

Faculty Teaching Competence and Professionalism: An Assessment Based on the Perceptions of 4th Year College of Business Administration Students in Research Subject at Wesleyan University–Philippines

Leonides F. Sarilla

Wesleyan University Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100300379>

Received: 22 March 2026; Accepted: 27 March 2026; Published: 09 April 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the teaching competence and professionalism of faculty members handling the Research subject as perceived by 4th year College of Business Administration students at Wesleyan University–Philippines. The study employed a descriptive–correlational research design with 300 purposively chosen respondents. A validated survey questionnaire served as the main data-gathering tool, while descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation were used for analysis. Results revealed that most respondents were young, female, and single. Faculty were rated as competent in teaching, particularly in classroom management and instructional delivery, though weaknesses were observed in integrating updated research materials, providing clear instructions, and giving constructive feedback. Professionalism was rated positively, with punctuality and preparedness as the strongest attribute, while respectful interaction scored the lowest, especially in listening attentively and showing empathy. Correlation analysis showed that age and sex significantly influenced students' perceptions in most dimensions of competence and professionalism, while civil status had limited effects.

The findings emphasized that while faculty members are perceived as competent and professional, improvement is needed in fostering inclusivity, enhancing fairness and transparency in evaluation, and strengthening student engagement strategies. The study recommends faculty training, institutional support programs, and continuous quality assurance initiatives to improve teaching competence and professionalism in higher education.

Keywords: Faculty competence, professionalism, instructional delivery, classroom management, student engagement, ethical behavior, fairness in grading, punctuality, higher education, business administration students

INTRODUCTION

Faculty teaching competence and professionalism are central to ensuring quality education in higher learning institutions. In today's competitive and rapidly changing academic environment, universities are tasked not only with imparting knowledge but also with shaping students into competent and ethical professionals. The role of faculty members in this regard is crucial, as their teaching competence directly influences students' learning outcomes, while their professionalism shapes the academic environment and students' respect for higher education (Darling-Hammond, 2017; González & Forés, 2019).

Teaching competence refers to a faculty member's ability to apply effective pedagogical skills, instructional strategies, and subject matter expertise that enhance the learning process. A competent teacher demonstrates mastery of content knowledge, effective communication, classroom management, and the ability to engage students in meaningful learning experiences (Ko, Sammons, & Bakkum, 2014). Professionalism, on the other hand, encompasses the values, attitudes, and behaviors that reflect integrity, ethical responsibility, and dedication to teaching. It includes being punctual, respectful, fair in assessment, and committed to continuous professional development (Boon, 2011). Together, competence and professionalism create a holistic framework for effective teaching and learning.

In the Philippine context, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) emphasizes the importance of faculty competence and professional conduct as vital components in achieving quality assurance in higher education. Business students, particularly those in their final year, are in a unique position to evaluate faculty performance since they have been exposed to diverse teaching styles and are preparing to transition into professional careers. Their perceptions provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of teaching and the professional conduct of faculty members, especially in research subjects where guidance and mentorship are critical (Sarmiento et al., 2021).

Given this background, this study assesses faculty teaching competence and professionalism based on the perceptions of 4th year College of Business Administration students at Wesleyan University–Philippines. The findings aim to highlight strengths and areas for improvement in faculty performance, thereby contributing to curriculum enhancement, faculty development programs, and ultimately the achievement of educational excellence.

Research Objectives

This study aimed to assess faculty teaching competence and professionalism as perceived by 4th Year College of Business Administration students in the Research subject at Wesleyan University–Philippines. Specifically, it sought to:

1. Determine the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, and academic standing.
2. Evaluate the teaching competence of faculty based on the perceptions of the respondents in areas such as subject matter expertise, instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement.
3. Assess the professionalism of faculty with regard to ethical behavior, fairness in evaluation and grading, punctuality and preparedness, and respectful interaction with students.
4. Determine significant relation between the profile of the respondents with the competence and professionalism of faculty.
5. Proposed recommendations to enhance the teaching competence and professionalism of faculty handling the Research subject in the College of Business Administration.

