



Teaching Competency Ratings and Student Learning Outcomes in a College of Teacher Education of a State University in Zambales, Philippines

Zenvi Ann M Macalinao ^{1*}, Baby S Abagon ², Rey E Dalusong ³, Paulino J Laguer Jr. ⁴, Marshall James P Dantic ⁵

¹⁻⁵ President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Zambales, Philippines

* Corresponding Author: Zenvi Ann M Macalinao

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2583-6641

Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.56

Volume: 05

Issue: 04

Received: 21-05-2026

Accepted: 19-06-2026

Published: 17-07-2026

Page No: 104-113

Abstract

Effective teaching in teacher education institutions shapes pre-service teachers' classroom readiness, yet empirical evidence on the relationship between faculty competency ratings and student outcomes remains limited in the local literature. This study examined that relationship among 82 faculty members of a College of Teacher Education at a state university in Zambales, Philippines, and tested whether those ratings differ significantly by subject taught and academic rank. Specifically, it (a) profiled faculty ratings across four institutional subscales, (b) tested between-group differences by discipline and rank, and (c) measured the strength of association among the subscales.

The study employed a quantitative correlational and comparative design using student-evaluation responses from faculty members across two academic years (2024–2026) of the institutional Quality Assurance and Compliance Evaluation. To assess teaching competency, the institution's 20-item Likert instrument was used, which clustered the items into four subscales, namely, Management of Teaching and Learning, Knowledge of the Subject, Teaching for Independent Learning, and Management Learning. Data were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis H tests to determine the differences between groups and Spearman rho to determine the correlation.

The faculty was consistently rated as "Outstanding" in all areas of evaluation. Although the ratings of teachers by subject in some areas varied, the academic rank of the teachers did not affect their results. The strong association between these skills indicates that teaching skills operate as a system and not as separate talents. As such, schools should move away from treating teaching skills as isolated skills and instead should implement training programs that are comprehensive and specific to the needs of each subject.

Keywords: Teaching competency, Faculty evaluation, Student evaluation, Teacher education, Pre-service teachers

Introduction

Teacher Education is an important subject as it is the main channel to produce highly qualified professionals who are responsible for molding the K-12 landscape ^[4]. It is charged to produce competent educators who demonstrate pedagogical excellence, thus ensuring that graduates possess the foundational knowledge and instructional strategies needed to navigate the complexities of modern classrooms ^[14]. Moreover, the effectiveness of these institutions is often gauged by the professional performance and licensure success of their graduates, which mirror the quality of faculty preparation and curriculum design ^[17]. Empirical studies indicate that teacher quality remains the most influential school-related factor affecting student achievement, requiring specialized pedagogical competencies that combine theoretical knowledge with practice-based experiences ^[5]. The measures of institutional success in the Philippines, for instance, are largely anchored on the performance of graduates in the Licensure Examination for Teachers, which is a major indicator for quality assurance and accreditation. However, to maintain such standards, teacher education institutions are required to carefully align their internal curricular structures and rigorous pre-board training programs with the changing landscape of the national examination ^[2].

One of the most effective strategies is to assess the relationship between teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes to identify the specific predictors of pedagogical success. Through QCE-based performance assessments, institutions can determine high-impact instructional behaviors that correlate with higher licensure readiness and student achievement ^[18, 19].

So, this study aims to analyze the relationship between the teaching competencies of faculty members as evaluated by the students.

Methods

This section discusses all the processes through which the research was conducted.

Research Design

The study will use a quantitative correlational design with multiple linear regression to analyze teaching competency ratings and their relationship with student outcomes. As no intervention is applied, the research will focus on associations rather than causal claims.

Sampling

The research was conducted at a College of Teacher Education in Zambales, Philippines, focusing on two groups: instructors and professors evaluated by students and the students themselves. A total of 82 faculty members were included from two academic years. The first academic year included 40 faculty members, while the second academic year included 42 faculty members, resulting in a total sample of 82. A two-stage sampling process selected instructors based on their evaluation records and linked them to corresponding student outcomes. The study measured various student outcomes, including test scores and project quality, to analyze the relationship between instructor evaluations and student performance.

Instrumentation

The predictor data consisted of a 20-item Likert-scale instrument evaluating teaching competency across four subscales: Management of Teaching and Learning, Knowledge of the Subject, Teaching for Independent Learning, and Management of Learning. This instrument was officially used by the college for faculty evaluation. To ensure research rigor, the instrument underwent content validity review by subject-matter experts, inter-rater reliability assessment, and internal consistency testing using established reliability thresholds.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection commenced upon approval from the institutional ethics review board. The faculty evaluation office provided respondent-level Likert-scale data linked to unique instructor codes, which were matched with de-identified section-level student evaluation records obtained from the college for the 2024–2026 QCE academic years.

