

Assessing the Instructional Practices of College Instructors Toward the Enhancement of Students' Academic Performance at Sulu State University

Shermona A. Yashier¹, Masnona S. Asiri

¹ School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo 7400, Philippines

*Corresponding author: gs@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. This study evaluated the instructional practices of college instructors and their impact on students' academic performance at Sulu State University. It utilized a descriptive-correlational research design with a sample of 100 teacher-respondents chosen through purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, Pearson's correlation test, t-test, and ANOVA. The research focused on instructional planning, teaching, and assessment practices, taking into account the demographic profiles of the respondents, including factors like age, gender, civil status, length of service, and educational attainment. Results indicated that the majority of participants were aged between 31 and 40, primarily female, married, with less than 5 years of service, and possessed master's degrees. Results showed that instructional practices across all domains were perceived as exceptional, consistently receiving a 'Frequently' rating. Respondents with doctorate degrees and those with 16-20 years of service demonstrated better perceptions of instructional practices at Sulu State University. A very high positive significant correlation was also observed, strongly supporting the Instructional Practices Model of Francisco and Celon (2020), which posits that teaching effectiveness results from the integration of planning, execution, and evaluation. The findings further confirm that maintaining high standards in planning and delivery fosters an enhanced instructional environment that contributes to improved student academic performance. Overall, the study emphasizes the importance of institutional and national standards in instructional planning, teaching, and assessment in promoting excellence in student academic performance.

KEYWORDS: *Instructional Practices, Academic Performance, Instructional Planning, Teaching Practices, Assessment Practices, Teaching Effectiveness*

ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00135; Received: April 15, 2026; Accepted: May 6, 2026; Published: May 25, 2026

CITATION:

Yashier, Shermona A., Asiri, Masnona S. (2026). *Assessing the Instructional Practices of College Instructors Toward the Enhancement of Students' Academic Performance at Sulu State University*. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*, 3(1). DOI: 10.62596/y2j6dn95

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.

Introduction

The effectiveness of teaching methods in higher education institutions is crucial in influencing learners' academic achievements and their preparedness for both professional and societal challenges. In higher education, instructional practices encompass the various strategies, methodologies, and pedagogical approaches employed by college instructors to enhance learning and foster academic achievement. Effective instructional methods impart knowledge,

accommodate various learning styles, encourage analytical thinking, and involve learners through practical applications, ultimately enhancing academic outcomes (Ortega, 2025). As higher education progresses in tandem with global and technological changes, the demand for effective teaching methods becomes increasingly important, necessitating continuous assessment and enhancement.

At Sulu State University (SSU), a major institution in the Sulu archipelago, there is a responsibility to produce graduates equipped with relevant knowledge, skills, and competencies. Despite its role in regional development, concerns about student learning outcomes persist. Academic performance—reflected in grades, retention, and engagement—is influenced by various factors, with instructional practices playing a central role (Francisco & Celon, 2020). The way instructors design, implement, and assess learning experiences significantly affects students' academic achievement and overall learning experience.

Thus, assessing the instructional practices of college instructors at SSU is essential in understanding their impact on students' academic performance. This includes examining the alignment of teaching strategies with curriculum goals, responsiveness to learners' needs, and effectiveness of instructional delivery (Clavel, Crespo, & Méndez, 2016). Moreover, teaching methods that prioritize human interaction and foster cognitive, social, and instructional presence have demonstrated effectiveness in boosting engagement and enhancing academic performance (Chavez, 2023). Such evaluation offers important perspectives for enhancing teaching methods and guiding professional growth and policy improvements.

Given these considerations, this study seeks to evaluate the teaching methods employed by college instructors at Sulu State University and to analyze the impact of these methods on improving students' academic performance.

Research Questions

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1. Gender;
 - 1.2. Age;
 - 1.3. Civil status;
 - 1.4. Educational attainment; and
 - 1.5. Length of service?
2. What is the level of instructional practices of college instructors in relation to students' academic performance at Sulu State College in terms of:
 - 2.1. Instructional Planning Practices;
 - 2.2. Teaching Practices; and
 - 2.3. Assessment Practices?
3. Is there a significant difference in the level of instructional practices of college instructors in relation to students' academic performance at Sulu State College when data are grouped according to respondents' profile in terms of:
 - 3.1. Gender;
 - 3.2. Age;
 - 3.3. Civil status;
 - 3.4. Educational attainment; and
 - 3.5. Length of service?