Hypothesis

There is on significant relation between the profile of the respondents with the competence and professionalism of faculty.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive–correlational research design to assess the perceptions of 4th Year College of Business Administration (CBA) students at Wesleyan University–Philippines regarding faculty teaching competence and professionalism in the Research subject. The descriptive aspect of the study was used to describe the profile of the respondents and their assessments of faculty competence and professionalism, while the correlational aspect sought to determine whether significant relationships exist between the respondents’ profiles and their perceptions. This design was deemed appropriate as it allows for both a comprehensive description and the identification of associations among variables (Creswell, 2014).

The respondents of the study consisted of at least 300 fourth-year Business Administration students officially enrolled in the Research subject during the academic year. This number was considered sufficient to generate reliable data for statistical analysis and ensure adequate representation of the target population. The sampling technique used was purposive random sampling, where only students enrolled in the Research subject were included, but within this group, participants were randomly chosen to avoid bias and provide equal chances for selection. This method ensured that the respondents were directly relevant to the objectives of the study.

The locale of the research was Wesleyan University–Philippines, specifically the College of Business Administration (CBA) Department. The university was selected as the site of the study since it offers comprehensive business programs and provides a suitable academic environment for evaluating faculty teaching competence and professionalism.

The research instrument used was a structured survey questionnaire composed of three parts: (1) the demographic profile of the respondents (age, sex, civil status, and academic standing); (2) items assessing faculty teaching competence in terms of subject matter expertise, instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement; and (3) items assessing faculty professionalism, focusing on ethical behavior, fairness, punctuality, preparedness, and respectful interaction. The instrument was validated by experts in research and education and subjected to a pilot test for reliability, yielding a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient greater than 0.80, indicating high internal consistency.

For the data collection procedure, formal permission was sought from the CBA Department prior to survey administration. After approval, questionnaires were distributed to the respondents during class hours to ensure a high retrieval rate. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, and voluntary participation was emphasized. Ethical considerations such as confidentiality and anonymity were strictly observed throughout the process.

The data analysis involved descriptive statistics, such as frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and standard deviation, to describe the profile of the respondents and their assessments of teaching competence and professionalism. Inferential statistics, including t-tests, ANOVA, and Pearson correlation, were employed to determine significant differences and relationships among the variables. All data were processed using SPSS software to ensure accuracy in statistical computations.

RESULTS DISCUSSIONS

Part 1. Profile of the respondents

Age	Frequency	Percent
20	250	83.3
21	30	10
22	20	6.7
Total	300	100
Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	86	28.7
Female	214	71.3
Total	300	100
Civil Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	297	99
Married	3	1
Total	300	100

The demographic profile of the 4th year College of Business Administration students at Wesleyan University–Philippines showed that a majority of the respondents were 20 years old, accounting for 250 students or 83.3% of the total population. This suggested that most of the students were within the typical age range for graduating college students. A smaller proportion, 10% (30 students), were 21 years old, while only 6.7% (20 students) were 22 years old, indicating that only a few students were slightly older than the expected age for their academic year level.

In terms of sex distribution, the data revealed a noticeable imbalance. Out of 300 respondents, 214 (71.3%) were female, while only 86 (28.7%) were male. This finding highlighted that the research subject, and possibly the program as a whole, was highly female-dominated. Such distribution reflected enrollment trends within the College of Business Administration, particularly in the chosen specialization.

Regarding civil status, an overwhelming majority of respondents were single (297 or 99%), while only 3 students (1%) were married. This was expected given that most respondents were still in their early twenties and were primarily focused on completing their education before entering more mature family roles.

The demographic profile established that the sample was largely composed of young, single male students, providing context for interpreting their perceptions of faculty teaching competence and professionalism. These characteristics may have influenced how they viewed and evaluated the teaching practices of their professors, as their perspectives were shaped by age, gender distribution, and life stage.

Part 2. Teaching competence of faculty based on the perceptions of the respondents in areas such as subject matter expertise, instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement.

