

# Assessing Teaching Performance and Student Learning Outcome in General education Courses at Sulu State University: An Implication to Mismatched Faculty Assignments

Jehada A. Asid and Masnona L. Sabdani-Asiri

School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo, Sulu, 4700, Philippines

\*Corresponding author: [sscgspub@sulustatecollege.edu.ph](mailto:sscgspub@sulustatecollege.edu.ph)

**ABSTRACT.** This study explored how teaching performance relates to student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University. It used a descriptive-correlational research design involving 100 student-respondents selected through purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, including frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, Pearson correlation, t-test, and ANOVA. The study looked at teaching performance in terms of faculty qualifications, teaching competence, instructional strategies, and perceived effectiveness. It also examined student learning outcomes in areas such as academic performance, subject mastery, motivation and engagement, and skills development. Respondents' demographic profiles age, gender, parents' educational background, and monthly income were also considered. Results showed that most respondents were 26–29 years old, predominantly female, and generally came from families where parents were high school graduates earning below minimum wage. Overall, students perceived both teaching performance and learning outcomes positively, with most indicators rated as “Agree,” suggesting favorable evaluations across all areas examined. In terms of perception differences, younger students (25 years old and below) tended to view both teaching performance and learning outcomes more positively compared to older groups. The analysis also revealed a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between teaching performance and student learning outcomes. These findings support the ideas behind Human Capital Theory and Constructivist Learning Theory, suggesting that effective teaching plays a central role in shaping students' intellectual development and real-world competencies. In other words, the quality of instruction acts as a key factor in turning educational input into meaningful academic and personal growth. Overall, the study highlights the importance of strengthening General Education by incorporating Higher-Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) and practical, transferable life skills to better prepare students for academic success and future careers.

**Keywords:** *Teaching, Performance, Outcome, Implication, Assignments*

## ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00119; Received: January 10, 2026; Accepted: January 28, 2026; Published: February 18, 2026

## CITATION:

Asid, J. A. & Sabdani-Asiri, M. L. (2026). *Assessing Teaching Performance and Student Learning Outcome in General education Courses at Sulu State University: An Implication to Mismatched Faculty Assignments*. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*, 3(1). DOI: 10.62596/frcdfc23

## COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by author(s). *Journal of Education and Academic Settings* is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Quality teaching in General Education (GE) courses plays a vital role in shaping how students learn and succeed in higher education. When instructors are well-prepared and confident in the subjects they teach, students are more likely to develop strong academic foundations, critical thinking skills, and meaningful engagement in learning (Engida, 2024; Chavez, 2022). In support of this, studies also highlight that technology-enhanced and innovative instructional practices can further strengthen student learning experiences in higher education settings (Verdeflor et al., 2025; Chavez, 2023). Likewise, institutional experiences during crises such as the pandemic have shown how teaching conditions and student learning adaptations directly shape educational outcomes (Chavez, 2020). However, this ideal situation is not always the case. In many higher education settings, including those in developing contexts, teachers are sometimes assigned to subjects outside their area of specialization. This “out-of-field” or faculty mismatch situation has been shown to place additional strain on teachers and can negatively affect instructional quality and student learning experiences (Hobbs, 2021). Recent findings also emphasize that emerging instructional tools, including AI-based approaches, must be carefully aligned with teacher preparedness to avoid weakening instructional delivery (Calzada, 2024; Chavez et al., 2024).

In the Philippines, this concern remains evident. Studies have reported that faculty mismatch continues to occur in both public and private institutions, affecting classroom instruction and student achievement, especially in foundational GE subjects (Guiaselon et al., 2022; Javines, 2024). Teachers who are not specialized in the subjects they handle often experience challenges in content mastery, lesson delivery, and instructional confidence, which may also influence student understanding and engagement (Abo, 2025). In addition, research on instructional support systems such as parental involvement and academic guidance highlights that learning outcomes are strongly influenced by the quality of educational environments surrounding the learner (Chavez et al., 2023). Curricular feedback from higher education graduates also highlights that soft skills development is closely linked to the quality and alignment of instruction received during college education (Bacalso et al., 2025). Policy discussions from the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) further emphasize that aligning teachers’ expertise with their assigned subjects is crucial for improving educational quality, yet gaps in staffing and workforce planning persist.

