needs satisfaction. However, significant differences were found between physiological and love needs satisfaction wherein love has a higher mean, physiological and esteem needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean, safety and love needs satisfaction wherein love has a higher mean, safety and esteem needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean, love and self-actualization needs satisfaction wherein in love has a higher mean and esteem and self-actualization needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean.

Tables 26 to 35 present the Pearson-r computations between all dimensions of the respondents' needs satisfaction. The results of the correlation computations are summarized in Table 36. Significant positive relationships were established between all possible pair-combinations of dimensions of needs satisfaction.

Table 37 presents the ranking of positive relationship strength between dimensions of needs satisfaction of the respondents based on the computed Pearson r values. The dimensions with the strongest positive relationship is between physiological and love (1), followed by love and esteem (2), esteem and self-actualization (3), love and self-actualization (4), physiological and self-actualization (5), physiological and esteem (6), physiological and safety (7), safety and self-actualization (8), safety and love (9) and safety and esteem (10).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the respondents' physiological needs are somewhat satisfied, their safety needs are somewhat satisfied, their love needs are completely satisfied and their esteem needs are completely satisfied. In addition, the respondents somewhat agree that their self-actualization needs are satisfied.

The married respondents have significantly higher physiological needs satisfaction.

When the respondents' needs satisfaction are ranked, love needs rank first followed by esteem needs, then by safety, next is physiological and last is self-actualization.

Comparing the needs satisfaction of the respondents, significant differences were found between physiological and love needs satisfaction wherein love has a higher mean, physiological and esteem needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean, safety and love needs satisfaction wherein love has a higher mean, safety and esteem needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean, love and self-actualization needs satisfaction wherein in love has a higher mean and esteem and self-actualization needs satisfaction in which esteem has a higher mean.

Based on the foregoing findings, it would appear that Maslow's proposition that the five dimensions of needs satisfaction decrease according the sequence of his theory's hierarchy, is not the case for the respondents of the study.

Significant positive relationships were established between all possible pair-combinations of the respondents' five dimensions of needs satisfaction. This implies that all these dimensions significantly influence each other in a positive direction.

Similar researches are recommended on larger samples and with respondents from other professions.

ETHICAL DECLARATION

The researcher declares that this study strictly adhered to the ethics of research. Informed consent was obtained, freedom to withdraw at any time from the study was made known to the participants, their identities were anonymized, the participants were not exposed to any physical, psychological or social harm and the results were used for research purposes only. The researcher further ensured steps to prevent bias in the interpretation of the data. Lastly, there was no conflict of interest in the conduct of the study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

1. Maslow AH. A theory of human motivation. Psychological Review. 1943;50(4):370–96. doi:10.1037/h0054346
2. Mcleod S. Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html
3. Shoib S, Amanda TW, Menon V, Ransing R, Kar SK, Ojeahere MI, et al. Is Maslow's hierarchy of needs applicable during the COVID-19 pandemic? Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine. 2022 Jan 18;44(1):98–100. doi:10.1177/02537176211060435
4. Ryan, B. J., Coppola, D., Canyon, D. V, et al. (2020). COVID-19 community stabilization and sustainability framework: An Integration of the Maslow hierarchy of needs and social determinants of health. Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2020.109
5. Santamaria JGO. Motivating the future workforce of Philippine Organizations [Internet]. 2016. Available from: https://pmr.upd.edu.ph/index.php/pmr/article/view/208
6. Ilagan, J. R. A., Hechanova, R. M., Co, T. A. C. and Pleyto, V. J. Z. "Bakit Ka Kumakayod?" Developing a Filipino Needs Theory of Motivation. Ateneo de Manila University. Philippine Journal of Psychology, 2014, 47(1), 117-143
7. Singh T, Behera MP. Application of the maslow's hierarchy of need theory: Impacts and implications on employee's career stages. Training and Development Journal. 2016;7(2):43. doi:10.5958/2231-069x.2016.00007.x
8. Ahmad Dar S, Sakthivel Dr P. Maslow's hierarchy of needs is still relevant in the 21st Century.Journal of Learning jand Educational Policy. 2022;(25):1–9. doi:10.55529/jlep25.1.9
9. Hagerty, M.R. Testing Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: National Quality-of-Life Across Time. Social Indicators Research 46, 249–271 (1999). https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006921107298
10. Gambrel P, Cianci R. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: Does It Apply In A Collectivist Culture [Internet]. 2003 [cited 2023 Sept 10]. Available from: https://www.proquest.com/openview/ae442f92052554df14618b5bd9104141/1?pq-origsite=gscholar

11. Benitez, J. L. (2022). An Inquiry into the Problems Concerning Filipino Values and Norms. Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 10(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj2210.01.03

12. Sevillano S. Teachers uphold quality education amid challenges [Internet]. 2022. Available from: https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1185242

13. Rogayan DV. Why young Filipino teachers teach? [Internet]. 2018. Available from: https://po.pnuresearchportal.org/ejournal/index.php/apherj/article/view/1028

14. Hao, Arleen B.; de Guzman, Allan B. Why go into teaching? Understanding Filipino preservice teachers' reasons for entering teacher education. KEDI Journal of Educational Policy. 2007, Vol. 4 Issue 2, p115-135. 21p.

15. Taormina RJ, Gao JH. Maslow and the motivation hierarchy: Measuring satisfaction of the needs. The American Journal of Psychology. 2013;126(2):155–77. doi:10.5406/amerjpsyc.126.2.0155