4. Is there a significant correlation among the subcategories subsumed under the level of instructional practices of college instructors in relation to students' academic performance at Sulu State College?

Literature

Instructional Practices and 21st-Century Teaching Approaches

Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) emphasized that to effectively address the swift technological and societal transformations, education systems need to foster 21st-century skills including critical thinking, problem-solving, collaboration, self-direction, and communication. In a similar vein, Pellegrino et al. (2012) noted that these competencies are most effectively cultivated through inquiry-based, collaborative, and application-oriented learning, as opposed to conventional lecture-based education. This aligns with learner-centered methodologies that encourage active participation and foster deeper understanding.

Harackiewicz et al. (2016) found that student interest and motivation have a substantial impact on learning outcomes, however Kolb & Kolb (2017) endorsed experiential learning as a process in which learners actively develop knowledge through experience. Schneider and Preckel (2017) also discovered that instructional quality, feedback, and meaningful assignments are highly linked to improved student accomplishment in higher education.

Chavez and Lamorinas (2023) emphasized the importance of continuously adapting instructional approaches to match the requirements of students, whereas Entong et al. (2024) emphasized that emotional connection in teaching enhances understanding, motivation, and retention. Furthermore, structured, learner-centered instruction that incorporates motivational and anxiety-reduction tactics improves engagement and academic achievement (Chavez et al., 2025; Verdeflor et al., 2025).

Empirical Evidence on Instructional Practices and Student Outcomes

Evidence repeatedly demonstrates that instructional techniques have a major impact on student learning outcomes. Francisco and Celon (2020) discovered that instructors' instructional practices enhance academic performance across disciplines, whereas Mangila (2022) found that professional development and better instructional competences increase teaching effectiveness.

Bibon (2022) discovered a substantial link between instructional delivery and science accomplishment, highlighting differentiated instruction, inquiry-based learning, and effective evaluation. Similarly, Salacut et al. (2025) discovered a strong positive association between teaching effectiveness and GPA, demonstrating that higher instructional quality leads to better academic success.

Instructional Challenges and Implementation Gaps in Higher Education

Despite these advantages, some obstacles remain. Bibon (2022) highlighted gaps in technology use, as well as difficulties such as limited training and computer fear, which impede educational practices. Mangila (2022) also observed variations in views of educational efficacy, which reflected differences in implementation and evaluation.

Castro et al. (2024) identified workload constraints, such as managing numerous subjects, as affecting instructional preparation and delivery. International studies also show a lack of professional development and a poor alignment of teaching practices with student needs (Kennedy, 2016; Steinert et al., 2016). In the Philippines, these problems highlight the importance of assessing how college instructors execute instructional strategies and how they affect students' academic achievement, notably at Sulu University.

Methodology

1. Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to systematically detail the instructional practices of college instructors and to identify significant differences and relationships among variables, including the demographic profiles of respondents and their instructional practices in relation to students' academic performance at Sulu State University. This design was executed to facilitate accurate measurement of variables and to investigate relationships and differences among groups based on prevailing conditions.

2. Participants and Sampling

The study's respondents were 100 college teachers from various academic departments and colleges at Sulu State University during the Academic Year 2025-2026, regardless of rank, position, or job status. They were chosen by purposive sampling based on availability. Ethical considerations were meticulously followed, ensuring voluntary participation, informed permission, confidentiality, anonymity, and adherence to research ethical guidelines.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents

College Units in Sulu State University	Number Of Respondents
1. College Computing Studies and Engineering	20
2. College Business Administration and Management	20
3. College of Teacher-Education	15
4. College Arts & Sciences	20
5. School of Agriculture	10
6. School of Nursing	10
7. School of Criminal Justice Education	5
Total:	100

3. Instruments

Data were collected utilizing a standardized survey questionnaire developed from the research of Francisco, C.D.C. & Celon, L.C. (2020), titled "Teachers' Instructional Practices and Its Effects on Students' Academic Performance." The instrument consisted of two parts: (1) a demographic profile featuring gender, age, civil status, educational attainment, and length of service; and (2) instructional practices that covered instructional planning practices (10 items), teaching practices (5 items), and assessment practices (8 items). The measure underwent validation through expert evaluation by a minimum of two faculty members from the School of Graduate Studies at Sulu State University, after which it was adjusted for local relevance.