	Subject matter expertise	W.M.	S.D.	V.D.
1.	The faculty demonstrates a thorough knowledge and understanding of research concepts and methodologies.	2.98	0.14	A.
2.	The faculty is able to explain complex research topics in a clear and understandable manner.	2.45	0.22	D.
3.	The faculty integrates relevant and updated research theories, examples, and case studies into class discussions.	2.49	0.23	D.
4.	The faculty confidently answers questions raised by students regarding research topics.	2.40	0.53	D.
5.	The faculty shows expertise in guiding students throughout the research process, from proposal to final defense.	2.49	0.33	D.
	A.W.M.	2.56	0.17	A
	Instructional delivery	W.M.	S.D.	V.D.
1.	The faculty presents lessons on research in a well-organized and systematic manner.	3.05	0.21	A.
2.	The faculty uses appropriate teaching strategies to make research concepts easier to understand.	3.08	0.28	A.
3.	The faculty provides clear instructions and guidelines for research-related tasks and requirements.	2.17	0.38	D.

4.	The faculty utilizes examples, illustrations, or activities that enhance student learning in research.	1.80	0.82	D.
5.	The faculty encourages active participation and interaction during class discussions on research topics.	2.86	0.62	A.
	A.W.M.	2.59	0.26	A.
	Classroom management	W.M.	S.D.	V.D.
1.	The faculty establishes clear rules and guidelines that promote order during research classes.	2.87	0.50	A.
2.	The faculty manages class time effectively to cover all necessary research topics and activities.	2.93	0.26	A.
3.	The faculty handles disruptions or distractions in the classroom in a professional manner.	2.92	0.27	A.
4.	The faculty maintains a learning environment that supports focus and productivity in research.	2.90	0.44	A.
5.	The faculty ensures that all students have equal opportunities to participate during class activities.	2.11	0.31	D.
	A.W.M.	2.74	0.17	A.
	Student Engagement	W.M.	S.D.	V.D.
1.	The faculty motivates students to actively participate in research discussions and activities.	2.59	0.49	A.
2.	The faculty encourages students to share their ideas and insights during class.	2.84	0.99	A.
3.	The faculty provides opportunities for collaborative learning and group work in research.	2.67	0.47	A.
4.	The faculty uses strategies that stimulate students' interest and curiosity in the subject matter.	2.48	1.42	D.
5.	The faculty gives constructive feedback that helps students stay engaged and improve their research work.	2.43	0.26	D.
	A.W.M.	2.60	0.44	A.

The assessment of faculty teaching competence, as perceived by the 4th year College of Business Administration students, was measured across four areas: subject matter expertise, instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement.

In terms of subject matter expertise, the faculty received an average weighted mean (AWM) of 2.56, verbally described as Agree. This indicated that students generally recognized their instructors' knowledge of research concepts and methodologies. The highest mean score (2.98) was given to the faculty's ability to demonstrate thorough knowledge of research, while the lowest (2.40) reflected weaker performance in confidently answering students' questions. Similarly, lower ratings were also seen in integrating updated theories and guiding students in the research process, which were only Described as Disagree. This implied that while faculty were

acknowledged as knowledgeable, there was room for improvement in applying their expertise to effectively support and guide students.

For instructional delivery, the faculty obtained an AWM of 2.59, also described as Agree. Students agreed that lessons were presented in a systematic manner (3.05) and that appropriate teaching strategies were used (3.08). However, weaknesses were noted in providing clear instructions for tasks (2.17) and in using examples or activities that enhance learning (1.80), both rated as Disagree. This suggested that while faculty could deliver lessons competently, more effort was needed in providing explicit guidance and incorporating varied instructional aids to enrich student learning.

On classroom management, the faculty achieved the highest overall rating with an AWM of 2.74 (Agree). Respondents perceived that faculty members managed time effectively (2.93) and handled disruptions professionally (2.92). They also maintained an orderly and focused environment (2.90). Nevertheless, the relatively low score in ensuring equal participation among students (2.11, Disagree) revealed the need to provide more inclusive opportunities for learners to engage equally during class activities.

