

ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL
Available Online: https://assajournal.com
Vol. 05 No. 01. Jan-March 2026.Page# 8857-8863
Print ISSN: 3006-2497 Online ISSN: 3006-2500
Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal Systems
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24130082

Student Perceptions of Teaching Quality, Academic Support, And Learning Outcomes at The Bs Level: Evidence from Government College University Faisalabad

Isha Khalid
B.Ed. (Hons) Bridging Scholar, Department of Education, Government College University Faisalabad.
khalidesha892@gmail.com
Tania Yaseen
BS (Hons) Criminology Scholar, Department of Criminology, Government College University Faisalabad.
raialpha534@gmail.com
MS Asma Ishtiaq (Corresponding Author)
Lecturer (BPS-18), Department of Education
Ishtiaqrajpoot1122@gmail.com
Atiqa Khalid
B.Ed. (Hons) Bridging Scholar, Department of Education, Government College University Faisalabad.
atiqakhalida@gmail.com
Adnan Akhtar
B.Ed. (Hons) Bridging Scholar, Department of Education, Government College University Faisalabad.
mianadnan3145@gmail.com
Muhammad Ashfaq Hassan Babar
PhD Scholar, Department of Education, Govt. College University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan
ashfaqhassan75@gmail.com

Abstract
Student satisfaction can provide valuable feedback regarding teaching, course structure and learning. This study explores students stated satisfaction aspects and investigates how they relate to learning outcomes. The study uses a quantitative cross-sectional correlation method to analyse the descriptive data provided which includes 200 participants. There is an apparent correlation (Pearson) between teacher-student satisfaction and learning outcomes. The sample consisted of 81 male participants (40.5%) and 119 female participants (59.5%). Teacher-student interaction had a mean of 3.03. Teaching quality had a mean of 2.91. Course structure had a mean of 2.97. Learning outcomes had a mean of 3.06. Social support and coping had a mean of 4.09. Overall teacher-student satisfaction had a mean of 3.21. There appears to be a positive and strong correlation between teacher-student satisfaction (M = 3.21, SD = 0.75) and learning outcomes (M = 3.42, SD = 0.83), r= .741, p< .01. Generally, when students have a more positive experience their perceived learning outcomes are stronger. However, the summary tables provided do not show causality. There is no information on validity of measurements. There is no information provided on who exactly the participants were. There is no information on whether the learning outcomes were self-reported or objectively measured. Practical implications and recommendations are provided at the end of the article to improve

future research. All results should be checked against the original statistical output before publishing.

Keywords: student satisfaction; teaching quality; teacher–student interaction; learning outcomes; undergraduate education; Pakistan; GCUF

1. Introduction

The learning experiences of undergraduate students involve various aspects of teaching styles, student-teacher relationships, assessment, course structure, and academic and social supports. Using student satisfaction can be an effective way for departments to get feedback on their teaching and the quality of their Programme (Elliott & Shin, 2002). Satisfaction is a subjective measure and does not necessarily reflect how much students have learned. To understand students' learning experiences and how satisfaction relates to learning outcomes, research should investigate how satisfaction and learning outcomes relate to each other. Students' experiences can be influenced by how effectively they interact with their teachers, receive feedback, and learn from their learning activities (Astin, 1984; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In Universities, students are expected to take greater responsibility for their independent learning. If a course is well structured with clear learning outcomes students had a better understanding of what the course expects of them (Biggs, 1996). Conversely, if there is a lack of clarity or interaction students may struggle to monitor their learning.

The data provided contains summary statistics from a study conducted at Government College University Faisalabad (GCUF). This study has looked at how teachers interact with students, teaching quality, course structure, social support and coping, student-teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes. It provides a basic idea of how satisfaction and learning outcomes are correlated. As only summary tables were provided, this article does not suggest any causal links between satisfaction and achievement. It also does not infer any tests, sampling methods, questionnaire questions or demographic comparisons. In general, conclusions should not go beyond what can be concluded from the data.