4. Data Collection Procedure

Approval to conduct the study and distribute the questionnaire was secured from the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, the University President, as well as the appropriate college deans and department heads. The questionnaires were personally distributed and collected by the researcher. Participants were given sufficient time to complete the survey, and upon completion, the submitted instruments were collected and examined for completeness.

5. Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage were employed to establish the profiles of the respondents. Mean and standard deviation were employed to evaluate the spectrum of instructional practices. Independent samples t-test was used to determine significant differences in instructional practices according to gender, while one-way ANOVA was applied for age, civil status, educational attainment, and length of service. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r) was utilized to determine significant relationships among the different subcategories

of instructional practices. A 4-point Likert scale was employed for interpretation: 3.50-4.00 (Frequently), 2.50-3.49 (Sometimes), 1.50-2.49 (Seldom), and 1.00-1.49 (Never).

Results

1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The demographic profile of the teacher-respondents (N = 100) in Sulu State University indicates a slight female majority (54%) compared to males (46%). Most respondents fall within the 31–40-year age range (39%), followed by those aged 30 and below (33%) and those aged 41 and above (28%), suggesting a predominantly early- to mid-career demographic. Regarding civil status, the majority are married (62%), followed by 34% who are single, and 4% who are separated or widowed. In terms of educational attainment, almost half possess master’s degrees (46%), followed by individuals with bachelor’s degrees and master’s units (21%), those holding doctorate degrees (15%), bachelor’s degree holders (11%), and individuals with master’s units in doctorate programs (7%). Regarding the duration of service, the majority have been in their roles for 5 years or less (46%), followed by those with 6–10 years of experience (29%), 16–20 years (11%), and both 11–15 years and 21 years or more (7% each).

Table 2: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic Variable	Number of Respondents (n=100)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	46	46%
Female	54	54%
Age		
30 years old and below	33	33%
31 to 40 years old	39	39%
41 years old and above	28	28%
Civil Status		
Single	34	34%
Married	64	64%
Widowed/ Separated	4	4%
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	11	11%
With Master's Units	21	21%
Master's Degree	46	46%
With Doctorate Units	7	7%
Doctorate Degree	15	15%
Length of Service		
5 years and below	46	46%
6 to 10 years	29	29%
11 to 15 years	7	7%
16 to 20 years	11	11%
21 years and above	7	7%

2. Level of Instructional Practices of College Instructors in Relation to Students’ Academic Performance

Overall, instructional practices received a rating of “Frequently” across all dimensions. In Instructional Planning Practices, respondents achieved a composite mean of 3.803 (SD = .30960). Top-rated indicators consist of aligning lessons with CHED competencies (M = 3.91, SD = .28762), choosing materials according to students’ needs and learning styles (M = 3.88, SD = .32660), and incorporating cooperative learning (M = 3.83, SD = .45070). In Teaching Practices,

the composite mean was 3.684 (SD = .44873). Key practices encompass demonstrating courtesy and respect (M = 3.81, SD = .48607), fostering collaborative group work (M = 3.73, SD = .50960), and incorporating reading/writing tasks (M = 3.70, SD = .59459). In Assessment Practices, the composite mean was 3.694 (SD = .41524). Top indicators consist of preparing TOS-based tests (M = 3.89, SD = .31447), utilizing written work, performance tasks, and semestral assessments (M = 3.82, SD = .38612), and implementing rubrics where relevant (M = 3.73, SD = .50960).

Table 3: Level of Instructional Practices of College Instructors in Relation to Students' Academic Performance