Finally, regarding student engagement, the faculty received an AWM of 2.60 (Agree). Students appreciated efforts in encouraging participation (2.84) and motivating involvement in research discussions (2.59). They also recognized the provision of opportunities for collaborative learning (2.67). However, the use of strategies to spark curiosity (2.48) and the giving of constructive feedback (2.43) were rated as Disagree. This pointed out that while the faculty were able to sustain basic engagement, they fell short in adopting innovative methods to stimulate interest and in providing feedback that could sustain motivation and improvement.

The findings indicated that the faculty were perceived as competent in teaching research, particularly in classroom management and instructional delivery. However, areas such as integrating updated knowledge, providing clearer instructions, ensuring inclusivity, stimulating curiosity, and offering constructive feedback emerged as important opportunities for improvement. These insights emphasized the need for professional development programs focusing on instructional strategies and student-centered approaches to enhance both teaching competence and professionalism.

Part 3. Professionalism of faculty with regard to ethical behavior, fairness in evaluation and grading, punctuality and preparedness, and respectful interaction with students

	Ethical behavior	W.M.	S.D.	V.D.
1.	The faculty demonstrates honesty and integrity in teaching and evaluating research work.	2.43	0.50	A.
2.	The faculty respects confidentiality of student research outputs and related information.	2.55	0.50	A.
3.	The faculty serves as a role model of ethical standards in both teaching and research practices.	2.94	0.24	A.
4.	The faculty avoids favoritism or bias in dealing with student's research	3.26	0.06	S.A.
5.	The faculty upholds academic integrity by discouraging plagiarism and other unethical practices.	3.07	0.26	A.
	A.W.M.	2.85	0.12	A.
	Fairness in evaluation and grading	W.M.	S.D.	V.D.

1.	The faculty provides clear grading criteria for research-related tasks and requirements.	3.08	0.28	A.
2.	The faculty evaluates student outputs objectively and without bias..	3.06	0.24	A.
3.	The faculty returns graded work with constructive comments for improvement.	3.19	0.39	A.
4.	The faculty ensures consistency in applying standards when grading research papers and presentations.	2.50	0.50	A.
5.	The faculty recognizes the efforts of students fairly, regardless of their academic standing or background.	2.60	0.45	A.
	A.W.M.	2.89	0.23	A.
	Punctuality and preparedness	W.M.	S.D.	V.D.
1.	The faculty comes to class on time consistently.	3.13	0.33	A.
2.	The faculty is well-prepared with lesson plans, materials, and activities for research classes..	3.06	0.24	A.
3.	The faculty starts and ends research classes according to the agreed schedule.	3.10	0.30	A.
4.	The faculty demonstrates readiness to address questions and concerns during discussions.	3.06	0.24	A.
5.	The faculty ensures smooth flow of lessons with well-prepared content.	3.11	0.70	A.
	A.W.M.	3.09	0.23	A.
	Respectful interaction with students	W.M.	S.D.	V.D.
1.	The faculty treats all students with courtesy and respect during research classes.	2.89	0.84	A.
2.	The faculty listens attentively to students' questions, opinions, and suggestions.	2.54	0.17	A.
3.	The faculty creates an inclusive classroom environment where all voices are valued.	2.65	0.59	A.
4.	The faculty communicates in a professional and respectful manner at all times.	2.60	0.48	A.
5.	The faculty shows consideration for students' challenges and responds with empathy.	2.59	0.80	A.
	A.W.M.	2.65	0.29	A.

The professionalism of faculty members was assessed in terms of ethical behavior, fairness in evaluation and grading, punctuality and preparedness, and respectful interaction with students.

In terms of ethical behavior, the faculty received an average weighted mean (AWM) of 2.85, interpreted as Agree. Students acknowledged that faculty generally demonstrated honesty and integrity (2.43) and respected

confidentiality (2.55). They also recognized that instructors served as role models of ethical standards (2.94) and discouraged plagiarism and other unethical practices (3.07). Notably, the highest rating (3.26, Strongly Agree) was observed in avoiding favoritism, indicating students’ strong perception of fairness in treatment. These results reflected that faculty were viewed as ethically responsible, though lower ratings suggested that consistency in honesty and confidentiality still required strengthening.