1.1 Problem Statement

Universities need data on how students experience teaching and the link between this and perceived learning outcomes. Satisfaction surveys can help highlight aspects of teaching that students think are effective or need improvement (Elliott & Shin, 2002). From the data provided, there seems to be variation in satisfaction and a positive correlation between student-teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes. However, care must be taken in interpreting the data due to the lack of detail provided. The tables do not show who completed the survey, how they were sampled, what the scale was or how learning outcomes were defined. The aim of this study is to responsibly interpret the data provided to improve teaching of undergraduates.

1.2 Aim

This study aims to describe how respondents rated various aspects relating to teaching and learning at BS level in GCUF. It also looks at the relationship between student-teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes.

1.3 Objectives

1. To find out the mean scores and variation of student-teacher interaction, teaching quality, course structure, learning outcomes, social support and coping and overall student-teacher satisfaction were.
2. To determine the direction and strength of the relationship between student-teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes.

3. To find recommendations based on evidence to improve teaching, course structure and academic support for undergraduates.

1.4 Research Questions

1. What was the gender of the respondents?
2. How did respondents rate various aspects of teaching, support, satisfaction and learning outcomes?
3. What was the relationship between student-teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes?
4. What are the practical improvements suggested by the data?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Satisfaction

Satisfaction can be seen as a general view students have relating to their education. They can be influenced by teaching styles, learning resources, academic support, assessment and quality of interaction with teachers (Elliott & Shin, 2002). Satisfaction surveys can provide insight into what aspects of their learning students feel are beneficial or need improvement. However, satisfaction is not an accurate reflection of the quality of education. Factors such as work load, grades, expectations or external factors can influence ratings. Satisfaction should be seen as a way to gain feedback from students. Universities should look at satisfaction alongside assessment, progression and learning.

2.2 Student-Teacher Interaction & Teaching Quality

Positive student-teacher interactions can allow learners to gain clarification, feedback and test their knowledge. The most useful feedback is when it provides learners with information to understand their current performance, identify areas to improve and how they can improve (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Teaching quality can include clear explanations, suitable learning activities, inclusivity and alignment between learning outcomes and assessment. Alignment between learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities and assessment is very important (Biggs, 1996). This can create plausible links between students having a positive experience in their courses.

2.3 Course Structure

Course structure can include sequencing of topics, clarity of course requirements, clarity of assessment and alignment of learning outcomes and activities. Having a good course structure can help students understand what is expected of them in their learning. This is due to alignment between learning outcomes, teaching/learning activities and assessment (Biggs, 1996). Learning outcomes should be assessed using appropriate evidence. This can vary depending on the course but could include exams, projects, practical demonstrations, portfolios and rubric-based assessments.

2.4 Social Support & Coping

University life can be busy with pressure to perform in assessments and adapting to independent learning. How engaged students are in their education can depend on how much time, effort and mental energy they put into their studies and university as a whole (Astin, 1984). Social support from peers, teachers, academic advisors and the university can play a role. A high score in social support can indicate a perceived strength in their learning. However, this will depend on the questions in the questionnaire and how it was scored.

Social Support & Coping has the highest mean score (4.09). This should be checked against the original questionnaire, scale and scoring method. It is quite a high score compared to the other aspects. Without knowing the actual instrument and descriptive statistics this should not be assumed to be due to increased support.

2.5 Conceptualization

This study looks at the practical relationship between teaching/support and how students evaluate learning outcomes. Student-teacher interaction, teaching quality, course structure and social support are all aspects of the education experience. Satisfaction and learning outcomes are related but separate concepts. Research into student satisfaction can provide insight into how students evaluate their education. Research into feedback and alignment can provide insight into how teaching can support learning (Biggs, 1996; Elliott & Shin, 2002; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). As the data provided only includes summary statistics we cannot conduct a full mediation or causal analysis. We can only look at the relationship between overall student-teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes. This means we cannot attribute causal effects.

3. Methodology

3.1 Design

This study is a quantitative cross-sectional study. Descriptive statistics and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation were used. Please ensure the design and statistical test is correct based on how the data was actually collected and analysed.

3.2 Context & Participants

This study was conducted at Government College University Faisalabad. It looked at BS level. The data provided shows there were 200 participants. Of these 81 were male and 119 females (see Gender Table). The tables do not show if all 200 participants were students. We do not know if teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire or if This is an issue as the original title mentions teachers and students. When submitting please ensure you state exactly who the participants were, how many, any inclusion criteria, sampling method, what Programme/Department they were from and when the data was collected.