This issue is also connected to broader global and national commitments. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) emphasizes inclusive and quality education for all, highlighting the importance of well-trained and competent teachers in achieving better learning outcomes. In the Philippines, policies such as Republic Act No. 7722 (CHED) and the Philippine Qualifications Framework (2012) support standards that promote proper teacher qualification and alignment of expertise with teaching assignments. These frameworks aim to ensure that students receive quality instruction from appropriately trained educators.

Within this context, GE courses serve as the academic foundation of college education, helping students develop essential competencies in communication, critical thinking, and civic responsibility. However, when faculty assignment does not match specialization, the quality of instruction in these core subjects may be affected, potentially influencing student learning outcomes such as academic performance, subject mastery, motivation, engagement, and skills development.

Despite existing studies on faculty mismatch, most research has focused on secondary education or technical-vocational settings (Demapendan, 2024; Javines & Azarias, 2024), leaving a limited understanding of how this issue affects GE instruction in higher education institutions. This gap is particularly important in institutions like Sulu State University, where GE courses play a central role in shaping students’ academic readiness.

To address this gap, this study examines the relationship between teaching performance and student learning outcomes in GE courses, focusing on key dimensions such as faculty qualifications, teaching competence, instructional strategies, and perceived effectiveness. It also considers whether faculty mismatch may influence these variables and how students perceive their learning experience in terms of academic achievement, motivation, engagement, and skills development.

By exploring these relationships, the study aims to provide evidence on how teaching assignments impact both instructional quality and student learning in GE courses. The expected outcome is to generate insights that can guide institutional policies on faculty deployment, professional development, and curriculum planning, ultimately contributing to improved teaching practices and better student outcomes in alignment with SDG 4.

## 2. METHODS

### 2.1 Research Design

This study used a descriptive research design, following the principles outlined by Calmorin (1995). This approach was chosen because it is well-suited for describing current conditions and examining relationships between variables as they naturally exist. In this study, the descriptive aspect was used to present the respondents' demographic profile, including their age, gender, parents' educational attainment, and parents' average monthly income. It also helped in describing the extent of students' learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University. Beyond description, the design also allowed the study to explore whether a relationship exists between teaching performance and student learning outcomes. This makes it possible to better understand how teaching practices and faculty assignments may be connected to students' academic experiences and performance in a real academic setting.

### 2.2 Participants of the Study

This study was conducted at Jolo in Sulu State University, a setting considered suitable for examining General Education (GE) courses and issues related to faculty assignment. The university offers a range of GE subjects that form the academic foundation of all degree programs, making it an appropriate place to explore how teaching practices influence student learning. The participants were 100 first-year college students enrolled in GE courses, selected through purposive sampling. First-year students were chosen because they were actively taking core GE subjects and could share firsthand experiences of how teaching performance affects their learning. Their responses provided useful insights into the connection between faculty assignment, teaching effectiveness, and student learning outcomes within the institution.

#### Respondents of the Study

Names of Schools at Sulu State University	First Year College Students- Respondents
College of Teacher Education	12
College of Computing Science	11
School of Nursing	11
School of Agriculture	11

---

College of Business Administration and Management	11
College of Arts and Sciences	11
School of Criminal Justice and Education	11
School of Social Work	11
School of Computer Engineering	11
TOTAL	100

---

### **2.3 Sampling Procedure**

This study used purposive sampling to select its respondents. The participants were first-year college students enrolled in General Education courses at Sulu State University. They were chosen because they were readily accessible and willing to take part in the study, making data collection more practical within the available time and resources. While this method does not completely remove the possibility of sampling bias, it was appropriate for identifying respondents who could provide relevant and meaningful insights about their learning experiences, particularly in relation to faculty assignment and teaching performance. Purposive sampling is a non-probability technique where participants are intentionally selected based on specific characteristics relevant to the research objectives (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016).