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Descriptive Interpretation
Instructional Planning Practices	3.803	.30960	Frequently
1. When I design my lesson, I consciously select content that required in CHED curriculum competencies, and/or performance standards	3.91	.28762	Frequently
2. When I design my lesson, I consciously select instructions materials based upon my knowledge of my student's development needs and learning styles	3.88	.32660	Frequently
3. When I design my lesson, I consciously select methods and strategies that accommodate individual needs and interest of specific students	3.82	.38612	Frequently
4. When I design my lesson, I consciously prepare lessons with high expectations designed to challenge and stimulate all students	3.80	.40202	Frequently
5. When I design my lesson, I consciously consider how to build upon my student's existing knowledge and experiences	3.79	.43333	Frequently
6. When I design my lesson, I consciously consider how to create active learning experiences for my students	3.76	.47397	Frequently
7. When I design my lesson, I consciously consider how to create cooperative learning experiences for my students	3.83	.45070	Frequently
8. When I design my lesson, I consciously designs lessons that require integration of content from more than one content area	3.75	.50000	Frequently
9. During each lesson, I move among the students, engaging individually and collectively with them during the learning experiences	3.79	.49838	Frequently
10. During each lesson, I consciously implement a teaching strategy that stimulates higher-order thinking skills	3.70	.54123	Frequently
Teaching Practices	3.684	.44873	Frequently
1. During each lesson, I create social interaction among students that enhances learning by requiring students to work as a team with both individual and group responsibilities	3.73	.50960	Frequently
2. During each lesson, I vary the size and composition of learning groups	3.61	.58422	Frequently
3. During each lesson, I discuss with my students the importance of courtesy and respect and consciously model for my students the types of personal behaviors that promote responsibility and social development among early adolescents	3.81	.48607	Frequently
4. During each lesson, I consciously implement two or more learning activities	3.57	.62369	Frequently
5. During each lesson, I consciously implement a learning activity that requires students to read or write in my content area	3.70	.59459	Frequently
Assessment Practices	3.694	.41524	Frequently
1. Conducts pre-test/diagnostic test	3.52	.73323	Frequently
2. Keeps and updates class record	3.69	.52599	Frequently
3. Prepares TOS based tests	3.89	.31447	Frequently
4. Uses rubrics when and where applicable	3.73	.50960	Frequently
5. Uses written work, Performance tasks, and Semestral Assessment adequately in evaluation of outcomes	3.82	.38612	Frequently
6. Evaluates learning outcomes through varied means	3.69	.52599	Frequently
7. Assists students who are hard-up by re-teaching and remedial	3.59	.69769	Frequently

Statements	Mean	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Descriptive Interpretation
8. Improve learners' achievement level (considers MPS and median)	3.62	.64792	Frequently

Legend: (4) 3.50 – 4.00= Frequently; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Sometimes; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Seldom; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Never

3. Differences in the Level of Instructional Practices Based on Demographic Profile

To assess differences in instructional practices among college instructors concerning students' academic performance at Sulu State University, t-test and ANOVA analyses were performed across demographic variables. Results indicated a notable difference based on gender, whereas no significant variations were observed in age and civil status ($p > 0.05$), suggesting that perceptions remained largely consistent among these groups. In terms of educational attainment, a notable difference was identified, with post-hoc analysis (Tukey HSD) revealing that respondents holding bachelor's degrees with master's units significantly differed from those with doctorate degrees in instructional planning ($p = .023$), teaching practices ($p = .050$), and assessment practices ($p = .023$), with the doctorate group showing more favorable outcomes.

Results indicated a significant difference overall for length of service, except in teaching practices, where no significant difference was found. Post-hoc analysis indicated a significant difference in instructional planning ($p = .024$) and assessment practices ($p = .030$) between teachers with 5 years or less of experience and those with 16–20 years, with the latter group exhibiting higher means.

Table 4: Differences in the Level of Instructional Practices of College Instructors in Relation to Students' Academic Performance

Demographic Grouping Domains	Test Statistic (t / F)	p-value (Sig.)	Description
Gender			
Instructional Planning Practices	-.089	.929	Not Significant
Teaching Practices	-.296	.768	Not Significant
Assessment Practices	-.356	.723	Not Significant
Age			
Instructional Planning Practices	1.457	.238	Not Significant
Teaching Practices	.288	.750	Not Significant
Assessment Practices	.068	.934	Not Significant
Civil Status			
Instructional Planning Practices	.776	.463	Not Significant
Teaching Practices	.528	.591	Not Significant
Assessment Practices	.218	.804	Not Significant
Educational Attainment			
Instructional Planning Practices	3.800	.007	Significant
Teaching Practices	2.793	.030	Significant
Assessment Practices	3.066	.020	Significant
Length of Service			
Instructional Planning Practices	4.113	.004	Significant
Teaching Practices	1.075	.373	Not Significant
Assessment Practices	2.690	.036	Significant

*Significance at alpha 0.05

4. Correlational Analysis Among Pedagogical Domains

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Pearson's r) was employed to analyze the relationships between instructional planning practices, teaching practices, and assessment

practices. Table 4.1 indicates that all sub-categories demonstrated very high positive and significant correlations ($p = .000$). The most significant correlation was observed between instructional planning practices and assessment practices ($r = .858$), followed by the relationship between instructional planning and teaching practices ($r = .828$), and the connection between teaching practices and assessment practices ($r = .815$).

