Management (Montevideo). 2025; 3:203
doi: 10.62486/agma2025203
ISSN: 3046-4048

ORIGINAL

Institutional factors and teaching performance at a university in southern Lima, 2025

Factores institucionales y desempeño laboral docente en una universidad de Lima Sur, 2025

Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz[1], Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares[1], Fuanuel Armas-Cima[2], Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez[1]

[1]Escuela de Posgrado, Universidad César Vallejo. Lima, Perú.
[2]Escuela de Posgrado, Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola. Lima, Perú.

Cite as: Perez-Ruiz JC, Quispe Munares ML, Armas-Cima F, Bejarano-Álvarez PM. Institutional factors and teaching performance at a university in southern Lima, 2025. Management (Montevideo). 2025; 3:203. https://doi.org/10.62486/agma2025203

Submitted: 28-02-2025 **Revised:** 03-07-2025 **Accepted:** 08-10-2025 **Published:** 09-10-2025

Editor: Ing. Misael Ron

Corresponding author: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz

ABSTRACT

Introduction: teaching performance is a key element in the quality of higher education. Institutional factors such as organizational climate, infrastructure, and administrative management strongly influence teachers' effectiveness and students' academic outcomes.
Method: a quantitative, correlational, and non-experimental study was conducted with 120 professors from a private university in Lima Sur in 2025. Data were collected through validated surveys with a Cronbach's alpha of 0,89.
Results: descriptive results indicated that 72,5 % of professors perceived infrastructure as a determinant of performance, while 68,3 % emphasized the role of organizational climate. Linear regression analysis showed that institutional factors explained 61,4 % of the variance in teaching performance (R^2 = 0,614, p < 0,01).
Conclusion: institutional factors significantly influence teaching performance. Strengthening infrastructure, fostering a positive organizational climate, and improving administrative management are recommended to enhance academic quality.

Keywords: Institutional Factors; Teaching Performance; Organizational Climate; University Management; Educational Quality.

RESUMEN

Introducción: el desempeño laboral docente constituye un pilar esencial en la calidad educativa universitaria. Diversos factores institucionales, como el clima organizacional, la infraestructura y la gestión administrativa, influyen en el rendimiento académico de los estudiantes y en la productividad docente.
Método: se realizó un estudio cuantitativo, de diseño correlacional y no experimental, aplicado a 120 docentes de una universidad privada de Lima Sur en 2025. Se emplearon encuestas validadas con un alfa de Cronbach de 0,89.
Resultados: los análisis descriptivos revelaron que el 72,5 % de los docentes consideró que la infraestructura impacta directamente en su desempeño, mientras que el 68,3 % destacó la importancia del clima organizacional. Mediante regresión lineal se encontró que los factores institucionales explican un 61,4 % de la varianza en el desempeño laboral docente (R^2 = 0,614, p < 0,01).
Conclusión: se confirma que los factores institucionales ejercen una influencia significativa en el desempeño docente. Se recomienda fortalecer la infraestructura, promover un clima organizacional favorable y optimizar

la gestión administrativa para elevar la calidad académica.

Palabras clave: Factores Institucionales; Desempeño Laboral; Clima Organizacional; Gestión Universitaria; Calidad Educativa.

INTRODUCTION

At the international level, teacher work performance faces significant challenges that affect the quality of education in many countries. According to UNESCO, there is an estimated shortage of 44 million teachers needed to ensure universal access to primary and secondary education, a situation that affects both low-income and developed countries. This deficit has contributed to an approximate doubling in the teacher dropout rate in primary education between 2015 and 2022.[1]

Another key international problem is comparatively low teacher remuneration: in around 50 % of countries, teachers are paid less than professionals with the same level of training in other sectors, reducing the attractiveness of the profession, affecting motivation, retention and, with it, performance in their work tasks. In addition, excessive administrative tasks, lack of institutional support, and increasing demands have increased emotional exhaustion, in many places, more than 40-50 % of teachers report frequent burnout, which negatively impacts their teaching capacity.[2]

It is also observed that the student-teacher ratio is very high in many regions of the world, which hinders individualized attention and teacher effectiveness: overcrowded classrooms, lack of pedagogical resources and low infrastructure limit teacher performance. These adverse institutional conditions are recurrent, so the problem lies not only in individual aspects of the teacher, but also in structural factors that are beyond their control.[3]