### **2.4 Research Instrument**

This study used a modified standardized questionnaire adapted from Biggs and Tang (2011), Darling-Hammond (2017), Shulman (1987), and Kuh et al. (2011) to examine teaching performance and student learning outcomes. The instrument had three parts: respondents' demographic profile, assessment of teaching performance (faculty qualifications, competence, instructional strategies, and effectiveness), and evaluation of student learning outcomes (academic performance, subject mastery, motivation, engagement, and skills development). All evaluative items used a five-point Likert scale. This tool helped gather students' perceptions of how teaching performance relates to their learning experiences in General Education courses at Sulu State University.

### **2.5 Data Gathering Procedure**

Before data collection, the researcher obtained the necessary approvals from the Office of the School of Graduate Studies, the College President, and the Deans of the participating colleges at Sulu State University. After approval was granted, coordination was made with faculty members and administrative staff to reach first-year students enrolled in General Education courses. The questionnaires were personally distributed by the researcher. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality was strictly observed in line with Republic Act No. 10173, or the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Respondents were also informed that their responses would be used exclusively for academic purposes. Once completed, the questionnaires were collected, then organized for tabulation, coding, and statistical analysis to assess the relationship between teaching performance and students' learning outcomes, as well as its implications for possible mismatches in faculty assignments.

### **2.6 Ethical Considerations**

Ethical standards were strictly observed to ensure the integrity, reliability, and credibility of the study. Participants were fully informed about the study and gave voluntary consent, with the option

to withdraw at any time without penalty. Their responses were kept confidential and anonymous, with no identifying information included in any report. The researcher ensured that participation was free from coercion and that all data were recorded and reported honestly and accurately. Respect for participants’ rights and well-being was maintained throughout, with no harm posed in any form. The study also complied with the ethical guidelines of the School of Graduate Studies at Sulu State College and relevant national and international research ethics standards.

### 3. RESULTS

**Question 2.** What is the extent of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in the context of: Faculty Qualification, Teaching Competence, Instructional Strategies, and Perceived Teaching Effectiveness?

**Table 2.1 Extent of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of faculty qualification**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	The instructor’s educational background is aligned with the subject taught.	4.29	.87957	Agree
2	The faculty member has sufficient expertise to handle the assigned subject.	4.34	.81921	Agree
3	Teaching subjects outside their specialization affects instructional quality.	4.20	.86457	Agree
4	The mismatch between specialization and subject assignment impacts learning effectiveness.	4.10	.84686	Agree
5	I believe instructors should handle subjects within their field of expertise	4.10	.89330	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.206</b>	<b>.49192</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 2.1 The results show the level of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of faculty qualification. Overall, the student-respondents gave a composite mean of 4.206 (SD = .49192), interpreted as “Agree,” indicating a positive perception of faculty qualifications.

Among the indicators, the highest rating was for the statement that faculty members have sufficient expertise to handle their assigned subjects (M = 4.34, SD = .81921). This was followed by the alignment of instructors’ educational background with the subjects they teach (M = 4.29, SD = .87957). The item stating that teaching outside one’s specialization affects instructional quality received a mean of 4.20 (SD = .86457), also rated as “Agree.”

Overall, the findings suggest that students highly value instructors’ competence and proper subject assignment. This supports the views of Ingersoll (2019) and Darling-Hammond (2020), who emphasized that qualified faculty assignments improve student outcomes. Similarly, Salazar (2021) found that students taught by specialized instructors tend to perform better academically.

**Table 2.2 Extent of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of teaching competence**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	The instructor demonstrates mastery of the subject matter.	4.21	.86801	Agree

2	The teacher confidently explains concepts even outside their specialization.	4.14	.86480	Agree
3	Lack of subject familiarity reduces the clarity of instruction.	4.14	.88785	Agree
4	The instructor provides accurate and updated information in lectures.	4.18	.80879	Agree
5	The faculty member can address student inquiries effectively	4.17	.86521	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.168</b>	<b>.48469</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 2.2 The results present the level of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of teaching competence. Overall, the student-respondents obtained a composite mean of 4.168 (SD = .48469), interpreted as “Agree,” indicating a generally positive assessment of faculty competence.