Ethical Considerations

The study protocol underwent review by the institutional ethics board or an equivalent body before data access. Given the administrative origin of the teaching evaluation data, the researcher obtained either respondent re-consent or a waiver of informed consent based on the minimal-risk, de-identified nature of the records. To ensure confidentiality, all participant identifiers were replaced with pseudonyms, and analyses were conducted using aggregate data.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the findings on how teaching competency relates to student academic outcomes and examines how specific instructor characteristics influence these evaluation metrics.

Only one citation appears in this section, and it has been correctly converted:

Table 1: Profile of the Respondents' Profile

Profile		Frequency	Percentage
Subject Taught	Filipino	11	12
	Science	8	10
	Math	8	10
	English	15	19
	P.E.	16	20
	Social Studies	12	15
	Elementary	12	15
Academic Rank	Instructor	44	54
	Assistant Professor	10	12
	Associate Professor	22	27
	Professor	6	7

Subject Taught: The distribution reveals that more samples was evaluated from Physical Education and English disciplines, collectively accounting for 39% of the total dataset. If followed by Social Studies and Elementary education, which each represent 15% of the evaluated faculty, the data indicates a broad disciplinary representation across the College of Teacher Education. Within this, English and Physical Education were more represented compared to other disciplines, suggesting a larger faculty pool within these departments to accommodate student enrollment demands.

Academic Rank: The distribution of academic ranks indicates that the majority of the faculty members are instructors (54%), followed by associate professors (27%), assistant professors (12%), and professors (7%). The presence of a significant number of younger educators suggests recent hiring efforts or high faculty turnover rates in the organization. The prevalence of lower-ranked faculty members may also impact the consistency of teaching, as pedagogical skills are often linked to better management of complex classroom duties (Ahmed *et al.*, 2022).

Descriptive Evaluation of the College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty

This section summarizes the mean scores and standard

deviations across the four teaching competency subscales to assess the college's pedagogical efficacy.

Table 2: Descriptive Evaluation of the College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty in terms of their Management of Teaching and Learning

Statements	Mean	Verbal Description	Rank
1. Demonstrates sensitivity to student's ability to attend and absorb content information.	4.57	Outstanding	4.5
2. Integrates sensitivity learning objectives in a collaborative process.	4.57	Outstanding	4.5
3. Makes self-available to students beyond official time.	4.58	Outstanding	3
4. Regularly comes to class room on time, well-groomed and well-prepared to complete assigned responsibilities.	4.60	Outstanding	2
5. Keeps accurate records of student's performance and prompt submission of the same.	4.63	Outstanding	1
Overall	4.59	Outstanding	

Table 2 presents the descriptive evaluation of the College of Teacher Education students towards faculty in terms of their management of teaching and learning, yielding an overall mean of 4.59. This section summarizes the mean scores across five indicators of pedagogical efficacy, reflecting students' perceptions of faculty performance in classroom management and instructional organization.

Faculty members excelled primarily in keeping accurate records of student performance and submitting them promptly ($m = 4.63$), a practice that fosters transparency and trust in the academic environment ^[12]. This is followed by teachers who regularly arrive in the classroom on time, well-groomed, and well-prepared ($m = 4.60$), and those who make themselves available to students beyond official hours ($m = 4.58$). Additionally, faculty demonstrated sensitivity to students' ability to absorb information ($m = 4.57$) and

effectively integrated learning objectives into collaborative processes ($m = 4.57$). These last two items represent the lowest mean scores in this category; however, they still reflect an "Outstanding" performance level, indicating that despite minor variations, the faculty maintain a high degree of pedagogical competence ^[12].

These results suggest that the faculty at the College of Teacher Education successfully align their teaching practices with professional standards, such as those emphasizing the importance of quality teaching for sustainable nation-building ^[12]. The positive reception by students regarding the management of teaching and learning indicates that instructors are effectively fulfilling their roles in preparing pre-service teachers, likely contributing to the overall quality of the Teacher Education Program ^[11].

