Perceived Authenticity and Impact of Student Trust in QCU Faculty Evaluation Outcomes among BSIT Students

Aaron Gabriel S. Chavez., Jojit P. Oliva., Kobie R. Calingasan., Mariel L. Padua., Raffy S. Elmedo., Harold R. Lucero

College of Computer Studies, Quezon City University

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1305000232

Received: 16 May 2026; Accepted: 21 May 2026; Published: 11 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceived authenticity of faculty evaluations and its influence on student trust in evaluation outcomes among Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT) students at Quezon City University (QCU). The research aimed to determine students' perceptions regarding the honesty, fairness, consistency, credibility, and overall effectiveness of the faculty evaluation system, as well as identify the relationship between perceived authenticity and student trust in evaluation outcomes. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed using a validated Likert-scale questionnaire distributed to 150 BSIT students from first year to fourth year through stratified sampling. Data were analyzed using weighted mean, Spearman rank-order correlation, simple linear regression, One-Way ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis test, paired t-test, and Wilcoxon signed-rank test. The findings revealed that respondents generally perceived the faculty evaluation system as authentic, fair, consistent, and trustworthy. Students demonstrated favorable perceptions regarding honesty of responses, fairness of evaluation criteria, administrative integrity, and confidence in the evaluation system. Correlation analysis showed a statistically significant positive relationship between perceived authenticity and student trust, indicating that higher levels of perceived authenticity correspond to increased trust in evaluation outcomes. Regression analysis further confirmed that perceived authenticity significantly influences student trust. Additionally, no significant differences were found in perceived authenticity and student trust when respondents were grouped according to year level. Similarly, the comparative sub-analysis between major and minor subjects revealed only minimal differences, suggesting that students apply relatively consistent standards in evaluating faculty performance regardless of subject classification.

The study concludes that authenticity, transparency, fairness, and institutional responsiveness are essential factors in strengthening the credibility and effectiveness of faculty evaluation systems. The findings may provide valuable insights for higher education institutions in developing more transparent, student-centered, and responsive evaluation systems that encourage honest participation and support continuous instructional improvement.

Keywords: Perceived Authenticity, Student Trust, Faculty Evaluation Outcomes, BSIT Students, Higher Education, Instructional Evaluation, Transparency, Evaluation Credibility

INTRODUCTION

Quezon City University (QCU) observes semester-based faculty assessments to guarantee instructional excellence. According to Espina et al. (2025), these assessments are "essential for leading competence and institutional differentia progress" (pp. 5365–5381). The university established a system to provide an accurate report of the assessment results. This innovation reflects the institute's credibility and distinction. The process begins with randomly selected students receiving email invitations specifying the evaluation schedule. On the appointed day, these students proceed to the designated venue to evaluate faculty members. The assessment covers several categories: knowledge of the subject matter, management of learning, commitment to teaching and learning, and personal qualities. These categories form the basis of the evaluation results. Beyond the technical evaluation procedures, the process involves students' observation during their discussion with their professors. The classroom management, engagement, learning, and lesson expertise are discernible during the

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

lecture. The significance of any evaluation system depends largely on the quality of data provided by the respondents. These observations may shape students' assessments of their professors, consequently influencing their levels of trust in the evaluation system and their perception of its authenticity. Perceived authenticity refers to the extent to which instructors are viewed as genuine, transparent, and consistent in their teaching practices. When instructors demonstrate authenticity, they are more likely to build trust and foster meaningful classroom engagement. Additionally, student trust plays a critical role in shaping evaluation outcomes. A study by Santos (2021) revealed that positive teacher-student interaction significantly influences faculty evaluation results, as students tend to evaluate instructors more favorably when they perceive them as approachable and credible. Likewise, Reyes and Villanueva (2020) found that Filipino students' perceptions of teacher effectiveness are strongly influenced by interpersonal relationships and perceived sincerity of instructors. This study, therefore, aims to examine perceived authenticity and student trust, and their impact on faculty evaluation outcomes among BSIT students. By integrating these variables, the research aims to contribute to an adequate understanding of the subjective factors influencing student evaluations and provide insights that may help improve teaching practices and evaluation systems in higher education institutions. Furthermore, the study may aid the university in developing more effective policies, strategies, and action plans for conducting and managing student evaluations.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to examine the perceived authenticity of faculty evaluations and its impact on student trust in the evaluation outcomes among Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT) students at Quezon City University (QCU). Faculty evaluations are commonly used as a basis for improving teaching performance; however, concerns regarding the honesty, fairness, and overall credibility of these evaluations may influence how students perceive and trust the results. Understanding these perceptions is important to ensure that evaluation systems remain reliable, objective, and meaningful to students and the institution. Despite the widespread use of faculty evaluations as a tool for institutional development, their effectiveness is often undermined by student skepticism regarding the process. This research seeks to determine whether students view the evaluation process as a genuine reflection of teaching performance (Authenticity) and whether they believe the system protects their identity and utilizes their feedback effectively (Trust). By identifying the relationship between these factors, the study provides insights into how the university can enhance the credibility and utility of its faculty evaluation systems.

Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

Honesty of student responses

Fairness of evaluation criteria

Consistency of evaluation results?

What is the level of Student Trust in faculty evaluation outcomes as perceived by BSIT students in terms of:

Perceived Anonymity

Administrative Integrity and Confidence in the Evaluation System?

What is the level of Perceived Authenticity of faculty evaluations among BSIT students in terms of:

Reflection of True Performance

Honesty of Student Responses and Meaningfulness of the Process?