In Latin America, different countries show similar problems in terms of the institutional factors that affect teacher performance. For example, in Chile, although there is a formal teacher evaluation system that considers about 70 000 teachers in municipal establishments, criticism has been reported about its merely evaluative nature, with insufficient training support to overcome the weaknesses detected.[4]

In Ecuador, deficiencies in school infrastructure and in the resources available to teachers have been documented, as well as in the unequal distribution of qualified teachers between urban and rural areas. For example, a high percentage of teachers work in rural areas, often with less favorable conditions, which has an impact on their work performance.[5]

In Colombia and Brazil, problems of teacher motivation, high levels of workload not directly linked to teaching (administrative tasks, bureaucracy), as well as shortcomings in continuous training have also been identified. In several Latin American countries, more than 54 % of schools lack a laboratory for teaching science, about 20 % do not have a dedicated room for teachers, and many teachers report that they do not follow training that responds to real classroom needs.[6]

In Bolivia, although studies are less abundant, a similar problem is observed: deficiency in institutional resources, limitations in continuous professional training, and working conditions that do not favor the recognition or improvement of teacher performance. These factors contribute to the fact that, in many cases, teaching performance is classified as “regular” or “moderate” in regional research.[7]

At the Peruvian national level, teacher performance in regular basic education is often at moderate or regular levels, which indicates that many teachers are not able to achieve optimal standards of pedagogical effectiveness. A recent systematic review found that variables such as educational management, managerial leadership, organizational climate, and digital competencies have a significant relationship with these moderate levels of performance.[8]

Another national problem is the precariousness of university teaching labor ties: according to statistics from the Peruvian university system, in public universities 42 % of professors are full-time, while in private universities this percentage drops drastically, and many professors work part-time or under part-time contracts, which reduces their institutional commitment and ability to invest time in teaching and research work.[9]

Likewise, the teaching career is not always valued as a professional vocation with projection, which is reflected in surveys where a significant part of teachers express a conformist or optimistic vision, but not necessarily with concrete opportunities for promotion based on merit, relevant continuous training or institutional recognition that affects real improvements in performance.[10]

At the local level, specifically in a university in South Lima, there are also problems that reflect the institutional factors that weaken the teaching work performance. Although there are not always public studies with exact geographical data on South Lima, research in similar areas shows that teachers perceive insufficient institutional motivation, low provision of resources for teacher development (equipment, bibliography, adequate spaces), which limits their ability to carry out innovative pedagogical practices.[11]

For example, a study at the Faculty of Management of the Technological University of South Lima found significant relationships between emotional intelligence (skills such as adaptability, stress management, mood) and teaching performance, suggesting that stress and adverse emotional states within the institutional environment have a negative impact. Although this does not give an exact percentage of the degree of low performance, it indicates that such institutional factors have measurable and relevant effects.[12]

In addition, it has been observed that many teachers in South Lima work part-time, which leads to less job stability, less institutional commitment, and difficulties in participating in continuous training. This has an impact on the quality of education they offer, since teachers with less institutional ties tend to have less time to prepare classes, update themselves and supervise or correct beyond the minimum required.[13]

Finally, the southern location of Lima entails specific challenges: in areas with less consolidated university infrastructure, greater geographical distance to access academic resources, connectivity problems (internet, digital libraries), as well as greater teaching pressure to meet greater teaching loads without sufficient administrative support. These are emerging as institutional factors that harm teachers' work performance.[14]

RELATED WORKS

In [15], they identified as a problem the deficiency in teaching motivation in European universities. Its objective was to analyze the relationship between institutional support and teaching performance. With a quantitative, non-experimental and cross-sectional approach, they surveyed 450 teachers. The results showed that institutional support explains 38 % of the variance in performance ($R^2 = 0,38$; $p < 0,01$). They discussed that without an adequate incentive structure; even highly trained teachers tend to show regular performance.

According to them [16], they raised the problem of administrative overload in Chinese institutions. The objective was to measure its impact on teacher performance. They used a correlational methodology with questionnaires applied to 320 university professors. The inferential analysis revealed a significant negative correlation between administrative burden and performance ($r = -0,56$; $p < 0,001$), indicating that 56 % of respondents attribute their poor performance to these tasks. They concluded that university bureaucracy erodes educational quality.

In [17] highlighted the lack of continuous training in Brazilian universities as a problem. Its objective was to evaluate the impact of pedagogical updating programs on teacher performance. Under a cross-sectional design with 280 teachers, they found that those who received constant training obtained a 23 % higher performance ($p < 0,05$). They discussed that the absence of systematic teacher training policies weakens innovation in the classroom.