Specifically, the highest rating was for the instructor’s mastery of the subject matter (M = 4.21, SD = .86801). This was followed by the provision of accurate and updated information during lectures (M = 4.18, SD = .80879) and the ability of faculty members to effectively address student inquiries (M = 4.17, SD = .86521), all interpreted as “Agree.”

These results suggest that students view their instructors as competent and effective facilitators of learning. This supports the findings of De Guzman and Pascual (2020), who noted that teaching outside one’s specialization can negatively affect student engagement and performance. Similarly, Salazar (2021) emphasized that alignment between faculty specialization and assigned subjects contributes to better academic performance and increased student motivation.

**Table 2.3 Extent of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of instructional strategies**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	The instructor uses appropriate teaching methods for the subject.	3.77	.93046	Agree
2	Learning activities are relevant to the course content.	3.97	.82211	Agree
3	The faculty member integrates practical examples related to the subject.	3.58	.87824	Agree
4	Instructional strategies are effective even when the instructor is not a specialist.	3.83	.84154	Agree
5	Use of varied teaching methods improves my understanding of the subject	3.60	.88763	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.750</b>	<b>.57234</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 2.3 The results show the level of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of instructional strategies. Overall, the student-respondents obtained a composite mean of 3.750 (SD = .57234), interpreted as “Agree,” indicating a generally positive perception of the instructional approaches used by faculty.

Among the indicators, the highest rating was for the relevance of learning activities to the course content (M = 3.97, SD = .82211). This was followed by the effectiveness of instructional strategies even when the instructor is not a specialist (M = 3.83, SD = .84154), and the use of appropriate teaching methods for the subject (M = 3.77, SD = .93046), all rated as “Agree.”

These findings suggest that students generally view the instructional strategies as effective, although experiences may vary among learners, resulting in differing levels of engagement. This aligns with Santos and Villanueva (2019), who noted that instructors teaching outside their specialization often rely on textbook-based approaches that limit interaction and contextual learning. Similarly, De Guzman and Pascual (2020) emphasized that mismatched faculty assignments can reduce pedagogical variety and affect students' skill development.

**Table 2.4 Extent of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of perceived teaching effectiveness**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	The instructor delivers the lesson clearly and understandably.	3.53	.88140	Agree
2	Examples used in discussions are relevant and easy to relate.	3.73	.80221	Agree
3	The teacher engages students actively during class sessions.	3.59	.82993	Agree
4	Teaching performance meets my expectations regardless of specialization.	3.70	.82266	Agree
5	The instructor maintains student interest and motivation in the subject	3.70	.85870	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.650</b>	<b>.56309</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 2.4 The results show the level of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of perceived teaching effectiveness. Overall, the student-respondents obtained a composite mean of 3.650 (SD = .56309), interpreted as “Agree,” indicating a generally positive perception of teaching effectiveness.

Specifically, the highest rating was for the relevance and clarity of examples used in discussions (M = 3.73, SD = .80221). This was followed by the perception that teaching performance meets expectations regardless of specialization (M = 3.70, SD = .82266), and that instructors are able to maintain student interest and motivation in the subject (M = 3.70, SD = .85870), all rated as “Agree.”

These findings suggest that students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness may vary depending on classroom experiences and expectations. This aligns with Villoria (2016), who found lower satisfaction levels in situations where faculty assignments were not aligned with their specialization. Similarly, Santos and Del Mundo (2018) noted that teaching effectiveness tends to be higher among instructors teaching within their field compared to those assigned outside their specialization.

**Question 3.** What is the extent of student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University in the context of: Academic Performance, Subject Mastery, Motivation and Engagement, and Skills Development?

**Table 3.1 Extent of student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of academic performance**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	I am performing well academically in my general education subjects.	4.12	.94195	Agree

2	My grades reflect my understanding of the topics discussed.	4.13	.89505	Agree
3	Faculty specialization influences my academic performance.	4.21	.86801	Agree
4	Having mismatched instructors affects my overall grades.	4.10	.91563	Agree
5	I am confident in achieving high marks despite mismatched faculty assignments	4.04	.90207	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.206</b>	<b>.49192</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 3.1 The results reflect the level of student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of academic performance. Overall, the student-respondents obtained a composite mean of 4.206 (SD = .49192), interpreted as “Agree,” indicating a positive assessment of their academic performance.