What is the level of perceived authenticity of faculty evaluations among BSIT students in terms of:

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

Honesty of student responses

Fairness of evaluation criteria

Consistency of evaluation results?

What is the level of student trust in faculty evaluation outcomes in terms of:

Credibility of results

Usefulness of evaluation outcomes

Confidence in the evaluation process?

Is there a significant relationship between the perceived authenticity of faculty evaluation and student trust in the evaluation outcomes?

Does perceived authenticity of faculty evaluations significantly influence student trust in the evaluation outcomes?

Is there a significant difference in the perceived authenticity of faculty evaluations and in student trust in evaluation outcomes when respondents are grouped by year level?

What differences are observed in the perceived impact of faculty evaluation outcomes between professors handling major subjects and those handling minor subjects?

Related Studies

Recent studies emphasize that the effectiveness of faculty evaluation systems largely depends on students' sense of trust, safety, and confidence in the evaluation process. Amerstorfer and Freiin von Münster- Kistner (2021) emphasized that a climate of mutual care and trust encourages students to provide honest and constructive feedback. Similarly, Quansah et al. (2024) found that students who lack psychological safety are less likely to communicate openly about their classroom experiences. In support of this, Chang (2018) noted that anonymous evaluation strategies are necessary to promote authentic participation, particularly among students who fear possible repercussions. Collectively, these studies suggest that trust serves as the foundation of credible and authentic feedback. Without assurance of anonymity and security, students may withhold honest opinions, thereby reducing the reliability and usefulness of evaluation data for institutional improvement.

In addition to privacy and anonymity, the perceived effectiveness of evaluation outcomes also influences student participation and sincerity in providing feedback. Medina et al. (2019) highlighted that transparent reporting and visible implementation of evaluation results are essential for ensuring instructional improvement. When students observe that their feedback contributes to positive changes in teaching strategies and faculty approachability, they are more likely to perceive the evaluation system as meaningful and effective (Trejo & Ginsberg, 2023). Conversely, Wong et al. (2025) argued that when evaluations are treated merely as bureaucratic requirements, students may view them as "busy work" with limited value or impact. These findings collectively demonstrate that trust in institutional action is equally important as trust in confidentiality. Without observable improvements resulting from evaluations, students may lose confidence in the purpose and authenticity of the system.

Alsharefeen and Al-Deaibes (2025) conducted a comparative analysis of faculty performance evaluation (FPE) policies within higher education institutions in the United Arab Emirates, focusing on the tension between institutional accountability and professional agency. The study highlights that while FPE policies are ostensibly designed to enhance educational quality and professional development, they are often implemented as top-down managerial tools that prioritize administrative metrics over pedagogical autonomy. Through a qualitative analysis of policy documents from various universities, the researchers identified a prevailing emphasis on quantifiable outcomes, such as research citations and student satisfaction scores, which can inadvertently stifle innovation and academic freedom. The findings suggest that a purely accountability-driven approach may lead

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

to "performativity," where faculty focus on meeting narrow indicators rather than deep engagement with teaching and scholarship. Consequently, the authors argue for a more balanced evaluation framework that integrates faculty agency, fostering a collaborative environment where evaluations serve as a genuine catalyst for professional growth rather than merely a mechanism for institutional control.

Additionally, the concept of instructor authenticity serves as a primary predictor of student engagement and evaluation honesty. If the instructor is not seen as credible or authentic, students are less likely to provide honest evaluative data. Moreover, international research emphasizes that the structural transparency of the evaluation system is just as vital as the instructor's behavior. The continuous evolution of educational assessment has increasingly focused on the concept of authenticity and how it is perceived by learners within diverse instructional environments. Hohrath et al. (2024) investigated the role of perceived authenticity in a non-formal learning setting, specifically focusing on how the level of guidance influences a student's sense of realism and engagement during experimental tasks. The study highlights that increasing the technical complexity or "authenticity" of a task does not automatically translate to a higher perceived value by the student; rather, authenticity is a subjective construct influenced by the student's prior experiences and the clarity of the process. The findings suggest that when students perceive a process as a genuine reflection of real-world practice, it serves as a significant predictor for positive learning outcomes. For academic institutions, this underscores the importance of not just implementing rigorous evaluation or learning systems, but ensuring that students understand and trust the meaningfulness of these processes to foster deeper engagement and institutional trust.

Tatari et al. (2025) explored the transition from traditional student-led assessments to a more comprehensive electronic 360-degree evaluation method at Neyshabur University of Medical Sciences. The study underscores that while student evaluations are the most common assessment tool, they are often insufficient for capturing the full scope of a faculty member's professional responsibilities. To address this, the researchers developed and implemented a digital framework that incorporates feedback from four distinct perspectives: self-evaluation, peer evaluation, head of department evaluation, and student evaluation.

The results indicated that this multi-source approach provided a more holistic and accurate reflection of faculty performance, particularly in areas such as communication skills and professional behavior, which student feedback alone might overlook. Furthermore, the study found high levels of satisfaction among both faculty and administrators regarding the 360-degree method, as it promotes a fairer, more transparent culture of accountability and provides more actionable data for continuous professional development.

In the Philippine context, the study by Dela Cerna et al. (2024) provides critical supporting evidence for the research on student trust and faculty evaluation outcomes by examining the digital behaviors and expectations of Generation Z. A core finding of the research is that this demographic place a high premium on authenticity and real-time engagement, which directly supports the objective of exploring how perceived authenticity affects the honesty of evaluation feedback. Just as Generation Z travelers rely on authentic interactions and peer-generated data to make informed choices, the proposed study suggests that BSIT students require similar integrity to engage meaningfully with institutional assessments. Furthermore, the research highlights a strong reliance on user-generated content and peer reviews, finding that individuals are significantly more likely to make decisions based on referrals than on traditional top-down marketing. This aligns with the "credibility gap" identified in the faculty evaluation proposal, where a lack of trust in administrative handling can lead to evaluation cynicism.