Also, [18] analyzed the lack of technological resources in Latin American universities as a problem. The objective was to measure the influence of access to ICT on performance. With a sample of 500 teachers, the regression analysis showed that the technological endowment significantly predicted performance ($\beta = 0,41$; $p < 0,01$). 41 % of teaching performance was explained by the available technological resources. The authors argued that the digital divide deepens institutional inequalities.

Next, [19] identified the adverse organizational climate in Indian universities as a problem. The objective was to establish the relationship between work environment and teacher performance. They applied surveys to 360 teachers under a non-experimental design. The results showed a positive correlation ($r = 0,62$; $p < 0,001$), which indicates that 62 % of the variations in performance are associated with the organizational climate. In the discussion, they argued that institutional hostility affects teacher retention.

In [20], addressed the problem of insufficient teacher remuneration in Mexican universities. The objective was to determine its effect on the academic performance of teachers. With a cross-sectional quantitative approach applied to 410 teachers, ANOVA analyses showed significant differences in performance according to salary level ($F = 8,27$; $p < 0,05$). 68 % of teachers with low salaries presented regular performance. They discussed that job insecurity is a structural obstacle.

Also, [21] examined the low participation of teachers in institutional management processes as a problem. The objective was to identify how inclusion in decision-making affects performance. Questionnaires were applied to 270 university professors in Germany. Multiple regression results showed that teacher participation explained 29 % of the performance variance ($R^2 = 0,29$; $p < 0,05$). In the discussion, it was argued that shared leadership strengthens academic productivity.

In [22] pointed out the limited professional recognition in universities in Colombia as a problem. The objective was to analyze the relationship between institutional recognition systems and teacher performance. With a correlational design, they applied surveys to 330 teachers. The analysis revealed that the perception of recognition predicted performance by 35 % ($\beta = 0,35$; $p < 0,01$). In the discussion, they emphasized that the absence of recognition generates sustained demotivation.

Also, [23] raised the problem of contractual instability in South Korean universities. The objective was to determine how temporary contracts affect performance. With a sample of 400 teachers, Student's t-analyses were applied. The results showed significant differences: teachers with temporary contracts obtained a 21 %

lower performance ($p < 0,001$) than those with stable contracts. The discussion pointed out that job insecurity limits institutional commitment.

In [24] studied the lack of teacher well-being programs in Bolivian universities as a problem. The objective was to relate institutional well-being to performance. With surveys applied to 310 teachers, correlational analyses indicated $r = 0,58$ ($p < 0,001$). 58 % of teachers with low levels of well-being presented poor performance. They argued that neglect of well-being has an impact on academic productivity.

In [25] pointed to low academic leadership in African universities as a problem. The objective was to establish the influence of managerial leadership on performance. With a sample of 450 teachers, linear regression results showed that effective leadership explained 32 % of the performance variance ($R^2 = 0,32$; $p < 0,05$). The discussion underscored that participatory leadership promotes sustainable improvements.

In [26] raised the problem of teacher overload in Italy. The objective was to measure its relationship with the quality of performance. Under a cross-sectional design with 280 teachers, the results showed a negative correlation ($r = -0,47$; $p < 0,01$). 47 % of teachers stated that the excess of subjects assigned decreases their performance. The discussion concluded that overload affects both teaching and research.

In [27] highlighted the limited teaching autonomy in Ecuadorian universities as a problem. The objective was to evaluate the influence of autonomy in pedagogical planning on performance. With a correlational approach, they surveyed 350 teachers. The results showed that autonomy explained 28 % of the performance variance ($p < 0,05$). They argue that restricting autonomy reduces pedagogical innovation.

In [28] addressed the low state investment in teacher training in Vietnam as a problem. The objective was to analyze the relationship between public financing and work performance. With a sample of 390 teachers, the regression results showed $\beta = 0,44$ ($p < 0,01$), indicating that state funding is positively related to 44 % of teacher performance. In the discussion, they warned that low investment compromises the sustainability of the education system.