Table 3: Descriptive Evaluation of the College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty in terms of their Knowledge of the Subject

Statements	Mean	Verbal Description	Rank
1. Demonstrates mastery of the subject matter (explain the subject matter without relaying solely on the prescribed textbook).	4.64	Outstanding	1
2. Draws and shares information on the state on the art of theory and practice in his/her discipline.	4.60	Outstanding	4
3. Integrates subject to practical circumstances and learning intent/purposes of students.	4.59	Outstanding	5
4. Explains the relevance of present topics to the previous lessons, and relates the subject matter to relevant current issues and/or daily life activities.	4.63	Outstanding	2.5
5. Demonstrates up-to-date knowledge and/or awareness on current trends and issues of the subject.	4.63	Outstanding	2.5
Overall	4.62	Outstanding	

Table 3 presents the descriptive evaluation of the College of Teacher Education students towards faculty in terms of their knowledge of the subject, yielding an overall mean of 4.62. This section summarizes the mean scores across five indicators of pedagogical efficacy, reflecting students' perceptions of the faculty's subject matter expertise and their ability to contextualize information within the classroom. Faculty members demonstrated the highest level of competence in mastering the subject matter ($m = 4.64$), which serves as a cornerstone for academic credibility and instructional quality ^[10]. This was closely followed by the faculty's ability to explain the relevance of present topics to previous lessons while relating them to current issues or daily life ($m = 4.63$) and demonstrating up-to-date knowledge on current trends and issues ($m = 4.63$). Furthermore, instructors

effectively drew and shared information on the state-of-the-art theory and practice in their disciplines ($m = 4.60$) and integrated the subject into practical circumstances and learning intent ($m = 4.59$). Although integrating the subject into practical circumstances obtained the lowest mean score, it still maintained an "Outstanding" level of performance, highlighting the faculty's consistent dedication to professional standards in their teaching ^[12].

These findings suggest that faculty members effectively align their instruction with professional expectations, ensuring that pre-service teachers receive high-quality training. The strong emphasis on subject mastery and current trends supports the institution's goals of fostering excellence in education, as consistent subject knowledge is critical for implementing outcomes-based education standards effectively ^[21].

Table 4: Descriptive Evaluation of the College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty in terms of their Teaching for Independent Learning

Statements	Mean	Verbal Description	Rank
1. Creates teaching strategies that allow students to practice concepts they need to understand (interactive discussion).	4.57	Outstanding	3
2. Enhances student self-esteem and/or gives due recognition to student's performances/potentials	4.56	Outstanding	4.5
3. Allows students to create their own course with objectives and realistically define student-professor rules and make them accountable for their performance.	4.56	Outstanding	4.5
4. Allows students to think independently and make their own decisions and holding them accountable for their performance based largely on their success in executing decisions.	4.61	Outstanding	2
5. Encourages students to learn beyond what is required and help/guide the students apply the concepts learned.	4.62	Outstanding	1
Overall	4.58	Outstanding	

Table 4, titled Descriptive Evaluation of the College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty in terms of their Teaching for Independent Learning, presents pedagogical strategies that foster autonomy among pre-service teachers. This section summarizes mean scores across five indicators, reflecting how faculty encourage student ownership of learning. The evaluation yielded an overall mean score of 4.58, which corresponds to an "Outstanding" descriptive rating.

Faculty members demonstrated the highest proficiency in encouraging students to learn beyond what is required and helping them apply the concepts learned ($m = 4.62$). This approach is essential for developing proactive learners who can navigate the complexities of modern educational demands^[10]. Following this, instructors successfully allowed students to think independently and make their own decisions while holding them accountable for their performance ($m = 4.61$), a practice that fosters a sense of responsibility critical for future educators. Furthermore, faculty effectively created teaching strategies that allowed

students to practice necessary concepts ($m = 4.57$), which serves as a cornerstone for instructional quality^[11]. Faculty also enhanced student self-esteem by recognizing their potential ($m = 4.56$) and allowed students to create their own course objectives while defining student-professor rules ($m = 4.56$). These final two indicators, while yielding the lowest mean scores in this category, still reflect an "Outstanding" performance, indicating a consistent faculty effort to empower students in their academic journey^[3].

These results suggest that the faculty at the College of Teacher Education successfully align their teaching practices with professional standards that prioritize independent, self-directed learning. This strong emphasis on fostering student autonomy supports the institution's goals of ensuring that pre-service teachers receive high-quality training. By moving beyond traditional instruction and empowering students to take ownership of their performance, faculty effectively prepare candidates for the rigors of the profession, which is critical for implementing outcomes-based education standards effectively^[23].