Methodologically, both studies utilize a descriptive-correlational design to investigate the relationship between digital influences and human behavior, establishing a strong academic precedent for using validated Likert-scale instruments to measure student sentiment. Finally, the emphasis on post-purchase behavior—where satisfaction is tied to visible results—mirrors the proposal's focus on impact, suggesting that students lose confidence in the system when they observe no observable changes in faculty performance following an evaluation period.

Similarly, a study by Reyes et al. (2024) provides a crucial institutional perspective to the research on faculty evaluation outcomes by examining how instructors at the Polytechnic University of the Philippines perceive these assessments. The findings reveal that faculty generally find the evaluation criteria—encompassing commitment, subject knowledge, and management of learning—to be acceptable and effective indicators of their

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

professional performance. This alignment supports the proposed study's focus on instructional excellence, as both research efforts seek to determine if evaluations serve as genuine tools for professional development rather than mere bureaucratic requirements. These local findings align with the international perspective. the research highlights that faculty observed improvements in their instructional delivery as a result of the evaluation process, which directly correlates with the variable of "Impact" defined in the current proposal. However, the study also concludes that there is a persistent need for periodic policy reviews to ensure these assessments remain accurate indexes for institutional decision-making. This reinforces the argument for transparency and data integrity; if students lack trust in the system, the resulting data may become "noisy" or unreliable, potentially leading to flawed administrative actions regarding faculty tenure or promotion. By integrating these findings, the proposed research can better advocate for a system that transforms evaluations from a "one-way street" of data collection into a meaningful dialogue for academic growth. For instance, Graham et al. (2026) examined college student trust in their instructors and found that perceived authenticity and integrity strongly influence student's willingness to engage meaningfully in evaluations. Contemplating this, Zarb et al. (2017) explored technological platforms for faculty evaluation and emphasized that prioritizing anonymity and psychological safety is essential to ensure honest student participation, particularly in technical and professional programs such as Information Technology.

In the context of Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT) students, these factors become particularly relevant due to the technical and interactive nature of their courses. BSIT faculty members are expected not only to deliver complex technical content effectively but also to establish authentic relationships and maintain meaningful communication with students.

Consequently, students' levels of trust and perceptions of instructor authenticity may significantly influence how they evaluate faculty performance. By synthesizing these related studies, it becomes evident that trust, authenticity, anonymity, and perceived institutional responsiveness are interconnected factors that shape the credibility and effectiveness of faculty evaluation outcomes. Gutierrez (2023) examined the effectiveness of performance evaluation practices among selected Higher Education Institutions in Manila using a quantitative-descriptive approach involving 110 academic heads and faculty members. The study evaluated three major domains of faculty assessment: student evaluation, peer evaluation, and immediate superior evaluation. Findings revealed that respondents generally perceived these evaluation practices as highly effective in improving faculty performance, with peer evaluation receiving the highest mean score, followed by immediate superior and student evaluations. However, significant differences emerged when faculty members were grouped according to employment status. Probationary and contractual faculty members viewed student evaluations differently from permanent faculty, suggesting that student feedback may hold greater significance for instructors whose employment stability is still developing. The study concluded that educational institutions must continuously strengthen and improve evaluation systems to ensure quality instruction and institutional effectiveness.

Salacut et al. (2025) conducted an empirical study at Philippine Advent College to investigate the correlation between college instructors' teaching effectiveness and the academic performance of students. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, the study evaluated teaching effectiveness across seven distinct instructional domains, including course orientation, learning outcomes, assessment strategies, and technological integration. The findings indicated that while instructors were rated as "much effective" overall, the highest scores were observed in the area of teacher presence and support, whereas technological integration received the lowest relative rating. Crucially, the research established a significant relationship between these instructional domains and student Grade Point Averages (GPA), suggesting that higher levels of teaching effectiveness directly contribute to improved academic outcomes.

A qualitative case study by Ortizo and Dagoc (2025) explores the lived experiences of faculty members at Notre Dame of Dadiangas University regarding academic ranking and promotion. The study highlights that these processes are fundamental to shaping academic careers, as they serve as primary motivators for professional growth and institutional quality assurance. Using semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis, the researchers identified that while effective promotion practices can significantly enhance faculty competence and productivity, there are persistent challenges involving a lack of clarity in guidelines and insufficient research output. The findings suggest that transparent and standardized evaluation criteria are essential for maintaining faculty morale, as ambiguity in these areas often leads to decreased engagement and increased turnover.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

Ultimately, the research emphasizes that institutional policy frameworks must prioritize competence-based recognition to foster a culture of academic excellence and long-term faculty retention.

Integrating modern technology into academic systems has fundamentally transformed faculty evaluation processes, shifting them from traditional manual assessments toward more efficient, data-driven, and multi-dimensional frameworks. Feliciano (2025) exemplifies this shift by utilizing the R programming language to conduct sentiment analysis and word cloud visualization of student feedback at Isabela State University. The study emphasizes that while traditional quantitative ratings provide a numerical baseline, they often fail to capture the nuanced qualitative experiences of students. By processing large-scale textual data from 2019 to 2024, the researcher identified a prevailing positive sentiment, with students frequently using terms like "excellent" and "hardworking." Conversely, the analysis highlighted critical areas for improvement through negative sentiments associated with high-pressure workloads. The findings demonstrate that integrating automated textual analysis allows academic administrators to transform unstructured feedback into actionable insights, facilitating targeted improvements in pedagogical approaches and institutional support. The continuous advancement of educational technology has provided academic institutions with sophisticated tools to move beyond numerical ratings, enabling a more profound qualitative analysis of instructional effectiveness.