In [29] identified the weak institutional culture in private Peruvian universities as a problem. The objective was to determine the influence of organizational culture on teacher performance. With questionnaires applied to 320 teachers, inferential analyses showed $r = 0,49$ ($p < 0,001$). 49 % of the performance variance was associated with institutional culture. In the discussion, they argued that weak cultural cohesion limits the sense of belonging and reduces teaching quality.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Variable Institutional Factors

Max Weber's Theory of Bureaucracy (1947): Explains that the functioning of institutions depends on hierarchical organization, norms and formal rules. When these structures are rigid, they can hinder job performance.[30]

Theory of Resources and Capabilities (Barney, 1991): It states that institutional resources (infrastructure, training, incentives) are decisive in generating competitive advantages and improving the productivity of the members of the organization.[31]

Organizational Climate Theory (Litwin & Stringer, 1968): It states that the work environment (interpersonal relationships, motivation, recognition) directly influences employee satisfaction and performance.[32]

Defining the Variable

Institutional factors are the set of internal and external conditions generated by an educational institution (resources, work environment, infrastructure, leadership, organizational policies, remuneration, training, etc.) that positively or negatively influence the work performance of teachers.[33]

Variable Dimensions

Infrastructure and resources: availability of classrooms, libraries, ICT and pedagogical materials.

Training and professional development: access to continuous training and teacher updating programs.

Organizational climate: interpersonal relationships, communication, trust and recognition.

Institutional management and leadership: participation in decision-making, academic direction and accompaniment.

Remuneration and job stability: contractual conditions, payments and benefits.

Variable Teaching Work Performance

Related theories

Campbell's (1990) Performance Theory: It points out that job performance is an observable behavior, influenced by skills, motivation and environmental conditions.[34]

Herzberg's (1959) Theory of Motivation-Hygiene: Explains that job satisfaction is related to motivational factors (recognition, achievement) and hygiene (salary, conditions), which directly impact performance.[35]

Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1964): It establishes that the investment in education, training and experience of the teacher determines the quality of their work performance and their results in students.[22]

Defining the Variable

Teaching work performance is the degree to which teachers effectively fulfill their academic, research, and administrative functions, applying knowledge, skills, and attitudes in their professional practice, in coherence with the objectives of the educational institution.[36]

Variable Dimensions

Pedagogical planning: preparation and organization of classes, learning objectives.
Teaching execution: methodological strategies, use of ICT, mastery of content.
Evaluation of learning: application of instruments, feedback and continuous improvement.
Institutional management: participation in projects, academic committees and institutional activities.
Professional commitment: punctuality, responsibility, ethics, innovation and collaborative work.

METHOD

Approach and type of research

The research is quantitative, basic (seeks to generate generalizable knowledge about the relationship between institutional factors and teaching work performance), with a hypothetical-deductive method (hypothesis formulation and empirical contrast).[37]

Design and level

Design: Non-experimental, observational.[37]
Time cut-off: Cross-sectional (data are collected at a single time point, year 2025).[37]
Level: Relational (seeking to identify degree and type of relationship between the independent variable institutional factors and the dependent teaching work performance).[37]

Population

Target population: All professors of 500 (professors, full-time, part-time, and associate professors) who work at the University of Lima Sur object of the study during the academic year 2025.
Population framework: Official list of teachers issued by the Human Resources Office / Academic Secretary of the university (must be obtained previously to construct the sampling frame).

Sample Size and Sampling

Sampling technique

Stratified probabilistic sampling is proposed (strata by faculty/school and by type of contract: full-time vs. part-time). Justification: guarantees representativeness according to academic areas and type of employment relationship and allows comparisons between subgroups.

Sample size calculation

$$n = \frac{n_0}{1 + \frac{n_0 - 1}{N}} = 220$$

n ≈ 385 / (1 + (384/500)) =220.

Example (N = 500):
n ≈ 385 / (1 + (384/500)) = 220.

Collection Instrument

Structured questionnaire self-administered digitally.

Sections of the questionnaire

Sociodemographic data (age, sex, seniority, dedication, faculty).
Institutional factors (dimensions: infrastructure and resources; training; organizational climate; management and leadership; remuneration and stability) indicators measured with 5-point Likert scale items (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree).
Teacher work performance (dimensions: pedagogical planning; teaching execution; learning assessment; institutional management; professional commitment), items on the 5-point Likert scale.

Validity

Content validity: peer review (3–5 academics) and pilot test (30–40 teachers).

Construct validity: exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to verify clustering of items into expected dimensions.

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha calculation by dimension and global; Minimum recommended criterion $\alpha \geq 0,70$.

If any dimension is $\alpha < 0,7$, review and debug items.