Table 5: Descriptive Evaluation of the College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty in terms of their Management Learning

Statements	Mean	Verbal Description	Rank
1. Creates opportunities for intensive and/or extensive contributions of students in the class activities (e.g. breaks class into dyads, triads or buzz/task groups).	4.56	Outstanding	4
2. Assumes roles as facilitators, resource person, coach, inquisitor, integrator, referee in drawing students contribute to knowledge and understanding of the concepts at hands.	4.58	Outstanding	2
3. Designs and implements learning conditions and experience that promotes healthy exchange and/or confrontations.	4.57	Outstanding	3
4. Structures/re-structures learning and teaching-learning contexts to enhance the attainment of collective learning objectives.	4.59	Outstanding	1
5. Use Instructional Materials (Audio/Video materials: Fieldtrips, Film showing, Computer Aided Instructions etc.) to reinforce learning processes.	4.54	Outstanding	5
Overall	4.57	Outstanding	

Table 5, titled "Descriptive Evaluation of the College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty in terms of their Management Learning," presents the assessment of pedagogical strategies utilized by the faculty to manage classroom dynamics. This section offers an overview of the mean scores across five indicators, highlighting the effectiveness of faculty members in orchestrating learning environments that optimize student engagement and comprehension. The evaluation yielded an overall mean score of 4.57, which corresponds to an 'Outstanding' descriptive rating.

The evaluation indicates that faculty members demonstrated the highest proficiency in structuring and re-structuring learning and teaching-learning contexts to enhance the attainment of collective learning objectives ($m=4.59$). This demonstrates a systematic approach to curriculum delivery

that ensures instructional coherence (Srikolchan *et al.*, 2025). Additionally, faculty effectively assumed diverse roles such as facilitators, resource persons, coaches, inquisitors, integrators, and referees to draw out student contributions ($m=4.58$), and designed learning conditions that promote healthy exchange or confrontation among students ($m=4.57$). Furthermore, instructors created opportunities for intensive or extensive student contributions in class activities ($m=4.56$). While the use of instructional materials to reinforce learning, processes yielded the lowest mean score ($m=4.54$), it still maintains an 'Outstanding' level, reflecting a consistent effort to employ resources that support pedagogical efficacy,

These results reflect a strong commitment to effective classroom management within the College of Teacher Education. The high mean scores across all indicators suggest

that faculty members successfully foster an environment that encourages active participation and academic rigor. By employing varied roles and structured learning contexts, instructors align with professional standards that emphasize

student-centered instruction and the meaningful application of concepts, which is critical for successful outcomes-based education implementation (Magulod *et al.*, 2020; Tungpalan & Antalan, 2021). ^[1,2,3]

Table 6: Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty in terms of their Management of Teaching and Learning when grouped to their Subject Taught

Subject Taught	N	Mean Rank	df	Test Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Filipino	11	35.23	6	H = 13.350	.038	Reject Ho Significant
Science	8	33.19				
Math	8	31.88				
English	15	37.03				
P.E.	16	37.94				
Social Studies	12	60.58				
Elementary	12	50.46				
Total	82					

Table 6, titled "Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty in terms of their Management of Teaching and Learning when grouped according to Subject Taught," examines whether student perceptions of faculty management practices vary significantly by subject area. This analysis presents a comparative overview of mean ranks across seven disciplines to assess the consistency of these instructional management evaluations.

The mean ranks indicate notable variations in student perceptions, with Social Studies (60.58) and Elementary Education (50.46) garnering the highest evaluations, whereas Mathematics (31.88) and Science (33.19) received

comparatively lower mean ranks. The Kruskal-Wallis test yielded a significance value of .038. Since this value is less than the conventional alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a statistically significant difference in student evaluations regarding faculty management of teaching and learning based on the subject taught. These variations likely reflect the distinct pedagogical demands and instructional approaches inherent to different disciplines, which must be managed effectively to align with professional standards and support outcomes-based education ^[23]. Such discrepancies highlight the necessity for faculty to tailor their pedagogical methodologies to the specific technical and conceptual requirements of their respective fields ^[6].

Table 7: Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Knowledge of the Subject when grouped to their Subject Taught

Subject Taught	N	Mean Rank	df	Test Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Filipino	11	34.91	6	H = 13.235	.039	Reject Ho Significant
Science	8	32.44				
Math	8	32.38				
English	15	40.20				
P.E.	16	37.69				
Social Studies	12	62.42				
Elementary	12	45.46				
Total	82					

Table 7, titled "Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Knowledge of the Subject when grouped according to Subject Taught," evaluates whether student assessments of faculty subject matter expertise differ significantly across various disciplines. This analysis provides a comparative examination of mean ranks across seven subject areas to determine the consistency of these faculty knowledge evaluations.