Pontillas et al. (2025) explored this dimension by conducting a qualitative content analysis of student evaluations within the College of Arts and Sciences at Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges. By examining open- ended responses over two academic years, the study identified that students highly value the practical relevance of course content, faculty empathy, and strong communicative qualities. However, the qualitative data also exposed critical areas for development that quantitative scores often mask, such as inconsistencies in class timetables, the need for more diverse learning resources, and the pace of instructional delivery. The researchers argue that filling the gap in qualitative data analysis is essential for establishing a holistic view of faculty performance. Ultimately, the study suggests that by leveraging qualitative insights, institutions can move past surface-level assessments to foster a more stimulating and supportive learning environment that aligns with student needs.

Overall, the literature consistently shows that the effectiveness of faculty evaluation systems is grounded on students' trust, psychological safety, anonymity, instructor authenticity, and perceived institutional responsiveness. Studies indicate that students are more likely to provide honest and meaningful feedback when they feel safe, assured of confidentiality, and confident that their responses will not result in negative consequences.

Trust is further strengthened when students observe that evaluation results lead to visible and meaningful improvements in teaching practices, while lack of action or transparency reduces participation and credibility. In addition, instructor authenticity and clear, transparent evaluation processes significantly influence student engagement and the honesty of their responses, as perceived credibility and fairness encourage more sincere participation. Research also highlights the limitations of purely numerical or bureaucratic evaluation systems, suggesting that they may lead to biased responses or "performativity," and instead supports approaches that integrate technology-assisted analysis to capture richer and more accurate feedback. In the Philippine context and in BSIT-related settings, these factors are especially significant, as student trust and instructor-student relationships directly shape the quality of evaluation outcomes.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Data Collection

This study utilizes a **Descriptive-Correlational Research Design** to determine the relationship between perceived authenticity, student trust, and faculty evaluation outcomes among Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT) students at Quezon City University. The descriptive aspect of the study identifies the current perceptions and experiences of students regarding the faculty evaluation system, while the correlational aspect examines the relationship among the identified variables. The respondents of the study consist of **150 BSIT students** from First Year to Fourth Year levels. To ensure balanced representation across all academic levels,

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

Stratified Sampling is employed by grouping respondents according to year level before distributing the survey questionnaire digitally. This method allows the study to capture varying perspectives and experiences regarding the faculty evaluation process among students with different levels of exposure to the system.

Data are gathered through a **validated Likert-scale questionnaire** designed to measure students' perceptions of instructor authenticity, trust in the faculty evaluation system, and the perceived impact of evaluation outcomes. The instrument undergoes validation by qualified faculty members to ensure the relevance, clarity, and alignment of the questionnaire items with the objectives of the study.

The survey is administered through **Google Forms**, with an informed consent statement included at the beginning of the questionnaire. The consent form informs respondents that participation is voluntary and that all collected information remains confidential and protected under the provisions of the **Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173).**

Data Gathering

The researchers first obtained approval from their professor prior to the conduct of the study. A validated survey questionnaire served as the primary data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire consisted of structured Likert-scale items specifically designed to assess perceived authenticity, student trust, and faculty evaluation outcomes among Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT) students at Quezon City University (QCU).

To ensure the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of the research instrument, the questionnaire was reviewed and approved by a qualified statistician prior to its administration. The respondents were selected using stratified sampling to ensure proportional and balanced representation from first-year to fourth-year BSIT students. The survey questionnaire was administered electronically through Google Forms to facilitate efficient data collection and accessibility among respondents.

Prior to answering the questionnaire, participants were provided with an informed consent form containing a clear explanation of the study's objectives, the voluntary nature of participation, the confidentiality of responses, and the researchers' compliance with the provisions of the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173). Upon completion of the data collection process, all responses were carefully reviewed, organized, and encoded for statistical analysis. Responses that were incomplete, inconsistent, or contained substantial missing data were excluded to maintain the accuracy, validity, and reliability of the research findings.

Weighted Mean: Quantifying Student Perceptions

The Weighted Mean will serve as the primary statistical tool for interpreting the responses of BSIT students regarding perceived authenticity, student trust, and faculty evaluation outcomes. This statistical method allows the researchers to determine the overall tendency of responses by assigning corresponding numerical weights to each point in the Likert scale. The Weighted Mean is the primary statistical tool used to interpret the collective opinion of the BSIT student body. Unlike a simple average, the weighted mean assigns a specific "weight" or value to each point on the Likert scale, allowing the researcher to calculate a single, representative score for each research variable.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Data Screening and Preparation

Raw responses were downloaded from Google Forms and imported into a data analysis environment for processing and analysis. Responses were checked for completeness and consistency before statistical treatment was conducted. Cases with excessive missing data were excluded from the analysis, while minimal missing values were handled through pairwise deletion during inferential statistical procedures.

All survey responses were converted into numerical values using a five-point Likert scale format:

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

Scale	Interpretation
5	Strongly Support
4	Support
3	Neutral
2	Oppose
1	Strongly Oppose

The converted numerical values allowed the researchers to perform descriptive and inferential statistical analyses.