For fairness in evaluation and grading, the faculty obtained an AWM of 2.89 (Agree). Respondents noted that grading criteria were clear (3.08) and that evaluations were objective (3.06). Students also recognized the effort of faculty in returning graded work with constructive feedback (3.19). However, the relatively lower score in applying consistent grading standards (2.50) and fairly recognizing efforts regardless of standing (2.60) revealed areas for improvement. This implied that while the faculty were perceived as fair overall, enhancing transparency and uniformity in evaluation processes would further build student trust.

When it came to punctuality and preparedness, faculty members earned an AWM of 3.09, the highest across the four dimensions. Students agreed that instructors came to class on time (3.13), were prepared with lessons and materials (3.06), and ensured a smooth flow of discussions (3.11). Starting and ending classes on schedule (3.10) and demonstrating readiness to address questions (3.06) further strengthened this perception. These results showed that punctuality and preparedness were strong professional attributes of the faculty, reflecting their commitment to organized and effective teaching.

In terms of respectful interaction with students, faculty members were rated with an AWM of 2.65 (Agree). Students acknowledged being treated with courtesy (2.89) and valued the professional communication of faculty (2.60). However, lower ratings were given in listening attentively to student inputs (2.54) and showing empathy for student challenges (2.59). This suggested that while the faculty generally practiced respectful interaction, there was a need to foster a more inclusive and empathetic learning environment where student voices and struggles were more fully recognized.

The findings indicated that professionalism among faculty was most evident in punctuality and preparedness, followed by fairness in evaluation and ethical behavior. Respectful interaction, while still positively rated, emerged as the area needing the most improvement. Strengthening active listening, empathy, and inclusivity could enhance student–faculty relationships and contribute to a more supportive academic atmosphere.

Part 4. significant relation between the profile of the respondents with the competence and professionalism of faculty

Correlations		Age	Sex	Civil Status
Academic Standing	Pearson Correlation	.408**	.301**	0.098
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.089
	N	300	300	300
subject Matter	Pearson Correlation	.636**	.525**	0.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.916
	N	300	300	300

Instructional Delivery	Pearson Correlation	.589**	.628**	.133*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.021
	N	300	300	300
Classroom Management	Pearson Correlation	-.619**	-.601**	0.032
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.579
	N	300	300	300
Student engagement	Pearson Correlation	-.474**	-.292**	-.183**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.001
	N	300	300	300
Ethical Behavior	Pearson Correlation	-.175**	-.186**	.491**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002	0.001	0.000
	N	300	300	300
Fairness in evaluation and Grading	Pearson Correlation	.712**	.638**	-0.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.913
	N	300	300	300
Punctuality and preparedness	Pearson Correlation	-.166**	-.269**	-0.04
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.004	0.000	0.49
	N	300	300	300
Respectful Interaction with student	Pearson Correlation	.624**	.482**	-0.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.527
	N	300	300	300
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).				

The analysis of correlations revealed that age and sex were consistently significant variables affecting students' perceptions of faculty competence and professionalism, while civil status had fewer significant associations.

For academic standing, both age ($p = .000$) and sex ($p = .000$) showed significant positive correlations; hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. Civil status ($p = .089$) showed no significant relationship, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

In terms of subject matter expertise, both age ($p = .000$) and sex ($p = .000$) were significantly related to perceptions, thus the null hypothesis was rejected. Civil status ($p = .916$) had no significance; hence, the null hypothesis was accepted.

For instructional delivery, age ($p = .000$), sex ($p = .000$), and civil status ($p = .021$) all showed significant correlations. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected across all three variables.

On classroom management, age ($p = .000$) and sex ($p = .000$) had significant negative relationships, leading to rejection of the null hypothesis. Civil status ($p = .579$) was not significant, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

With respect to student engagement, age ($p = .000$), sex ($p = .000$), and civil status ($p = .001$) all demonstrated significant correlations. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected in all cases.

For ethical behavior, age ($p = .002$) and sex ($p = .001$) were significantly related (null hypothesis rejected), while civil status ($p = .000$) also showed strong significance, resulting in rejection of the null hypothesis for all three variables.