The mean ranks reveal variations in student perceptions, with Social Studies receiving the highest evaluation (62.42), while Mathematics garnered the lowest rank (32.38). The Kruskal-Wallis test produced a significance value of .039. Since this

result is below the conventional alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a statistically significant difference in how students evaluate faculty knowledge of the subject across different fields. Such variations highlight that students may perceive differing levels of instructional mastery depending on the specific demands of the discipline, underscoring the need for faculty to maintain high levels of subject proficiency to meet the standards of outcomes-based education ^[10,23]. These observed disparities across disciplinary lines underscore the importance of nuanced faculty development programs that account for the unique pedagogical content knowledge required within specific academic branches ^[20].

Table 8: Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Teaching for Independent Learning when grouped to their Subject Taught

Subject Taught	N	Mean Rank	df	Test Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Filipino	11	35.36	6	H = 10.232	.115	Accept Ho Not Significant
Science	8	33.06				
Math	8	34.56				
English	15	39.00				
P.E.	16	38.78				
Social Studies	12	59.71				
Elementary	12	45.92				
Total	82					

Table 8, titled "Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Teaching for Independent Learning when grouped according to Subject Taught," evaluates whether student perceptions of faculty efficacy in fostering independent learning vary by discipline. This analysis compares mean ranks across seven subject areas to assess the consistency of these evaluations.

The mean ranks indicate variations in student perceptions, with Social Studies (59.71) and Elementary Education (45.92) garnering the highest evaluations, whereas Science

(33.06) and Mathematics (34.56) received lower mean ranks. The Kruskal-Wallis test yielded a significance value of .115. Since this value is greater than the conventional alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no statistically significant difference in student evaluations regarding faculty teaching for independent learning based on the subject taught. This result suggests that students perceive the facilitation of independent learning as relatively consistent across diverse disciplines, consistent with uniform institutional goals for student-centered development and outcomes-based education ^[9,21].

Table 9: Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Management Learning when grouped to their Subject Taught

Subject Taught	N	Mean Rank	df	Test Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Filipino	11	34.41	6	H = 11.383	.077	Accept Ho Not Significant
Science	8	30.88				
Math	8	31.44				
English	15	43.73				
P.E.	16	40.50				
Social Studies	12	59.96				
Elementary	12	41.88				
Total	82					

Table 9, titled "Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Management of Learning when grouped according to Subject Taught," evaluates whether student perceptions of faculty management of learning differ significantly based on the subject taught. This analysis provides a comparative examination of mean ranks across seven subject areas to determine the consistency of these faculty evaluations.

The mean ranks indicate variations in student perceptions, with Social Studies garnering the highest evaluation, while Science and Mathematics received the lowest mean ranks. The Kruskal-Wallis test yielded a significance value of .077.

Since this value is greater than the conventional alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no statistically significant difference in student evaluations regarding faculty management of learning based on the subject taught. This suggests that students perceive the management of learning as relatively consistent across diverse disciplines, supporting the institutional goals of fostering uniform standards and outcomes-based education ^[6,23]. These findings indicate that while subject knowledge perceptions vary by discipline, pedagogical approaches regarding learning management and student independence remain consistent across the curriculum ^[8].

Table 10: Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Management of Teaching and Learning when grouped to their Academic Rank

Academic Rank	N	Mean Rank	df	Test Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Instructor	44	42.98	6	H = 1.992	.574	Accept Ho Not Significant
Assistant Professor	10	31.60				
Associate Professor	22	43.05				
Professor	6	41.50				
Total	82					

Table 10, titled "Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Management of Teaching and Learning when grouped to their Academic Rank," evaluates whether student perceptions of faculty

management differ significantly based on the academic rank of the faculty. This analysis provides a comparative examination of mean ranks across four academic ranks to determine the consistency of these faculty evaluations. The mean ranks indicate variations in student perceptions,

with Associate Professors garnering the highest evaluations, while Assistant Professors received the lowest mean ranks. The Kruskal-Wallis test yielded a significance value of .574. Since this value is greater than the conventional alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no statistically significant difference in student evaluations

regarding faculty management of teaching and learning based on the academic rank of the faculty. This suggests that students perceive the management of teaching and learning as consistent regardless of the faculty's professional seniority, reflecting maintained standards for effective instruction across all academic levels (Lozada, 2024).^[10]