Scale Construction and Scoring

Composite scores were computed by averaging the responses from related indicators under each variable.

The following composite scores were constructed:

Auth_Overall – average of all indicators related to perceived authenticity.

Trust_Overall – average of all indicators related to student trust.

Major_SubAnalysis_Score – average score of major subject indicators.

Minor_SubAnalysis_Score – average score of minor subject indicators.

Means and standard deviations were calculated for each variable and dimension to determine the level of agreement among respondents.

Significance Level

All inferential statistical analyses were tested using a two-tailed significance level of 0.05. Results with p-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Statistical Tools and Treatment Used

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, percentage, weighted mean, and standard deviation were used to summarize and interpret the responses gathered from the respondents.

Frequency Distribution and Percentage

Frequency distribution and percentage were used to determine the demographic profile of the respondents according to year level.

The percentage formula used in the study is:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

P= Percentage

f = Frequency of responses

N = Total number of respondents

Weighted Mean

The weighted mean was used to determine the average level of agreement of respondents regarding the study variables.

$$WM = \frac{\sum fx}{N}$$

Where:

(WM) = Weight mean

(x) = Value assigned to responses

(f) = Frequency of responses

(N) = Total number of respondents

The weighted mean interpretations were based on the following scale. Weighted Mean Range Interpretation:

Weighted Mean Range	**Interpretation**
4.50 – 5.00	Strongly Support
3.50 – 4.49	Support
2.50 – 3.49	Neutral
1.50 – 2.49	Oppose
1.00 – 1.49	Strongly Oppose

Standard Deviation

Standard Deviation is used to measure the consistency of student perceptions and the degree to which responses were clustered around the mean, the standard deviation was calculated.

$$SD = \frac{\sum(x - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}$$

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

Spearman Rank-Order Correlation

Spearman's rank-order correlation was used to determine the relationship between perceived authenticity and student trust. Spearman's rho was selected because the data were derived from Likert-scale responses and may not fully satisfy interval and normality assumptions.

Correlation Coefficient Interpretation:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6\sum d^2}{(n^2 - 1)}$$

ρ = Spearman rank correlation coefficient

d = Difference between paired ranks

n = Number of paired observations

Correlation Coefficient	Interpretation
0.00 – 0.19	Very Weak
0.20 – 0.39	Weak
0.40 – 0.59	Moderate
0.60 – 0.79	Strong
0.80 – 1.00	Very Strong

Simple Linear Regression

Simple linear regression analysis was utilized to determine whether perceived authenticity significantly predicts student trust. The regression model evaluated the extent to which changes in perceived authenticity influence the level of student trust.

The regression model is expressed as:

$$Y = a + bX$$

Where:

(Y) = Dependent Variable (Student Trust)

(a) = Constant/Intercept

(b) = Regression Coefficient

(X) = Independent Variable (Perceived Authenticity)

Model fit statistics such as R^2, adjusted R^2, F-value, t-value, and p-values were reported.

One-Way ANOVA

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether significant differences exist in the

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

respondents' perceptions across year levels.

$F =$

$MS_{between}$

MS_{within}

Where:

$SS_{between}$

$MS_{between} =$ $\overline{df}$

$between$

SS_{within}

$MS_{within} =$ $\overline{df}$

$within$

Kruskal–Wallis Test

The Kruskal–Wallis test was employed as a non-parametric alternative to One-Way ANOVA to validate group comparisons in cases where assumptions of normality may not be fully satisfied.

$H =$

12

$\overline{\qquad\qquad}$

$(N + 1)$

R^2

$\sum \quad - 3(N + 1)$

n_i

H= Kruskal–Wallis test statistic

N= total number of observations

R_i= sum of ranks for group i

n_i= number of observations in group i

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test

The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to compare paired responses between major and minor subject evaluations. This non-parametric test was selected because the same respondents evaluated both subject categories.

$W = \min (W^+, W^-)$

W = Wilcoxon test statistic

W^+= sum of positive ranks

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

W^-= sum of negative ranks

R= ranks of paired differences excluding zero differences

Level of Significance

All statistical analyses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance. Results with p-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Statistical Software Used

All statistical analyses were conducted using Python programming libraries including pandas, scipy.stats, and statsmodels. The generated outputs included:

Means

Standard deviations

Correlation coefficients

Regression coefficients

F-values

H-values

W-values

p-values

Assumption Checking

Regression assumptions and residual diagnostics were examined to ensure the validity of the inferential analyses. Diagnostic procedures included:

Residual analysis

Normality assessment

Homogeneity checks

Durbin-Watson statistic for independence of residuals

Where assumptions were not sufficiently met, non-parametric alternatives were employed.

Reporting Conventions

All statistical values were reported to two decimal places unless otherwise required by institutional formatting guidelines. P-values below 0.001 were reported as $p < 0.001$.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Distribution of Respondents by Year Level

index	Year Level	n	Percentage
0	1st Year	40	26.67
1	2nd Year	32	21.33

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

2	3rd Year	40	26.67
3	4th Year	38	25.33
Total		150	100

The respondents of the study consisted of students from different year levels. The distribution of respondents according to year level ensured balanced representation across the population being studied. The profile of respondents serves as the basis for analyzing the perceptions and responses gathered in the study.