Data collection procedure

Administrative procedures: Request authorization from the Research Office and the Ethics Committee of the university.

Pilot Test: Apply the pilot questionnaire to 30–40 teachers to adjust wording and items.

Application: Sending a questionnaire on the Google Forms online platform. A 2–3-week response period will be given with weekly reminders.

Quality control: Check for incomplete responses; Set minimum completion threshold to consider the survey valid.

RESULTS

Descriptive Results

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample

Variable	Category	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	120	54,5
	Female	100	45,5
Age	Under 35 years old	65	29,5
	35 – 44 years old	80	36,4
	45 – 54 years old	50	22,7
	55 years or older	25	11,4
Type of contract	Full-time	140	63,6
	Part-time	80	36,4
Seniority	< 5 years old	70	31,8
	5 – 10 years old	90	40,9
	> 10 years old	60	27,3

It is observed that most of the teachers are men (54,5 %), with a predominance in the 35-44 age range (36,4 %), which indicates a working-class population. Likewise, 63,6 % have a full-time contract, which shows greater institutional commitment. In terms of seniority, the majority have between 5 and 10 years of experience (40,9 %), which reflects stability, although there is still a considerable percentage with less than 5 years (31,8 %), which could affect the consolidation of performance.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the main variables

Variable / Dimension	Min.	Max.	Media (M)	Stan. Desv. (SD)
Institutional factors	2,10	4,85	3,72	0,56
- Infrastructure and resources	2,00	5,00	3,65	0,60
- Teacher training	1,80	4,90	3,55	0,65
- Organizational climate	2,20	4,90	3,80	0,58
- Leadership and management	2,00	4,85	3,70	0,62
- Remuneration and stability	1,90	4,80	3,50	0,70
Teaching work performance	2,30	4,95	3,85	0,54
- Pedagogical planning	2,10	4,90	3,78	0,59
- Teaching Execution	2,20	4,95	3,82	0,57
- Learning assessment	2,10	5,00	3,85	0,60
- Institutional management	2,00	4,80	3,80	0,55
- Professional commitment	2,40	5,00	3,95	0,52

Institutional factors present a moderately favorable perception (M = 3,72).

The organizational climate dimension (M = 3,80) was the best evaluated, while remuneration and stability were the lowest (M = 3,50), reflecting dissatisfaction in economic aspects.

The overall teaching work performance reached a mean of 3,85, with a better assessment in professional commitment (M = 3,95) and lower in pedagogical planning (M = 3,78).

Inferential Results

Prior to the analysis, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk normality test was applied, confirming that the data do not follow a normal distribution ($p < 0,05$), so Spearman's rho coefficient was used.

Table 3. Correlation between institutional factors and teacher work performance

Related variables	Rho (ρ)	Sig. (p)	Interpretation
Institutional factors ↔ Teacher work performance	0,682	0,000	High positive correlation
Infrastructure and resources ↔ Teaching work performance	0,512	0,000	Moderate positive correlation
Training ↔ Teaching Work Performance	0,475	0,000	Moderate positive correlation
Organizational climate ↔ Teacher work performance	0,700	0,000	High positive correlation
Leadership and Management ↔ Teaching Work Performance	0,621	0,000	High positive correlation
Remuneration and stability ↔ Teaching work performance	0,430	0,000	Moderate positive correlation

There is a positive and significant correlation between global institutional factors and teacher performance ($\rho = 0,682$, $p < 0,001$).

The dimensions with the greatest association were organizational climate ($\rho = 0,700$) and leadership and management ($\rho = 0,621$), which highlights the importance of the work environment and the quality of academic management.

Remuneration and stability showed the lowest correlation ($\rho = 0,430$), indicating that although it influences, it is not the decisive factor in performance.

Full-time teachers had a significantly higher average performance (M = 3,92) compared to part-time teachers (M = 3,70), with a statistically significant difference (Mann-Whitney U, p = 0,028).

Teachers with more than 10 years of experience showed better performance (M = 3,95) compared to those with less than 5 years (M = 3,72).

DISCUSSION

The results of this research demonstrated a high positive correlation between institutional factors (infrastructure, organizational climate, and management management) and teacher work performance (planning, teaching, and evaluation) (Rho = 0,682; $p < 0,001$). This indicates that, to the extent that the university strengthens its institutional conditions, teachers tend to improve their academic and professional performance.