3.3 Measures & Scoring

The data provided shows scores from 1.00 to 5.00 for student-teacher interaction, teaching quality, course structure, learning outcomes, social support & coping and student-teacher satisfaction (see Descriptive Table). The name of the questionnaire, questions asked, number of questions in each subscale, scale, reverse scored questions and evidence of reliability and validity was not provided. This should be added based on the actual questionnaire.

3.4 Analysis

Frequency and percentage were used to describe the gender. Mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores were used to describe the aspects of the study. Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was used to show the relationship between student-teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes. Pearson Correlation Coefficient shows the direction and strength of a linear relationship but does not show causation or time order. The data provided shows there is a strong positive correlation ($r=.741$, $p<.01$). Please ensure the sample size used in this analysis is correct. Please check for missing data and assumptions. If possible, please state the exact p-value and confidence interval from the original statistical software.

3.5 Ethics

No ethical approval reference, consent or data protection were provided. In your final manuscript please state what ethical approval (or exemption) you received from the relevant authority, how informed consent was obtained, how participants were assured participation was voluntary and how confidentiality was ensured. This should be based on what actually happened in the study.

4. Results

4.1 Gender-wise classification

Table 1 presents the gender distribution supplied by the researcher.

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	81	40.5
Female	119	59.5

Total	200	100.0

There were 119 female participants (59.5%) and 81 male participants (40.5%) in the sample. This demonstrates that there were more women within the sample. There was no test provided to show if there were any differences between genders when it came to satisfaction or learning outcomes.

4.2 Descriptive analysis of study dimensions

Table 2 reproduces the supplied descriptive statistics. All reported dimensions had observed scores from 1.00 to 5.00.

Dimension	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Teacher–student interaction	200	1.00	5.00	3.03	0.75
Teaching quality	200	1.00	5.00	2.91	0.75
Course organization	200	1.00	5.00	2.97	0.85
Learning outcomes	200	1.00	5.00	3.06	0.86
Social support and coping	200	1.00	5.00	4.09	0.73
Teacher–student satisfaction	200	1.00	5.00	3.21	0.75

Overall means for the teacher-student relationships (M = 3.03), quality of teaching (M = 2.91), structure of the course (M = 2.97) and learning outcomes (M = 3.06) were approximately mid-range within the 5-point scale. However, without using the anchors it would be inaccurate to classify these as positive or negative. They can be seen as averages that are mid-range. Quality of teaching had by far the lowest average (M = 2.91) followed by structure of the course (M = 2.97) so these areas may require further exploration and could act as realistic areas to improve.

Social support and coping had the highest mean (M = 4.09, SD = 0.73). This was considerably higher than the rest of the dimensions. This may be an indication of perceived strengths; however, this will depend on the wording and coding of the items. You should ensure that this subscale has been measured in the same way as the others and that the scale was measured in the same direction. Overall, teacher-student satisfaction had a mean of 3.21 (SD = 0.75) which would be just above mid-range if the scale used

4.3 Relationship between teacher–student satisfaction and learning outcomes

Table 3 presents the reported means, standard deviations, and correlation.

Variable	Mean	SD	Pearson r	p-value
Teacher–student satisfaction	3.21	0.75	0.741	< .01
Learning outcomes	3.42	0.83	—	—

The correlation coefficient r is positive and strong (r=.741, p<.01), suggesting that within the sample there is a tendency for high scores in student satisfaction with teachers to be paired with high scores in learning outcomes. This supports the hypothesis however the null hypothesis is not supported given the significant level. A correlation does not demonstrate causation and there may be other factors causing this relationship. This may be due to the two variables affecting each other, or other variables such as prior attainment, course conditions, engagement, assessment design and response bias. Prior to submission, an issue needs to be resolved. There appears to be a conflict between Table 4.16 and Table 4.9 with regards to the mean learning outcomes. Table 4.16 shows that the mean is 3.42 (SD = 0.83) whilst Table 4.9 shows that the mean is 3.06 (SD = 0.86). It is important we check the original SPSS output, coding manual and how the questionnaire was scored to ensure we have the correct score. In addition, the correlation table does not provide information about the effective sample size.