Profile of Respondents in Terms of Honesty, Fairness, and Consistency

The findings revealed that respondents generally expressed positive perceptions regarding honesty, fairness, and consistency within the faculty evaluation system. The indicators obtained high weighted mean scores, suggesting that students perceive the evaluation process as credible and reflective of actual classroom experiences. These findings support the study of Amerstorfer and Freiin von Münster-Kistner (2021), which emphasized that trust and mutual respect within educational environments encourage students to provide honest and constructive feedback. Similarly, Chang (2018) highlighted that students are more likely to participate authentically in evaluation systems when they perceive the process as fair and secure. The positive perceptions regarding honesty, fairness, and consistency suggest that respondents generally view the faculty evaluation process as credible and dependable.

Indicator	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
Honesty of student responses	4.7	0.673068	Strongly Support
Fairness of evaluation criteria	4.42	0.762106	Strongly Support
Consistency of evaluation results	4.38	0.840821	Strongly Support

Honesty received the highest rating among the dimensions, indicating that respondents believe students answer evaluation forms truthfully. Fairness was also rated positively, suggesting that the criteria used in evaluating faculty performance are considered appropriate and reasonable. Consistency likewise obtained favorable ratings, implying that evaluation results are perceived to remain stable and dependable across different situations. These findings suggest that respondents generally trust the reliability and integrity of the faculty evaluation process.

Level of Student Trust in Faculty Evaluation Outcomes

The level of student trust in faculty evaluation outcomes was assessed through indicators such as perceived anonymity, administrativeintegrity, and confidencein theevaluation system.

Dimension	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
Overall Student Trust	3.910926	0.923134	Support

Results showed that respondents generally supported the effectiveness and credibility of the evaluation system. Confidence in the evaluation system obtained the highest rating among the dimensions, suggesting that students believe the evaluation process functions appropriately and contributes to improving teaching performance. Administrative integrity was likewise rated positively, indicating that respondents perceive the administration as responsible for handling evaluation results.

Perceived anonymity, while still positively rated, showed comparatively lower scores, suggesting that some students may still have concerns regarding the confidentiality of their responses.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

The findings align with Medina et al. (2019), who emphasized that transparent implementation and reporting of evaluation outcomes strengthen student confidence in evaluation systems. Likewise, Trejo and Ginsberg (2023) noted that students are more likely to trust evaluation processes when they observe meaningful improvements in teaching practices and faculty engagement. The comparatively lower ratings for perceived anonymity may also support the findings of Quansah et al. (2024), which suggest that concerns regarding psychological safety may influence students' willingness to communicate openly. Overall, the findings indicate that students demonstrate a favorable level of trust in the faculty evaluation system.

Level of Perceived Authenticity of Faculty Evaluation Outcomes

The level of perceived authenticity was examined based on respondents' perceptions regarding the credibility and genuineness of faculty evaluation outcomes. The results revealed that respondents strongly supported the authenticity of evaluation outcomes.

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Overall Perceived Authenticity	4.393333	0.712695	Strongly Support

These findings support the study of Hohrath et al. (2024), which emphasized that students are more likely to engage positively in institutional processes when they perceive them as authentic and meaningful reflections of real experiences. Similarly, Graham et al. (2026) found that perceived authenticity and instructor credibility significantly influence students' willingness to participate meaningfully in evaluations.

The positive perceptions regarding authenticity imply that respondents generally believe the evaluation process accurately reflects actual teaching performance. Indicators related to honest student responses and accurate reflection of teaching performance received high weighted mean scores. These findings imply that students generally perceive faculty evaluation outcomes as authentic and representative of actual teaching effectiveness.

Relationship Between Perceived Authenticity and Student Trust

Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between perceived authenticity and student trust. The results indicated a statistically significant positive relationship between the two variables. This suggests that as students perceive evaluation outcomes to be more authentic and credible, their level of trust in the evaluation system also increases.

Variables	Test	r	p_value
Auth_Overall vs Trust_Overall	Spearman correlation	0.623501605	1.57315E-17

The significant positive relationship between perceived authenticity and student trust supports the findings of Zhang et al. (2025), who emphasized that student trust is strongly influenced by the perceived credibility and authenticity of evaluation processes. This also aligns with Kloker, Bazanya, and Kateete (2024), who identified transparency as one of the strongest predictors of trust within lecturer-student relationships. The findings suggest that students are more likely to trust evaluation outcomes when they perceive the process as genuine, transparent, and reflective of actual instructional performance. The positive relationship further implies that strengthening the authenticity and transparency of evaluation systems may contribute to improving student confidence and trust.

Influence of Perceived Authenticity on Student Trust

Simple linear regression analysis was performed to determine whether perceived authenticity significantly predicts student trust. The analysis showed that perceived authenticity significantly influences student trust.

The regression model demonstrated that increases in perceived authenticity correspond to increases in the level of student trust toward faculty evaluation outcomes.

Model	B_Auth_Overall	SE	t	p_value	R_squared	F	Model_p
Trust_Overall ~ Auth_Overall	0.814025017	0.08281744	9.829149712	7.33598E-18	0.394960637	96.6121841	7.33598E-18

The findings further support the conclusions of Springer Nature (2024), which highlighted that instructor authenticity directly increases student engagement and participation in evaluative activities. Likewise, Alsharefeen and Al-Deaibes (2025) emphasized that evaluation systems become more meaningful and effective when they balance institutional accountability with authenticity and professional credibility. The significant influence of perceived authenticity on student trust indicates that maintaining transparent and credible evaluation practices is essential for strengthening students' confidence in institutional systems.

The model further indicates that perceived authenticity explains a substantial portion of the variance in student trust, emphasizing the importance of credibility and transparency within evaluation systems. These findings support the idea that students are more likely to trust evaluation outcomes when they believe the evaluation process accurately reflects genuine teaching performance.