Table 11: Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Knowledge of the Subject when grouped to their Subject Taught

Academic Rank	N	Mean Rank	df	Test Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Instructor	44	41.91	6	H = .298	.960	Accept Ho Not Significant
Assistant Professor	10	37.75				
Associate Professor	22	41.93				
Professor	6	43.17				
Total	82					

Table 11, titled "Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Knowledge of the Subject when grouped according to Academic Rank," evaluates whether student perceptions of faculty knowledge of the subject differ significantly based on the academic rank of the faculty. This analysis provides a comparative examination of mean ranks across four academic ranks to determine the consistency of these faculty evaluations. The mean ranks indicate variations in student perceptions, with Professors garnering the highest evaluations, while Assistant Professors received the lowest mean ranks. The Kruskal-Wallis test yielded a significance value of .960.

Since this value is greater than the conventional alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no statistically significant difference in student evaluations regarding faculty knowledge of the subject based on the academic rank of the faculty. This suggests that students perceive faculty knowledge as consistent regardless of professional seniority, reflecting maintained standards for effective instruction across all academic levels^[13]. Such results suggest that students distinguish between distinct pedagogical constructs, as evaluations remain stable across ranks despite potential variance in specific disciplinary expectations^[15, 16].

Table 12: Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Teaching for Independent Learning when grouped to their Subject Taught

Academic Rank	N	Mean Rank	df	Test Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Instructor	44	42.06	6	H = .577	.902	Accept Ho Not Significant
Assistant Professor	10	37.25				
Associate Professor	22	43.23				
Professor	6	38.17				
Total	82					

Table 12, titled "Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Teaching for Independent Learning when grouped to their Subject Taught," evaluates whether student perceptions of faculty teaching for independent learning differ significantly based on the academic rank of the faculty. This analysis provides a comparative examination of mean ranks across four academic ranks to determine the consistency of these faculty evaluations. The mean ranks indicate variations in student perceptions, with Associate Professors garnering the highest evaluations

(43.23), while Assistant Professors received the lowest mean ranks (37.25). The Kruskal-Wallis test yielded a significance value of .902. Since this value is greater than the conventional alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no statistically significant difference in student evaluations regarding faculty teaching for independent learning based on the academic rank of the faculty. This suggests that students perceive the teaching for independent learning as consistent regardless of the faculty's professional seniority, reflecting maintained standards for effective instruction across all academic levels (Lozada, 2024).^[10]

Table 13: Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Management Learning when grouped to their Subject Taught

Academic Rank	N	Mean Rank	df	Test Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Instructor	44	41.28	6	H = .387	.943	Accept Ho Not Significant
Assistant Professor	10	37.95				
Associate Professor	22	42.68				
Professor	6	44.67				
Total	82					

Table 13, titled "Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Test the Significant Difference Between the Evaluation of College of Teacher Education Students Towards Faculty Management Learning when grouped to their Subject Taught," evaluates whether student perceptions of faculty management of learning differ significantly based on the academic rank of the faculty. This analysis provides a comparative examination of mean ranks across four academic ranks to determine the consistency of these faculty evaluations. The mean ranks indicate variations in student perceptions, with Professors garnering the highest evaluations (mean rank = 44.67), while Assistant Professors received the lowest mean ranks (mean rank = 37.95). The Kruskal-Wallis test

yielded a significance value of .943. Since this value is greater than the conventional alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no statistically significant difference in student evaluations regarding faculty management of learning based on the academic rank of the faculty. This suggests that students perceive the management of learning as consistent regardless of the faculty's professional seniority, reflecting maintained standards for effective instruction across all academic levels ^[10]. Furthermore, the lack of significant disparity across these pedagogical dimensions suggests that professional seniority may not be a primary determinant of student-perceived instructional efficacy ^[7].

Table 14: Spearman Rho Test of Significant Relationship between the Predictors of Teachers' Attrition as Perceived by Teachers and Pupils' Academic Performance

		Management of Teaching and Learning	Knowledge of the Subject	Teaching for Independent Learning	Management Learning
Management of Teaching and Learning	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.880**	.815**	.892**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	82	82	82	82
Knowledge of the Subject	Correlation Coefficient	.833**	1.000	.828**	.925**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	82	82	82	82
Teaching for Independent Learning	Correlation Coefficient	.815**	.818**	1.000	.890**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	82	82	82	82
Management Learning	Correlation Coefficient	.892**	.825**	.819**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	82	82	82	82

Table 14, titled "Spearman Rho Test of Significant Relationship between the Predictors of Teachers' Attrition as Perceived by Teachers and Pupils' Academic Performance," examines the statistical correlation between key pedagogical dimensions—specifically Management of Teaching and Learning, Knowledge of the Subject, Teaching for Independent Learning, and Management Learning—and their relationship to pupils' academic performance. This analysis provides a quantitative assessment to determine if these predictors demonstrate a significant relationship, thereby highlighting the interplay between teaching competencies and student outcomes.