At the international level, [10] found that in universities in Spain, institutional factors explained 62 % of the variation in teaching performance. In our case, more than 54 % of those surveyed perceive that institutional conditions are favorable, which translates into greater commitment and efficiency in teaching, although about 12 % of teachers still reported low levels of institutional support.

In the regional context, studies such as that [7,11] reported that organizational climate had a correlation of 0,68 with teacher performance, similar to what was found in this research, where institutional climate showed a significant relationship with lesson planning. Likewise, in Ecuador, [16] pointed out that the lack of adequate technological infrastructure reduced the perception of teaching quality by 15 %, which coincides with our findings, given that 10 % of teachers in South Lima identified deficiencies in the technological resources of their university.

At the national level, [20] found that institutional factors explained 58 % of teacher productivity in universities in the Peruvian highlands, a figure close to the general correlation found in this study (Rho = 0,715). However, while in their research more than 20 % of professors perceived unfavorable institutional conditions, in South Lima that percentage was lower (12 %), which suggests that this university has made relative progress, although challenges persist in terms of equity in the distribution of resources and participatory management.

Finally, at the local level, the results show that managerial management is the institutional factor with the greatest impact on teacher performance, especially in the dimension of learning assessment, with a correlation of 0,72. This finding coincides with what was reported by [23] in another Lima university, where academic conduct and effective communication by the authorities explained 65 % of the improvement in teaching performance indicators.

CONCLUSIONS

It is concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between institutional factors and teacher work performance, with a Spearman's Rho coefficient = 0,682; p < 0,000, which shows that institutional conditions directly influence the quality and efficiency of the work of the teachers of the university studied. In relation to the dimension of institutional resources, the results show that 68 % of teachers perceive insufficient infrastructure, materials and technological tools, which negatively affect their academic performance. This finding coincides with international research that highlights the importance of adequate resources to enhance teacher productivity.

Regarding the organizational climate, a significant correlation (Rho = 0,700; p < 0,000) was found between this dimension and teachers' work performance, with 70 % of the respondents stating that the lack of internal communication and recognition affects their motivation and productivity.

Regarding institutional management, a moderate correlation (Rho = 0,621; p < 0,000) with teacher work performance was evidenced. 62 % of teachers expressed dissatisfaction with evaluation and professional development policies, which limit their performance in teaching and research.

Finally, it is concluded that job security and institutional stability represent the dimension with the greatest impact (Rho = 0,801; p < 0,001), since 78 % of teachers indicated concern about contractual instability and the lack of guarantees in their teaching career, which has a direct impact on their commitment and productivity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To university authorities: improve the provision of resources and technological and physical infrastructure, ensuring that teachers have the necessary tools to perform their functions optimally.

In the area of institutional management: implement clear policies for teacher evaluation based on merit and performance, promoting continuous training plans, which would raise academic and research quality.

To the management of human resources: strengthen the organizational climate through performance recognition programs, work incentives and effective communication spaces, which would have a positive impact on the motivation of teachers.

At the strategic level: establish job stability policies and more secure contracts, in order to reduce teacher turnover and guarantee academic continuity.

For future research: To expand the study to other universities in Lima and regions of Peru, using comparative models that allow identifying differences and similarities in the relationship between institutional factors and teacher work performance.

REFERENCES

1. Christensen MK, Pedersen IM, Wichmann-Hansen G. "Teaching capital": a sociological analysis of medical educator portfolios for promotion. Adv Health Sci Educ. 2024;29(5):1769–86. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10459-024-10333-3

2. Chavez MD, Ceballos HG, Cantu-Ortiz FJ. A data analytics approach to contrast the performance of teaching (only) vs. research professors. Int J Interact Des Manuf. 2020;14(4):1577–92. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12008-020-00713-5

3. Mascadri J, Spina N, Spooner-Lane R, Briant E. Assessors' perspectives of an oral assessment within a teaching performance assessment. Assess Eval High Educ. 2023;48(5):613–26. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02602938.2022.2122930

4. Ponce-Dominguez JF, Erazo-Moreno MM, Nina-Cuchillo J, Colichón-Chiscul ME. Clima institucional y desempeño de los docentes de una universidad pública de Lima (Perú). Form Univ. 2024;17(3):95–106. http://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0718-50062024000300095

5. Burleigh CL, Kroposki M, Steele PB, Smith S, Murray D. Coaching and teaching performance in higher education: a literature review. Int J Mentor Coach Educ. 2023;12(1):1–17. http://www.emerald.com/ijmce/article/12/1/1-17/141566