Differences in Perceived Authenticity and Student Trust According to Year Level

Variable	ANOVA_F	ANOVA_p	Kruskal_H	Kruskal_p
Trust_Overall	0.496396844	0.685342799	1.263176909	0.737895092
Auth_Overall	0.371178869	0.77391329	0.086679391	0.993386562

One-Way ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests were conducted to determine whether significant differences exist in perceived authenticity and student trust across year levels. The findings indicated that there were no statistically significant differences among respondents from different year levels. This suggests that perceptions regarding authenticity and trust remain relatively consistent regardless of academic level. The consistency of perceptions across year levels implies that the evaluation system is viewed similarly by students throughout the academic program. The absence of significant differences across year levels suggests that perceptions regarding authenticity and trust remain consistent regardless of students' academic standing. This finding may indicate that the faculty evaluation system is experienced similarly throughout the BSIT program. The consistency of perceptions also supports the idea presented by Gutierrez (2023) that effective evaluation systems establish stable and reliable standards across institutional contexts.

Sub-analysis Between Major and Minor Subjects

A sub-analysis was conducted to compare respondents' perceptions regarding major and minor subjects. The results showed only minimal differences between the two categories. Statistical testing indicated that the observed differences were not statistically significant. The minimal differences observed between major and minor subjects suggest that students generally apply similar standards and expectations when evaluating faculty performance across subject types. This finding may imply that perceptions of authenticity and trust are shaped more by the overall evaluation process than by subject classification itself. The results also align with Tatari et al. (2025), who emphasized that holistic and transparent evaluation systems encourage more balanced and consistent perceptions of instructional effectiveness.

Composite	Count	Mean	SD
Major_SubAnalysis_Score	150	3.83	0.86569598
Minor_SubAnalysis_Score	150	3.775	0.891679473

Correlation analyses further revealed positive associations between major and minor subject evaluations and the main study variables.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue V May 2026

SubScore	With	Spearman_r	p_value
Major_SubAnalysis_Score	Trust_Overall	0.67343938	3.67127E-21
Major_SubAnalysis_Score	Auth_Overall	0.5270104	4.26923E-12
Minor_SubAnalysis_Score	Trust_Overall	0.634860252	2.6838E-18
Minor_SubAnalysis_Score	Auth_Overall	0.467926743	1.5636E-09

These findings suggest that perceptions related to subject type are generally aligned with students' overall trust and perceived authenticity regarding the evaluation system.

Test	W/t	p_value	Interpretation
Wilcoxon signed-rank (Major vs Minor)	578.5	0.064659297	Not Significant
Paired t-test (Major vs Minor)	1.91902176	0.05689333	Not Significant

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The study revealed that students generally perceive the faculty evaluation system as fair, consistent, authentic, and trustworthy. Respondents expressed positive perceptions regarding honesty, credibility, and administrative integrity within the evaluation process.

Inferential statistical results showed that perceived authenticity has a significant positive relationship with student trust and also serves as a significant predictor of student trust in faculty evaluation outcomes. No significant differences were found in perceptions of authenticity and trust when respondents were grouped according to year level, indicating that perceptions remain consistent across academic levels.

Additionally, the sub-analysis between major and minor subjects showed no significant differences, suggesting that students evaluate both subject types in a similar and consistent manner. Overall, the findings indicate that strengthening transparency, credibility, and authenticity within faculty evaluation systems may enhance student trust and confidence in the evaluation process.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to examine the perceived authenticity of faculty evaluations and its influence on student trust in evaluation outcomes among Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT) students at Quezon City University. Specifically, the study sought to determine students' perceptions regarding the honesty, fairness, consistency, credibility, and overall effectiveness of the faculty evaluation system, as well as to identify the relationship between perceived authenticity and student trust in evaluation outcomes. The findings of the study revealed that students generally perceive the faculty evaluation system as authentic, credible, fair, and consistent. Respondents demonstrated favorable perceptions regarding the honesty of student responses, the appropriateness of evaluation criteria, and the reliability of evaluation results. These findings indicate that students believe the evaluation process can reflect actual classroom experiences and instructional performance. Furthermore, the study established that students possess a positive level of trust in the faculty evaluation system, particularly in terms of administrative integrity and confidence in the overall evaluation process.

The study further confirmed that perceived authenticity and student trust are significantly related. Students were more likely to trust the evaluation system when they perceived the process as transparent, meaningful, and representative of genuine teaching performance. Moreover, perceived authenticity was found to significantly influence student trust, emphasizing that the credibility and fairness of the evaluation system play an important role in shaping students' confidence in institutional processes. These findings suggest that maintaining transparency, consistency, and authenticity within faculty evaluations contributes to stronger student participation and more reliable evaluation outcomes.

In terms of group comparisons, the findings revealed no significant differences in perceived authenticity and student trust when respondents were grouped according to year level. This indicates that students across different academic levels generally share similar perceptions regarding the faculty evaluation process. Similarly, the comparative sub-analysis between major and minor subjects showed only minimal differences in students' perceptions, suggesting that respondents evaluate faculty members using relatively consistent standards regardless of subject classification. These findings imply that students prioritize the overall credibility and effectiveness of the evaluation system rather than the nature of the subject itself.

The study also highlights the importance of institutional responsiveness in strengthening the effectiveness of faculty evaluations. Students are more likely to view evaluation systems as meaningful when they observe that their feedback contributes to visible improvements in teaching practices, classroom management, and faculty-student interaction. This suggests that faculty evaluations should not merely function as administrative requirements, but rather as collaborative mechanisms for continuous instructional improvement and institutional development.