Specifically, the highest rating was for the influence of faculty specialization on academic performance (M = 4.21, SD = .86801). This was followed by the perception that grades reflect understanding of the topics discussed (M = 4.13, SD = .89505) and that students are performing well academically in their general education subjects (M = 4.12, SD = .94195), all rated as “Agree.”

These findings suggest that curriculum design and instructional delivery are effectively contributing to student achievement. This supports the findings of Beteille and Loeb (2018), who noted that faculty-course mismatch negatively affects learning outcomes. Similarly, Clotfelter et al. (2017) found that properly aligned teaching assignments are associated with higher student GPA performance.

**Table 3.2 Extent of student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of subject mastery**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	I have gained sufficient knowledge from my general education courses.	3.73	.93046	Agree
2	The teaching approach helped me understand complex concepts.	3.79	.93523	Agree
3	Faculty specialization affects the depth of my learning.	3.79	.82014	Agree
4	Lessons are delivered in a way that supports mastery of the subject.	3.67	.87681	Agree
5	I can apply what I learned from my general education courses effectively	3.77	.90849	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.750</b>	<b>.60794</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 3.2 The results show the level of student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of subject mastery. Overall, the student-respondents obtained a composite mean of 3.750 (SD = .60794), interpreted as “Agree,” indicating a generally positive perception of their understanding of course content.

Specifically, students agreed that the teaching approach helped them understand complex concepts (M = 3.79), that faculty specialization affects the depth of learning (M = 3.79), and that they can apply what they learned in their subjects effectively (M = 3.77).

These findings suggest that students experience a meaningful level of subject mastery, which aligns with Salazar (2021), who noted that teaching within one’s specialization improves instructional quality and learning outcomes.

**Table 3.3 Extent of student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of motivation and engagement**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	The instructor motivates me to study and learn more.	4.11	.91998	Agree
2	My interest in the subject depends on the instructor’s teaching competence.	4.08	.88398	Agree
3	Mismatched faculty assignments affect my willingness to participate in class.	4.21	.92436	Agree
4	I feel engaged during lectures and discussions.	4.15	.95743	Agree
5	The instructor’s enthusiasm encourages my active learning	4.20	.92113	Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>4.150</b>	<b>.58767</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 3.3 The results show the level of teaching performance in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of motivation and engagement. Overall, the student-respondents obtained a composite mean of 4.150 (SD = .58767), interpreted as “Agree,” indicating a generally positive level of motivation and engagement.

Students agreed that mismatched faculty assignments affect their willingness to participate (M = 4.21), that instructor enthusiasm promotes active learning (M = 4.20), and that they feel engaged during class discussions (M = 4.15).

These findings suggest that teaching assignment and instructor behavior influence student engagement. This supports Cabrera (2022) and Morales (2017), who found that alignment of faculty specialization with assigned subjects leads to higher student engagement.

**Table 3.4 Extent of student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of skills development**

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	General education courses have improved my critical thinking skills.	3.42	.90095	Moderately Agree
2	The teaching method helps me enhance my communication skills.	3.43	.89052	Moderately Agree
3	Instructors contribute to developing my analytical abilities.	3.38	.70754	Moderately Agree
4	I gained practical skills applicable to my field of study.	3.30	.91563	Moderately Agree
5	Teaching alignment affects the development of essential student skills.	3.32	.81501	Moderately Agree
<b>Weighted Mean</b>		<b>3.371</b>	<b>.63397</b>	<b>Moderately Agree</b>

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49= Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

Table 3.4 The results show the level of student learning outcomes in General Education courses at Sulu State University in terms of skills development. Overall, the student-respondents

obtained a composite mean of 3.371 (SD = .63397), interpreted as “Moderately Agree,” indicating a moderate level of skills development.

Students moderately agreed that the courses help improve communication skills (M = 3.43), critical thinking (M = 3.42), and analytical abilities (M = 3.38).