In fairness in evaluation and grading, significant relationships were observed with age ($p = .000$) and sex ($p = .000$), both leading to rejection of the null hypothesis. Civil status ($p = .913$) had no significance, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

Regarding punctuality and preparedness, significant relationships were found with age ($p = .004$) and sex ($p = .000$), leading to rejection of the null hypothesis. Civil status ($p = .490$) was not significant; therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Lastly, for respectful interaction with students, significant positive correlations were found with age ($p = .000$) and sex ($p = .000$), both leading to rejection of the null hypothesis. Civil status ($p = .527$) was not significant, so the null hypothesis was accepted.

The results confirmed that age and sex had significant relationships with most dimensions of faculty competence and professionalism, leading to rejection of the null hypothesis in nearly all cases. Civil status, however, was mostly not significant, except for its relationships with instructional delivery, student engagement, and ethical behavior, where the null hypothesis was also rejected.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The majority of the 4th Year Business Administration students were young (mostly 20 years old), female, and single. This demographic composition provided a relatively homogeneous group, which likely influenced their perceptions of faculty competence and professionalism.
2. Faculty were generally rated as *competent* in subject matter expertise, instructional delivery, classroom management, and student engagement. The highest strength was in classroom management, while weaker areas included integrating updated research examples, giving clear instructions, and providing constructive feedback.
3. Professionalism was rated positively, with punctuality and preparedness identified as the strongest attribute. Ethical behavior and fairness in evaluation were also recognized, but respectful interaction received the lowest scores, particularly in terms of listening attentively and showing empathy.

4. Age and sex were found to have significant relationships with most dimensions of faculty competence, while civil status showed little effect. This indicates that demographic differences influenced how students perceived faculty teaching performance.
5. Age and sex were again significant factors influencing perceptions of professionalism, while civil status had limited influence, except in ethical behavior and instructional delivery. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship was rejected in most cases.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Faculty members, with support from the College of Business Administration (CBA) administration, should undergo continuous training and workshops on innovative instructional strategies, updated research integration, and effective classroom practices. This will enhance their subject matter expertise and strengthen instructional delivery.
2. Faculty should adopt more student-centered teaching approaches such as collaborative learning, interactive discussions, and the use of modern instructional tools. These strategies will help address weaknesses in student engagement and stimulate curiosity and motivation in research classes.
3. Faculty, under the guidance of their department heads, should reinforce ethical behavior and fairness in evaluation by applying consistent grading rubrics, giving timely and constructive feedback, and demonstrating respectful interactions with students. This will improve trust and inclusivity in the academic environment.
4. Faculty, in collaboration with the curriculum committee, should consider the varying perceptions influenced by students' age and sex. Teaching strategies may be adjusted to accommodate diverse learning needs, ensuring fairness and inclusivity across different student groups.
5. The university administration should implement regular monitoring and evaluation systems, feedback mechanisms, and recognition programs for faculty who excel in competence and professionalism. This aligns with CHED's quality assurance framework and will sustain continuous faculty improvement.

REFERENCES

1. Biggs, J. &. (2021). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
2. Boon, H. (2017). Raising the bar: Ethics education for quality teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(7), 76–93. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n7.2>.
3. Brookfield, S. (2015). *the skillful teacher: On technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
4. Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
5. Danielson, C. (2023). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument* (2013 ed.). The Danielson Group.
6. Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 291–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1315399>.
7. George, D. &. (2023). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
8. González, J. &. (2019). Professional competencies in higher education. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 8(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2019.1.32>.
9. Hattie, J. (2019). *the new art and science of teaching*. Solution Tree Press.
10. Ko, J. S. (2014). *Effective teaching: A review of research and evidence*. CfBT Education Trust. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.5110.1920>.
11. Sarmiento, P. J. (2021). Perceptions of teaching effectiveness in Philippine higher education. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(3), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.3.8>.
12. Shulman, L. S. (2018). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411>.

13. Tschannen-Moran, M. &. (2017). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944–956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003>.
14. Zeichner, K. (2020). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1–2), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671>.