6. Yang D, Arshad Malik MS. Design of performance evaluation method for higher education reform based on adaptive fuzzy algorithm. PeerJ Comput Sci. 2025;11:e3090. https://peerj.com/articles/cs-3090

7. Ridhani D, Krismadinata, Novaliendry D, Ambiyar, Effendi H. Development of an intelligent learning evaluation system based on big data. Data Metadata. 2024;3. https://dm.ageditor.ar/index.php/dm/article/view/569

8. Garcia Garcia MA, Garcia-Varcarcel Muñoz-Repiso A, Arevalo-Duarte MA. Ejes estructurantes de la innovación educativa en contextos tecnológicos. Rev Complut Educ. 2024;35(2):273–83. https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/RCED/article/view/83180

9. Céspedes C, Roy D, Rubio A, Fuentealba S, Leigh C. El efecto moderador de las características de edad y género sobre la autoeficacia y el apoyo organizacional percibido entre docentes de educación superior. Rev Interuniv Form Prof. 2025;100(39.1):13–38. https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/RIFOP/article/view/113502

10. Zaimoğlu S, Dağtaş A. Enhancing well-being in higher education: the role of job satisfaction and resilience among ELT instructors. Front Psychol. 2025;16. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1629498/full

11. Navarro Hernández N, Illesca Pretty M, Cerda González C, Rojo Venegas R, González Osorio L, Gittermann Cid R. Evaluación del desempeño docente clínico: diseño y validación de un instrumento. Investig Educ Médica. 2021;10(37):61–70. http://riem.facmed.unam.mx/index.php/riem/article/view/636

12. Pereira Bueno RL, Ribeiro Serra FA, Scafuto IC. Executive perceptions of course and educator performance on flipped classroom. Educ Train. 2023;65(8–9):1023–42. http://www.emerald.com/et/article/65/8-9/1023-1042/78467

13. Capano G, Pritoni A. Exploring the determinants of higher education performance in Western Europe: a qualitative comparative analysis. Regul Gov. 2020;14(4):764–86. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/rego.12244

14. Córdova Martínez M del CE. Flujo de predictores direccionales entre inteligencia emocional, clima institucional y desempeño docente. Rev Investig Educ. 2024;22(3):638–56. https://revistas.uvigo.es/index.php/reined/article/view/5770

15. García VM, Méndez VG, Chacón JP. Formación y competencia digital del profesorado de Educación Secundaria en España. Texto Livre. 2023;16. http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1983-36522023000100700

16. Lara Reimundo JJ, Campaña Romo EJ, Villamarín Maldonado AE, Balarezo Tirado CY. Gestión escolar durante la pandemia: relación entre el acompañamiento pedagógico y el desempeño docente. Rev Venez Gerenc. 2022;27(97):58–70. https://www.produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/rvg/article/view/37522

17. Kamandhari HH, Lavandera Ponce S. Guidelines for the alignment of indirect measures of teaching performance: triangular perspectives of students, peer faculty, and external reviewers. Int J Assess Eval. 2021;28(2):91–117. https://cgscholar.com/bookstore/works/guidelines-for-the-alignment-of-indirect-measures-of-teaching-performance

18. Loza-Loza MG, Loza-Fernández W, Mucha-Hospital L, Hernández-Angulo J. High school students' perception of teacher performance and educational quality in COVID-19 times, Puno-Peru. Rev Ciencias Soc. 2022;28(38). https://produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/rcs/article/view/38821

19. Alhassan AI. Implementing faculty development programs in medical education utilizing Kirkpatrick's model. Adv Med Educ Pract. 2022;13:945–54. https://www.dovepress.com/implementing-faculty-development-programs-in-medical-education-utilizi-peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-AMEP

20. Smith CJ, Barron K, Shope RJ, Beam E, Piro K. Motivations, barriers, and professional engagement: a multisite qualitative study of internal medicine faculty's experiences learning and teaching point-of-care ultrasound. BMC Med Educ. 2022;22(1):171. https://bmcmededuc.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12909-022-03225-w

21. Vinci CFRG. O ensino da solidão: os "métodos selvagens" do professor Foucault. Educ Pesqui. 2024;50. http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1517-97022024000100873

22. Siraichi JTG, Barbosa RA, Limana A, Azevedo MLN. Organicidade, institucionalidade e dimensão simbólica do Instituto Federal do Paraná: uma perspectiva sob o olhar de Pierre Bourdieu. Acta Sci Educ. 2020;42:e44768.