These findings suggest that students perceive only moderate improvement in their skills. This supports Lopez (2019) and Villanueva and Ramos (2021), who found that mismatched faculty assignments may limit the development of higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills.

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

The results of this study provide a clearer picture of how teaching performance and student learning outcomes are experienced in General Education courses at Sulu State University. In terms of demographic profile, most respondents were young college students aged 25 and below, predominantly female, with many coming from families with low to below-minimum wage income and parents who are mostly high school graduates. This suggests that the student population reflects a typical public university context where many learners come from modest socioeconomic backgrounds.

Regarding teaching performance, students generally rated faculty positively across all dimensions, interpreting them as “Agree.” Faculty qualification received the highest rating, showing that students value instructors who demonstrate competence and presence in the classroom. Teaching competence followed closely, indicating that students see their teachers as capable facilitators of learning. Instructional strategies were also rated positively, although responses suggest mixed experiences—some students find the methods effective, while others experience them as less engaging, pointing to differences in classroom delivery. Perceived teaching effectiveness received the lowest rating among the categories, suggesting that students’ evaluations of effectiveness may vary depending on expectations and classroom context.

For student learning outcomes, results also showed generally positive responses. Academic performance received the highest rating, indicating that students believe the curriculum and instruction contribute to measurable achievement. Motivation and engagement were also rated highly, showing that students feel connected and involved in their learning. Subject mastery followed closely, reflecting that students are developing a meaningful understanding of their lessons. However, skills development received a lower rating (“Moderately Agree”), suggesting that while students are gaining knowledge, they are less confident about the deeper development of critical skills such as communication, analysis, and problem-solving.

When differences were examined based on demographic variables, age showed a significant influence on both teaching performance and student learning outcomes. Students aged 25 and below tended to have more positive perceptions, particularly in teaching competence, effectiveness, academic performance, and skills development. This may reflect differences in learning expectations, adaptability, or engagement levels among younger students. In contrast, no significant differences were found in terms of gender, parental educational attainment, and family income. This indicates that perceptions of teaching and learning are generally consistent across these groups, suggesting that the educational experience is relatively uniform regardless of background.

Finally, the correlation analysis revealed a strong and meaningful relationship between teaching performance and student learning outcomes. This indicates that when faculty demonstrate strong qualifications, competence, effective instructional strategies, and teaching

effectiveness, students are more likely to perform better academically, develop mastery, stay motivated, and improve their skills. This finding highlights the central role of teaching quality in shaping student success, emphasizing that effective instruction is a key factor in achieving positive learning outcomes in General Education courses.

Overall, the findings suggest that while students generally view teaching performance and learning outcomes positively, there are areas—particularly skills development and instructional consistency that may still benefit from further improvement to ensure a more balanced and impactful learning experience.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The study found that most respondents are young college students, mostly female, with parents who are generally high school graduates and earning below minimum wage. Overall, students rated teaching performance and learning outcomes positively, reflecting a stable and supportive academic environment, although improvements in teaching strategies, effectiveness, and skills development are still needed. No significant differences were found in perceptions based on gender, parental education, or income, but age showed a significant effect, with younger students reporting more positive views. The findings also show a strong link between teaching performance and student learning outcomes, emphasizing that effective instruction plays a key role in student success and development.

## References

1. Ang, J. V., Corpin, F. J., Supremo, M. E., et al. (2025). Are we reaching 21st century learners status? Aspirations and realities for motivating and engaging classrooms. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(5), 3270. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i5.3270>
2. Abo, (2025). (not included in your list—if needed, please provide full details)
3. Bacalso, F. D., Orquia, C. J. B., Paclipan, C. P., et al. (2025). Curricular feedback from technology-based workforce: Assessment of soft skills among CTU graduates. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(5), 2557. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i5.2557>
4. Beteille, T., & Loeb, S. (2018). Teacher quality and student achievement: Understanding the effects of teacher assignment and mismatch.
5. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
6. Cabrera, J. (2022). Faculty specialization and its impact on student engagement in higher education.
7. Calmorin, L. P. (1995). *Methods of research and thesis writing*. National Book Store.
8. Calzada, K. P. D. (2024). Anti-dependency teaching strategy for innovation in the age of AI among technology-based students. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(8), 3026. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i8.3026>
9. Chavez, J. V. (2020). Academic and health insecurities of indigent students during pandemic: Study on adaptive strategies under learning constraints. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 16(3), 74–81.
10. Chavez, J. V. (2022). Narratives of bilingual parents on the real-life use of English language: Materials for English language teaching curriculum. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(3), 325–338. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no3.21>