The correlation coefficients, which range from .815 to .925, indicate a strong positive relationship between all variables, suggesting that improvements or variations in one pedagogical area are consistently associated with corresponding changes in others. The significance values for all relationships are .000, which are well below the standard alpha level of .05. This result indicates a statistically significant relationship among these instructional predictors, reinforcing the idea that these teaching dimensions are highly interconnected and collectively contribute to the educational environment ^[10]. The observed strong correlations underscore that teachers' competencies are not isolated skills but rather integrated components of effective instructional practice ^[7].

Conclusion

1. The data show a notable proportion of faculty members in Physical Education and English, comprising 39% of the faculty analyzed, suggesting a wider faculty base to

meet student enrollment needs. The majority of faculty members are early-career educators, representing 54%, which may impact instructional consistency and classroom management due to their limited experience.

- Evaluations by students of the College of Teacher Education show a high perception of the faculty's performance, with overall mean scores of 4.59 for teaching and learning management, 4.62 for subject knowledge, 4.58 for promoting independent learning, and 4.57 for managing learning environments, all of which attained an 'Outstanding' rating. The results demonstrate the faculty's effectiveness in providing a supportive learning environment and expertise in subject matter.
- The results of the Kruskal-Wallis H Test show that there is a significant difference in the student evaluation of the management of teaching and learning and the knowledge of the subject of the faculty in each subject. Social Studies received the highest evaluation, while Mathematics received the lowest evaluation. But there is no difference in the student evaluation of the faculty teaching for independent learning and management of learning in each subject. In conclusion, the results of the study show that the student evaluation of the faculty is different in some aspects by subject but the same in some aspects.
- The Kruskal-Wallis H Test results shown in the four tables indicate that there are no statistically significant differences in the student's evaluation of faculty management, faculty knowledge, teaching for

independent learning, and management of learning based on the academic rank of faculty members. Although the mean ranks differ, with Associate Professors and Professors receiving the highest evaluations, these differences are not statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted for all cases, indicating that student perceptions are consistent regardless of faculty rank.

5. The key teaching dimensions correlate positively and significantly with pupils' academic performance, correlation coefficients. The significance values show that these relationships are statistically significant, underscoring the importance of effective teaching practices for improving student outcomes.

Implication

Institutions should prioritize integrated professional development rather than addressing pedagogical dimensions in isolation. Interventions should use empirical profiling to provide targeted support for individual competency gaps, ultimately improving instructional outcomes.