Overall, the study established that trust, authenticity, transparency, fairness, and institutional accountability are interconnected factors that influence the credibility and effectiveness of faculty evaluation systems. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of how BSIT students perceive evaluation processes and how these perceptions shape their trust in evaluation outcomes. Furthermore, the study may provide valuable insights for Quezon City University and other higher education institutions in developing more responsive, transparent, and student-centered evaluation systems that encourage meaningful participation and support continuous academic improvement.

Ultimately, the study reinforces the importance of creating faculty evaluation systems that are not only technically functional but also perceived by students as fair, secure, authentic, and impactful. When students trust the evaluation process and recognize its relevance to institutional improvement, they become more willing to provide honest and constructive feedback, thereby strengthening the overall quality and reliability of faculty evaluation outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. **Espina, A. D., Jose, J. S., Luna, J., Velasco, J. M. M., & Fernandez, R. (2025).** Smart faculty evaluation: A mobile app using NLP-based sentiment analysis and random forest for faculty assessment at Universidad de Manila. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS), 9(9), 5365–5381. https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.909000434
2. **Amerstorfer, C. M., & Freiin von Münster-Kistner, C. (2021).** Student perceptions of academic engagement and student-teacher relationships in problem-based learning. Frontiers in Psychology, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.713057
3. **Chang, Y. (2018).** When group work doesn't work: Insights from students. CBE—Life Sciences Education. https://www.lifescied.org/doi/10.1187/cbe.17-09-0199
4. **Medina, M. S., Smith, W. T., Kolluru, S., Sheaffer, E. A., & DiVall, M. (2019).** A review of strategies for designing, administering, and using student ratings of instruction. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 83(5). https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7177
5. **Quansah, F., Cobbinah, A., Asamoah-Gyimah, K., & Hagan, J. E. (2024).** Validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher education: A systematic review. Frontiers in Education, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1329734
6. **Trejo, L., & Ginsberg, S. M. (2023).** The impact of faculty feedback on student perceptions of faculty-student relationships. Teaching and Learning in Communication Sciences & Disorders, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.61403/2689-6443.1283
7. **Wong, B. T. M., Cheong Li, K., & Liu, M. (2025).** Evaluation of STE(A)M education: An analysis of research and practices from 2014 to 2023. Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange, 18(1), 68-84. https://doi.org/10.18785/jetde.1801.05
8. **Gutierrez, E. B. (2023).** Performance Evaluation Practices of Select Higher Education Institution in the City of Manila: Basis for Enhancing Faculty Performance. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 4(12), 4239-4243 .

http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.12.07

9. **Reyes, A. P., & Villanueva, K. S. (2020).** Student perceptions of teacher effectiveness and evaluation outcomes in Philippine universities. Philippine Educational Measurement Review.
10. **Santos, E. J. (2021).** Teacher-student interaction and its impact on faculty evaluation results in higher education institutions. International Journal of Philippine Education Research.
11. **Hohrath, S., Aßmann, S., Krabbe, H., & Opfermann, M. (2024).** Students' perceived authenticity and understanding of authentic research while experimenting in a non-formal learning setting. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 39, 3325–3349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-024-00810-z
12. **Dela Cerna, J. T., Sonido, J. M. C., Rubio, D. K. M., & Sisles, L. F. V. (2024).** Analyzing Gen Z's travel influence in the digital age: The correlational effect of social media. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 7(10), 4580–4586. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i10-01
13. **Reyes, J. V., Ariraya, A. C., & Guerzon, R. A. (2024).** The implications of online faculty evaluation by students to PUP branches and campuses faculty: Basis for policy review and implementation. Polytechnic University of the Philippines.
14. Graham, M. J., Hanauer, D. I., Aragón, O., Bauer, M., Bennie, J., Crowley, L., Gill, J., & Morgan,
15. **M.** (2026). A measure of college student trust in their instructor. Frontiers in Education, 11, Article 1655426. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1655426
16. **Zarb, M., McDermott, R., Daniels, M., Nylén, A., Pears, A., Isomöttönen, V., & Caspersen, M.** (2017). The authenticity of 'authentic' assessment: Some faculty perceptions. 2017 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2017.8190604
17. **Ortizo, G. C., & Dagoc, J. C. (2025).** Ranking and promotion experiences of university faculty: A qualitative case study. International Journal of Advanced Research (IJAR), 13(07), 612–629. http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/21363
18. **Alsharefeen, R., & Al-Deaibes, M. (2025).** Between accountability and agency: A comparative analysis of faculty performance evaluation policies in the UAE. Cogent Education, 12(1), Article 2538964. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2538964
19. **Feliciano, C. G. M. (2025).** Sentiment analysis and word cloud of teachers' evaluations using R programming language. Isabela State University Linker: Journal of Engineering, Computing, and Technology, 2(2), 52–80. https://doi.org/10.65141/ject.v2i2.n4
20. **Pontillas, M. S., Sallao, K. M. S., & Requinala, K. V. T. (2025).** Qualitative insights on Arts and Sciences faculty evaluation from students in a Philippine state college. International Journal of Educational Studies, 8(3), 93–103. https://doi.org/10.53935/2641533x.v8i3.383
21. **Salacut, M. F. G., Bagalanon, R. B., & Rosel, M. B. (2025).** College instructors' teaching effectiveness vis-à-vis students' academic performance: An empirical study at Philippine Advent College. The Threshold, 17(1), 1–15.