5. Discussion

Three key trends can be identified from the data provided. Firstly, there is a median score for teaching quality and course organisation, and a lower average when compared to the

overall student satisfaction score. If this was accurately measured, it indicates certain areas need to be looked at by departments. They can use the course level feedback, assessment schedule and student teacher consultation to improve teaching quality and course organisation. However, this does not indicate what teaching practices were given low scores. We would need to look at the item level data and qualitative responses to inform us of the specific changes. Secondly, social support and coping had a much higher average score. If this was scored correctly, it may indicate that this was seen as a relative strength. Departments can continue using the good practices within peer support and academic advising but can look into why this was seen as a higher positive score. The higher score should be checked to ensure there was no error with the scoring or labeling.

Finally, a strong positive correlation was found between student teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes. This suggests that there is a close relationship between these two variables within the sample. Students who give positive responses to their educational experience are likely to give positive responses to their learning outcomes. However, because the data was collected from the same people and using self-reporting methods there may be common method bias and response bias. If the learning outcomes were self-reported then there is a relationship between perceived student satisfaction and perceived learning outcomes.

Overall, this data is useful for a diagnostic purpose. GCUF departments can identify where improvements could be made based on this trend. However, we should ensure we use the corrected tables, instrument information, course level data and direct measures of student learning.

6. Conclusion

This article has summarized the data provided on satisfaction related variables and learning outcomes at BS level within GCUF. The sample contained 59.5% female participants. The average scores for student-teacher interaction, teaching quality, course organisation and learning outcomes were all around the middle of the 5-point scale. The highest average was social support and coping. There was a positive and strong correlation between student-teacher satisfaction and learning outcomes ($r=.741$, $p<.01$) indicating that there is a close relationship between student experience and perceived learning outcomes. However, there were issues to resolve with the learning outcomes average scores and there wasn't much information provided on the methodology. The data indicates there is a relationship between the two variables.

7. Recommendations

1. Look at improving the teaching quality within courses by looking at the item level data, classroom observation and structured student feedback. Improve course organisation by having clear learning outcomes, transparent assessment criteria, timely course outlines and well-organized assignment schedules. Improve student-teacher interaction by ensuring there are set times for consultation, timely feedback and inclusive ways for questions.
2. If the high score for social support is accurate, continue using good practices within peer support and academic advising. Check the item wording and scoring. Use triangulation and collect direct evidence of student learning such as rubrics, course grades, projects or Programme level outcomes. If students and teachers were both surveyed, this should be split into two sections. If this is not possible then ensure this was justified within the design and scoring. Check the learning outcomes have the same average score. Ensure the sample size and exact p-value are provided for the correlation. Include information on the reliability of the instrument.

3. Provide information on the sampling method, time frame, response rate, consent and whether they received ethics approval or exemption.

8. Limitations

There were limitations within this analysis as there was only summary statistics provided. There was no individual data to validate the findings, carry out further testing, calculate confidence intervals, reliability or compare subgroups. The role of the respondents was not clear as the original topic mentioned both teachers and students. There was no information provided about the instrument, response options, sampling method, time frame or ethics. There was a conflict with the learning outcomes averages. This means the findings should be considered as tentative until checked against the original data.

9. Further Research

Further research could be carried out using a clear stratified sample across different departments and degree programmes. If applicable, separate instruments should be used for students and teachers. A longitudinal design could be used to gather satisfaction data and direct assessment evidence. Reliability estimates should be included for each scale. If there is a sufficient sample size, factor analysis should be carried out to ensure the factor structure. Look into whether there are differences in the relationships depending on Programme, semester or other variables. Interviews or focus groups could be carried out to understand why respondents gave different scores to course organisation and teaching quality compared to social support.

References

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(4), 297–308. ERIC record.

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. Higher Education, 32, 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university (4th ed.). Open University Press.

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43(8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Elliott, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 24(2), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080022000013518.

Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). SAGE.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112. h90ttps://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Richardson, J. T. E. (2005). Instruments for obtaining student feedback: A review of the literature. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30(4), 387–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500099193

York, T. T., Gibson, C., & Rankin, S. (2015). Defining and measuring academic success. Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 20, Article 5. https://doi.org/10.7275/hz5x-tx03