These results demonstrate a strong connection between instructional planning and its impact on teaching delivery and assessment, highlighting the close relationship between teaching practices and evaluative strategies. Therefore, the hypothesis indicating that there is no significant correlation among the sub-categories is rejected.

Table 5. Correlation Among Instructional Practices Sub-Categories

Variables	Pearson r	Sig.	N	Description
Instructional Planning Practices				
Teaching Practices	.828**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Assessment Practices	.858**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Teaching Practices				
Assessment Practices	.815**	.000	100	Very High Correlation

** Correlation Coefficient is significant at alpha .01 level

Discussion

The evaluation of college instructors at Sulu State University indicates a teaching workforce that is largely mature and stable, primarily consisting of middle-aged, female educators who are mostly married and possess master’s degrees. A significant portion are also in the initial phases of their teaching careers, reflecting a mix of novice and somewhat seasoned faculty. Overall, this profile indicates a workforce that is well-educated and fairly stable in their roles, establishing a basis for reliable instructional delivery within the institution.

In terms of instructional practices, the findings indicate a consistently very high level across all dimensions, with a “Frequently” verbal interpretation. Instructional planning practices emerged as the most prominent, characterized by purposeful and standards-aligned preparation that integrates student development and cooperative learning strategies. Assessment practices followed closely, reflecting strong technical competence through the use of Table of Specifications, balanced assessment methods, and transparent grading systems. Teaching practices, while slightly lower in ranking, still demonstrated a high level of implementation, particularly in active learning strategies, literacy integration, and character development, indicating an overall cohesive instructional approach.

In examining instructional practices, there were no significant differences identified based on gender, age, or civil status, indicating a consistent perception of these practices across the various demographics. However, significant differences were noted concerning educational attainment and length of service. Instructors holding doctorate degrees and those with 16 to 20 years of service exhibited more positive views on instructional practices than other groups, suggesting that advanced academic qualifications and extensive professional experience could shape instructional perspectives.

Finally, the correlational analysis shows a strong interrelationship among instructional planning, teaching, and assessment practices. Instructional planning was strongly linked with both teaching and assessment practices, suggesting that well-prepared lesson design supports effective classroom delivery and more accurate evaluation of student performance. Likewise, the close relationship between teaching and assessment practices reflects strong instructional alignment, where classroom activities and evaluation methods are mutually reinforcing. Overall, these

findings suggest that instructional practices at Sulu State University function as an integrated system that collectively supports the enhancement of student academic performance.

Conclusion

The study concludes that instructors at Sulu State University are largely early-career, predominantly female, married, aged 31–40, and mostly master’s degree holders, reflecting a qualified yet still developing academic workforce. Instructional practices were consistently rated very high across all dimensions, with instructional planning emerging as the strongest, followed by assessment and teaching practices, indicating a coherent and standards-aligned instructional system that supports student academic performance. No significant differences emerged when responses were categorized by gender, age, and civil status. However, significant differences were noted in educational attainment and length of service, especially among those holding doctorates and instructors with 16–20 years of experience. Furthermore, strong correlations between instructional planning, teaching, and assessment practices validate the Instructional Practices Model proposed by Francisco and Celon (2020), emphasizing that effective instruction relies on the cohesive integration of planning, execution, and evaluation.

Given these findings, it is recommended that college administrators enhance institutional mentorship and introduce focused professional development programs aimed at improving advanced instructional strategies, promoting active learning, and ensuring better alignment between teaching and assessment practices. College instructors are encouraged to maintain high standards in instructional planning while ensuring alignment between classroom delivery and assessment practices. They should also participate in peer observation and collaborative teaching to enhance instructional effectiveness. Future investigators are urged to embrace mixed-method approaches to gain a deeper insight into instructional practices within state universities and colleges, especially concerning new educational needs and changing teaching environments.

(Disclaimer: While artificial intelligence (AI) was used for language enhancement, all concepts that were generated are entirely original.)