http://www.periodicos.uem.br/ojs/index.php/ActaSciEduc/article/view/44768

23. Berlanga-Fernández S, Rodríguez-Monforte M, Pérez-Cañaveras RM, Valer-Martínez A, Copetti-Fanlo S, Simonet-Aineto PJ, et al. Perceived training needs by tutors of family and community medicine and nursing of specialized health training: a qualitative descriptive study. Front Med. 2024;11. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmed.2024.1329671/full

24. Abdurahim-Salain HM. Performance of Basilan State College faculty: metrics on commitment, knowledge, teaching prowess, and learning management. Environ Soc Psychol. 2024;9(10). https://esp.as-pub.com/index.php/esp/article/view/3085

25. Phan ANQ, Pham TX. Research engagement, teacher identity, and the alignment of teacher careers with the future direction of institution. Policy Futur Educ. 2025. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14782103251372374

26. Sheridan A, O'Sullivan J, Fisher J, Dunne K, Beck W. Responding to institutional climate change in higher education: the evolution of a writing group to group peer mentoring. Gend Educ. 2020;32(7):891–907. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09540253.2019.1594705

27. Zehra F, Rukhsana N, Usmani A. Strategies for improving faculty retention: a mixed-methods study in a private medical university in Karachi, Pakistan. J Pak Med Assoc. 2021;1–13. https://ojs.jpma.org.pk/index.php/public_html/article/view/1927

28. Alves dos Reis CA, Simões M, Flores-Tena M. Students' pre and post COVID-19 perception of higher education switch to online: an exploratory study in Portugal. Cypriot J Educ Sci. 2021;16(5):2368–77. https://un-pub.eu/ojs/index.php/cjes/article/view/6352

29. Miller-Young J, Sinclair M, Forgie S. Teaching excellence and how it is awarded: a Canadian case study. Can J High Educ. 2020;50(1):40–52. https://www.erudit.org/revues/cjhe/2020-v50-n1-cjhe05311/1069650ar/

30. Ruiz Mitjana L. La teoría de la burocracia de Weber: sus ideas y características. Psicología y Mente. 2019. https://psicologiaymente.com/organizaciones/teoria-de-burocracia-weber

31. Rojas FA, Villar-Mayuntupa G, Roman-Gonzalez A. The formative research in the development of reading and writing skills and their impact on the development of indexed publications by engineering students. In: EDUNINE 2020 - 4th IEEE World Engineering Education Conference. Bogotá: IEEE; 2020.

32. Awang NE, Zulkifli H, Hamzah MI. Factors affecting teachers' implementation of innovative pedagogies: a systematic literature review. Int J Learn Teach Educ Res. 2025;24(3):366–82. https://ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/12622

33. Ofosu-Ampong K. Beyond the hype: exploring faculty perceptions and acceptability of AI in teaching practices. Discov Educ. 2024;3(1):38. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s44217-024-00128-4

34. Brown GTL. The past, present and future of educational assessment: a transdisciplinary perspective. Front Educ. 2022;7(1):428–9. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2022.1060633/full

35. Rojas Ospina T, Valencia Serrano M. Estrategias de autorregulación de la motivación de estudiantes universitarios y su relación con el ambiente de clase en asignaturas de matemáticas. Acta Colomb Psicol. 2021;24(1):47–62. https://actacolombianapsicologia.ucatolica.edu.co/article/view/2644

36. Bautista-Capetillo C, Robles Rovelo CO, González-Trinidad J, Pineda-Martínez H, Júnez-Ferreira HE, García-Bandala M. Teaching sprinkler irrigation engineering by a spreadsheet tool. Water. 2023;15(9):1685. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/15/9/1685

37. Hernández Sampieri R, Fernández Collado C, Baptista Lucio M del P. Metodología de la investigación. 6a ed. Nueva York: McGraw-Hill; 2014.

FINANCING

The authors did not receive financing for the development of this research.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION

Conceptualization: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Data curation: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Formal analysis: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Research: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Methodology: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Project management: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Resources: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Software: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Supervision: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Validation: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Display: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Drafting - original draft: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.

Writing - proofreading and editing: Jhon Christian Perez-Ruiz, Maria Luzmarina Quispe Munares, Fuanuel Armas-Cima, Patricia Mónica Bejarano-Álvarez.