

# Leadership Strategic Planning in Managing Teacher-Subject Mismatch in Selected National High School

Chelamie M. Dela Cruz<sup>1\*</sup>, Julie L. Enriquez<sup>2</sup>, Maisora T. Tahir<sup>3</sup>

## Authors Information:

<sup>1-3</sup>Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Zamboanga City, Philippines

## Correspondence:

[chelamiemontebon1986@gmail.com](mailto:chelamiemontebon1986@gmail.com)

## Article History:

Date Received: May 5, 2026

Date Revised: May 12, 2026

Date Accepted: May 18, 2026

## DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20300908>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0079

## Recommended Citation:

Dela Cruz, C. M., Enriquez, J. L., & Tahir, M. T. (2026). Leadership Strategic Planning in Managing Teacher-Subject Mismatch in Selected National High School. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(4), 313–320.  
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20300908>

**Abstract.** Abstract. This study attempted to describe the extent or level of challenges encountered and coping strategies employed by teachers in addressing teacher–subject mismatch through strategic planning amongst the teachers in Selected National High School, specifically the junior high school teachers. It adopted the descriptive-quantitative research design involving 29 teacher-subject mismatch teachers. In this study, the respondents were identified and determined through purposive sampling technique. This means that, the participants of this study are the teachers of Selected National High School, teaching not their field of specializations. The research instrument of this study was adopted survey questionnaire in matrix form using a 5-point Likert scale to gather data. The instrument measured both the level of challenges experienced by teachers and the coping strategies they employ (Du Plessis, 2017). The questionnaire covered the following domains, content knowledge limitations; instructional preparation and planning; classroom management; assessment and evaluation; workload and time management; emotional and professional stress. Each item was rated on a scale from 1 (Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), allowing for a quantitative assessment of the variables under study. Consent letter was presented to the respondents informing them the research activity.

**Keywords:** Teacher–Subject Mismatch, challenges, coping strategies, strategic planning, descriptive-quantitative research

## Introduction

Teacher–subject mismatch occurs when teachers are assigned to teach subjects outside their field of specialization. This practice is common in National High Schools due to teacher shortages, uneven distribution of teachers, limited plantilla positions, and fluctuations in student enrollment. Although it ensures continuity of instruction, research suggests that teaching out-of-field may affect instructional quality, teacher confidence, and student academic performance (Ingersoll, 2003; Hobbs, 2013). In many educational systems, including developing contexts, school leaders are compelled to make strategic decisions to address staffing gaps while maintaining curriculum standards and learner outcomes.

Leadership strategic planning plays a critical role in managing teacher–subject mismatch. Through systematic goal setting, teacher assignment review, professional development programs, mentoring, collaborative teaching, and monitoring mechanisms, school leaders attempt to minimize the negative effects of mismatch and sustain instructional effectiveness (Bush, 2011). Strategic leadership enables schools to align human resource management with institutional goals and long-term educational improvement.

Despite the growing attention to teacher–subject mismatch, significant gaps remain in the literature. Most existing studies focus primarily on teachers' instructional challenges and personal experiences rather than on structured leadership planning processes implemented at the school level. There is limited local empirical research that describes how school leaders strategically manage teacher–subject mismatch in national high schools. Furthermore, insufficient descriptive statistical data exist regarding the challenges encountered by teachers and the coping strategies they employ within school-based strategic planning frameworks. A gap also persists between national teacher deployment policies and the actual leadership practices applied in schools. This study seeks to address these gaps by describing leadership strategic planning practices and examining the challenges and coping strategies of teachers in selected national high schools.

This research aligns with the development agenda of the United Nations, particularly Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), which aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. By strengthening leadership practices and supporting teachers handling subjects outside their specialization, the study contributes to improving instructional quality and teacher development. It also indirectly supports Sustainable Development Goal 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) by promoting supportive working conditions for educators and Sustainable Development Goal 10 (Reduced Inequalities) by addressing disparities in teacher distribution and access to quality education.

## Research Questions

This study aims to describe the challenges encountered and coping strategies employed by teachers in addressing teacher–subject mismatch through strategic planning.

1. What is the level of challenges experienced by teachers in handling subjects outside their specialization in terms of:
  - 1.1 Content knowledge limitations
  - 1.2 Instructional preparation and planning
  - 1.3 Classroom management
  - 1.4 Assessment and evaluation of learners
  - 1.5 Workload and time management
  - 1.6 Emotional and professional stress

## Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study examines leadership strategic planning in managing teacher-subject mismatch in selected national high schools. Specifically, it investigates the strategic leadership practices employed by school heads in addressing out-of-field teaching and specialization gaps among teachers. The study focuses on how school leaders utilize strategic planning mechanisms, including teacher deployment, instructional supervision, and professional development initiatives, to support effective school management and maintain instructional quality. Strategic planning is recognized as a critical leadership function that contributes to organizational effectiveness and continuous school improvement (Bryson, 2018). Likewise, previous studies emphasize that leadership interventions related to teacher assignment and instructional support are essential in addressing teacher-subject mismatch and sustaining educational quality (Ingersoll, 2003). The scope of the study is limited to selected national high schools and concentrates primarily on the leadership strategies, planning processes, and support systems implemented by school heads in managing teacher specialization gaps. The study excludes private schools and other educational levels, such as elementary and tertiary institutions. Furthermore, it does not directly assess student academic performance or learning outcomes, as the primary focus is on leadership and management practices rather than instructional effectiveness. Consequently, the findings of the study are context-specific and may not be generalized to all educational institutions or educational settings.