References

- Bibon, Michael B. (2022). Teachers' Instructional Practices and Learners' Academic Achievement in Science. *Contemporary Mathematics and Science Education*, 3(1), ep22007. <https://doi.org/10.30935/conmaths/11816>
- Castro, F. L. T., Ventura, B. L. O., Estajal, R. S., Timpango-Macario, J., Limen, M. V., Garil, B. A., & Chavez, J. V. (2024). Teachers handling multiple subject areas: Difficulties and adaptive attributes in the delivery of instructions. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2520>
- Chavez, J. V. (2023). Assessing Online Academic Integrity and Humanized Teaching in Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University. <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/sduhs/article/view/268335>
- Chavez, J. V., Quinto, J. B., Samilo, P. J. E., Cabiles, N. V. A., Cuilan, J. T., Miralles, A. C., Suazo, M. L. S. A., Salvaleon, R. G., Samarca, A. Y., & Cruz, J. L. (2025b). Intentional learning styles and practices of parents towards their children: Strengthening discipline for language learning. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(8). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i8.3830>
- Chavez, J., & Lamorinas, D. D. (2023). Reconfiguring assessment practices and strategies in online education during the pandemic. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 10(1), 160–174. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.1094589>
- Clavel, J. G., Crespo, F. J. G., & Méndez, I. (2016). Are teacher characteristics and teaching practices associated with student performance? (Policy Brief No. 11). International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B. & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development, *Applied Developmental Science*, 24:2, 97-140, DOI: 10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791. To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- Entong, M. B. M., Garil, B. A., Muarip, V. C., & Chavez, J. V. (2024). Language Delivery Styles in Academic Trainings: Analysis of Speaker' s Emotional Connection to Audience for Lasting Learning. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(3), 326–342. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6533>
- Francisco, C.D.C. & Celon, L.C. (2020). Teachers' Instructional Practices and Its Effects on Students' Academic Performance. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Multidisciplinary Studies*; Vol.6, Issue.7, pp.64-71, July (2020). E-ISSN: 2454-9312
- Harackiewicz, J.M., Smith, J.L. & Priniski, S.J. (2016). Interest Matters: The Importance of Promoting Interest in Education. *Policy Insights Behav Brain Sci*. 2016 October ; 3(2): 220–227. doi:10.1177/2372732216655542.
- Kennedy, Mary M. (2016). How Does Professional Development Improve Teaching? Review of Educational Research Month 201X, Vol. XX, No. X, pp. 1 –36 DOI: 10.3102/0034654315626800 © 2016 AERA. <http://rer.aera.net>
- Kolb, Alice Y. & Kolb, David A. (2017). Experiential Learning Theory as a Guide for Experiential Educators in Higher Education. *Experiential Learning & Teaching in Higher Education*: Vol. 1 : No. 1 , Article 7. Available at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/elthe/vol1/iss1/7>
- Mangila, Benjamin B. (2022). Teaching Effectiveness and Work Performance of General Education Instructors in a Higher Education Institution in the Philippines. *Akademika* 92(3), 2022: 91-99. <https://doi.org/10.17576/akad-2022-9203-07>

- Ortega, M. L. V. (2025). Effectiveness of an enhanced physical science learning material in teaching Grade 10 learners. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 14, 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v14i1.217>
- Pellegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (Eds.). (2012). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century*. The National Academies Press.
- Salacut, M.F.G., Bagalanon, R. & Rosel, M.B. (2025). College Instructors' Teaching Effectiveness Vis-À-Vis Students' Academic Performance: an Empirical Study at Philippine Advent College. *The Threshold Volume XVII Issue 1 January– March 2025*
- Schneider, M., & Preckel, F. (2017). Variables Associated With Achievement in Higher Education: A Systematic Review of Meta-Analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/bul0000098>
- Steinert, Y. et al. (2016). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to enhance teaching effectiveness: A 10-year update: BEME Guide No. 40. *MEDICAL TEACHER*, 2016; VOL. 38, NO. 8, 769–786. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1181851>
- Verdeflor, R. N., Gayrama, V. P., Cabalbag, J. R., Sabonsolin, R. T., Panit, N. M., Aquino, W. G., & Sintos, J. R. (2025). Fear of numbers: How learners overcome mathematics anxiety through positive teaching practices and instructional intervention. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(5). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i5.3301>