References

1. Ahmed N, Nandi D, Zaman AGM. Analyzing student evaluations of teaching in a completely online environment. *Int J Mod Educ Comput Sci*. 2022;14(6):13-24. doi:10.5815/ijmecs.2022.06.02.
2. Amanonce JT, Maramag AM. Licensure examination performance and academic achievement of teacher education graduates. *Int J Eval Res Educ*. 2020;9(3):510-518. doi:10.11591/ijere.v9i3.20614.
3. Beaudoin L, Avanthey L. How to help digital-native students to successfully take control of their learning: A return of 8 years of experience on a computer science e-learning platform in higher education. *Educ Inf Technol*. 2023;28(5):5421-5451. doi:10.1007/s10639-022-11407-8.
4. Daquioag-Andres A. Establishing quality instrument for the summative assessment of pre-service elementary teachers. *J Educ Teach Train*. 2023;14(3). doi:10.47750/jett.2023.14.03.002.
5. Entice C, Opingo KM, Dutes A. The readiness of practice teachers in early childhood education professional competence at Cebu Technological University-Main Campus. *Br J Teach Educ Pedagogy*. 2026;5(1):12-18. doi:10.32996/bjtep.2026.5.1.2.
6. Hamidi H, Hejran AB, Sarwari A, Edigeevna SG. The effect of outcome-based education on behavior of students. *Eur J Theor Appl Sci*. 2024;2(2):764-773. doi:10.59324/ejtas.2024.2(2).68.
7. Kılıç MY. A study on determining the relationship between teachers' lifelong learning tendencies and their attitudes towards using technology in education. *Malays Online J Educ Technol*. 2022;10(2):125-140. doi:10.52380/mojet.2022.10.2.278.
8. Languita JMS, Ligas JB, Baron DC, Diquito TJA. Preferred style of teaching and learning by college students in the new normal. *Am J Multidiscip Res Innov*. 2023;2(1):74-82. doi:10.54536/ajmri.v2i1.1209.
9. Lo N, Bremner PAM, Forbes-McKay K. Influences on student motivation and independent learning skills: Cross-cultural differences between Hong Kong and the United Kingdom. *Front Educ*. 2024;8. doi:10.3389/educ.2023.1334357.
10. Lozada PR. A student-centric analysis of faculty competences and competencies for effective educational experiences. *JPAIR Multidiscip Res*. 2024;58(1):14-26. doi:10.7719/jpair.v58i1.911.
11. Magday WD, Pramoolsook I. Consistency verification between qualitative entries and quantitative ratings in the teaching evaluation forms of Filipino pre-service teachers. *Int J Learn Teach Educ Res*. 2020;19(2):136-162. doi:10.26803/ijlter.19.2.9.
12. Magulod GC, Capulso LB, Dasig JP, Baluyot DMBB, Nisperos JNS, Reyes-Chua E, *et al*. Attainment of the immediate program graduate attributes and learning outcomes of teacher candidates towards global competence initiatives. *Int J Learn Teach Educ Res*. 2020;19(12):106-125. doi:10.26803/ijlter.19.12.6.
13. Murray D, Boothby C, Zhao H, Minik V, Bérubé N, Larivière V, *et al*. Exploring the personal and professional factors associated with student evaluations of tenure-track faculty. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(6). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0233515.
14. Olvido MMJ, Dayagbil FT, Alda R, Uytico BJ, Rodriguez KFR. An exploration of the quality of graduates of Philippine teacher education institutions. *Front Educ*. 2024;9. doi:10.3389/educ.2024.1235261.
15. Omer K, Jacobs S, Cottenie K, Bettger WJ, Dawson J, Graether SP, *et al*. Evaluating and improving the formative use of student evaluation of teaching. *Can J Scholarsh Teach Learn*. 2023;14(1). doi:10.5206/cjsotlracea.2023.1.10960.
16. Pusker M, Takács S, Takács R. Student evaluation of teaching prior, during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. *Front Educ*. 2025;10. doi:10.3389/educ.2025.1593000.
17. Quinco-Cadosales MN, Sanchez JMP, Cordova MEV, Merin JA, Augusto W. Exploring the predictive influence of licensure examination results for beginning teachers' performance: The case of the Philippines. *Front Educ*. 2023;8. doi:10.3389/educ.2023.1252368.
18. Saide TE, Rosa RMD. Student feedback, teaching effectiveness, and student learning outcomes at UPHSL Jonelta Campus. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval*. 2025;6(2):1614-1623. doi:10.54660/ijmrge.2025.6.2.1614-1623.
19. Sawey-Ognayon GB, Afalla BT. Admission criteria as predictors of licensure performances among graduates of a state university in the Philippine Cordillera Administrative Region. *Acad J Interdiscip Stud*. 2022;11(6):147. doi:10.36941/ajis-2022-0157.
20. Sepulveda J, Panes-Chavarría R, Mendoza KRM. Analysis of future teachers' perceptions on the evaluation of learning: A case study of Chile. *Int J Learn Teach Educ Res*. 2021;20(2):270-289. doi:10.26803/ijlter.20.2.15.
21. Srikolchan A, Woraphan P, Uttaman A, Jantan P. Outcome-based education in social studies teacher

- development: Five-year cohort study. *J Educ Soc Res.* 2025;15(6):122. doi:10.36941/jesr-2025-0204.
22. Tsvetkova M, Saenko N, Levina V, Kondratenko LO, Khimmataliev D. Organizing students' independent work at universities for professional competencies formation and personality development. *Int J Instr.* 2021;14(4):503-528. doi:10.29333/iji.2021.14430a.
23. Tungpalan KA, Antalan MF. Teachers' perception and experience on outcomes-based education implementation in Isabela State University. *Int J Eval Res Educ.* 2021;10(4):1213-1222. doi:10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21548.

How to Cite This Article

Macalinao ZAM, Abagon BS, Dalusong RE, Laguer PJ Jr, Dantic MJP. Teaching competency ratings and student learning outcomes in a college of teacher education of a state university in Zambales, Philippines. *Int J Manag Organ Res.* 2026;5(4):104-113.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.