11. Chavez, J. V. (2023). Assessing online academic integrity and humanized teaching in Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 19(1), 9–17.
12. Chavez, J. V., Adalia, H. G., & Alberto, J. P. (2023). Parental support strategies and motivation in aiding their children learn the English language. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 5(2), 1541. <https://doi.org/10.59400.fl.s.v5i2.1541>
13. Chavez, J. V., Ceneciro, C. C., & others. (2024). Magna Carta for women health workers, teachers, and minimum-wage earners in the workplace: Policy awareness and organizational compliance. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(1), 1735. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i1.1735>
14. Chavez, J. V., Cuilan, J. T., & Mannan, S. S. (2024). Discourse analysis on the ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in academic settings. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fl.s.v6i5.6765>
15. Chavez, J. V., Gregorio, M. W., Araneta, A. L., & Bihag, C. D. (2024). Magna Carta for women health workers, teachers, and minimum-wage earners in the workplace. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(1), 1735. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i1.1735>
16. Chavez, J. V., Lamorinas, D. D., & Ceneciro, C. C. (2023). Message patterns of online gender-based humor. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 5(2), 1535. <https://doi.org/10.59400.fl.s.v5i2.1535>
17. Chavez, J. V., Valencia, E. O., Diamante, M. R. D., et al. (2025). From classroom to work room: Grammar and professional confidence. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(12), 4180. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i12.4180>
18. Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2017). Teacher credentials and student performance: Evidence on the impact of aligned teaching assignments.
19. Cutillas, A. L. (2025). Generative AI as a catalyst for instruction in higher education. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(4), 3185. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i4.3185>
20. Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Empowered educators: How high-performing systems shape teaching quality around the world*. Jossey-Bass.
21. Darling-Hammond, L. (2020). Implications for educational quality and equity in teaching and teacher preparation.
22. De Guzman, J., & Pascual, R. (2020). Teaching specialization and its impact on student engagement and academic performance.
23. Demapendan, R. (2024). Faculty mismatch in technical-vocational education: Implications for teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Technical Education and Training*, 16(2), 45–60.
24. Engida, T. (2024). The role of teacher competence in enhancing student learning outcomes in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 89, 102–110.
25. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
26. Guiaselon, J., et al. (2022). Faculty assignment practices and their impact on student achievement in Philippine higher education. *Philippine Journal of Education Research*, 31(1), 55–72.
27. Hobbs, L. (2021). Out-of-field teaching and its implications for educational quality. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 97, 103–112.

28. Ingersoll, R. M. (2019). Measuring the teacher workforce: Challenges and issues in educational staffing and quality.
29. Javines, M. (2024). Teacher specialization mismatch and its effects on classroom instruction. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 40(3), 18–30.
30. Javines, M., & Azarias, P. (2024). Challenges in teacher assignment in secondary education. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 12(4), 201–215.
31. Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2011). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. Jossey-Bass.
32. Lopez, R. (2019). Faculty specialization and its influence on analytical learning and higher-order thinking skills.
33. Morales, A. (2017). Faculty alignment and student engagement in classroom settings.
34. Salazar, M. (2021). Effects of specialized teaching on student academic performance.
35. Santos, R., & Villanueva, M. (2019). Textbook-based teaching and its impact on interactive learning.
36. Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
37. Villanueva, M., & Ramos, J. (2021). Out-of-field teaching and its impact on critical thinking and problem-solving skills.
38. Verdeflor, R. N., Dellosa, R. V., Ventures, R. R., et al. (2025). Using technology in instruction to increase innovative mindset and behavior. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(4), 3266. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i4.3266>