## Literature Review

### Teacher-Subject Mismatch

Teacher–subject mismatch refers to the situation in which teachers are assigned to teach subjects outside their area of specialization, as determined through their teaching load and professional background. This issue is widely recognized as a factor that can affect instructional quality and teacher performance, particularly when teachers lack sufficient subject expertise (Ingersoll, 2003; Hobbs, 2013). Studies indicate that out-of-field teaching may lead to difficulties in content delivery and reduced teaching confidence, highlighting the importance of proper teacher assignment.

### Leadership Strategic Planning Practices

Leadership strategic planning practices refer to the extent to which school heads implement strategies to manage teacher–subject mismatch, including goal setting, reviewing teacher assignments, mentoring, professional development, and monitoring instructional practices. Research emphasizes that effective leadership and strategic planning significantly contribute to improving teacher competence and instructional quality, especially when addressing specialization gaps (Bush, 2011; Hallinger, 2011). These practices are commonly assessed using structured instruments such as Likert-scale questionnaires to capture teachers' perceptions.

### Challenges Experience by Teachers

Challenges experienced by teachers pertain to the level of difficulty encountered when teaching subjects outside their specialization. These include issues related to content knowledge, lesson preparation, classroom management, assessment practices, workload, and emotional stress. Literature suggests that these challenges negatively influence teachers' instructional effectiveness and overall well-being, particularly in the absence of adequate support systems (Garcia, 2018; Villanueva, 2020).

### Coping Strategies

Coping strategies refer to the approach's teachers use to manage the demands of out-of-field teaching, such as self-directed learning, peer collaboration, lesson adaptation, and participation in professional development programs. Studies show that these strategies help teachers adjust to unfamiliar

subject areas and improve their instructional practices, serving as important mechanisms in reducing the negative effects of teacher–subject mismatch (Du Plessis, 2017; Kyriacou, 2001; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010).

### Teacher Effectiveness and well-being

Teacher effectiveness and well-being refer to teachers' self-assessed instructional performance and professional condition, including their confidence, teaching quality, job satisfaction, and stress levels. Research highlights that teacher effectiveness is closely linked to proper subject alignment, leadership support, and access to professional development, all of which contribute to improved teaching outcomes and overall well-being (Day et al., 2016).

### Descriptive Survey Instrument

A descriptive survey instrument refers to a researcher-developed questionnaire, typically structured in matrix form using a Likert scale, designed to gather data on teachers' experiences, challenges, and coping strategies in handling subjects outside their specialization. This type of instrument is widely used in educational research to measure perceptions and analyze trends using descriptive statistics such as mean scores and standard deviations (Creswell, 2014).

The reviewed literature indicates that teacher–subject mismatch, along with the challenges and coping strategies associated with it, significantly influences teacher effectiveness and well-being. Leadership strategic planning practices play a crucial role in addressing these issues, emphasizing the need for structured support systems and data-driven approaches to improve instructional quality.

## Methodology

### Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive research design to examine the challenges faced by teachers assigned to subjects outside their area of specialization and the coping strategies they employ. Descriptive research is appropriate for this study as it allows for the systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to identify patterns, trends, and relationships among variables (Best & Kahn, 2016). Through this design, the study provides a quantitative description of teacher–subject mismatch, focusing on the extent of challenges experienced and the strategies used to address them within the context of leadership strategic planning.

### Sampling Design

This study employed purposive sampling to select teachers who are teaching subjects outside their specialization in selected national high schools. This method ensured that respondents possessed relevant experiences necessary for the study.

### Research Locale

This study was conducted in selected public national high schools in the Philippines under the supervision of the Department of Education (DepEd). These schools offer both Junior High School and Senior High School programs and are mandated to deliver quality basic education. The selected schools were chosen due to the presence of teacher–subject mismatch, often resulting from teacher shortages, scheduling constraints, and administrative demands. The locale is appropriate for the study as school heads play a critical role in instructional leadership, teacher deployment, and strategic planning. Under the School-Based Management framework, school leaders are expected to implement strategic interventions to address staffing gaps and improve instructional quality (DepEd, 2022). Thus, these schools provide a relevant setting for examining leadership strategic planning in managing teacher–subject mismatch.

### Research Participants

This study involved teachers from selected public secondary schools under the Department of Education (DepEd) who are assigned to teach subjects outside their area of specialization. These teachers served as the target population of the study due to their direct experience with teacher–subject mismatch. A purposive sampling technique was employed to select respondents who meet the inclusion criteria of handling subjects beyond their specialization. This ensured that the data gathered were relevant to the objectives of the study. The sample size consisted of twenty-nine (29) teachers from the selected national high schools. A larger sample size is appropriate for descriptive research as it allows for more reliable quantitative analysis and meaningful interpretation of results. Focusing on these respondents enabled the study to examine the challenges they experience and the coping strategies they employ within the context of leadership strategic planning.

## Research Instrument

The study utilized an adopted survey questionnaire as the primary data-gathering instrument. The questionnaire was structured using a matrix format and employed a five-point Likert scale to quantitatively assess the challenges experienced by teachers and the coping strategies they employed in managing teacher-subject mismatch and out-of-field teaching situations, consistent with the framework of Du Plessis (2017). The instrument consisted of indicators covering six major domains: content knowledge limitations, instructional preparation and planning, classroom management, assessment and evaluation, workload and time management, and emotional and professional stress. Each statement in the questionnaire was rated on a scale ranging from 1 to 5, where 1 corresponded to "Disagree" and 5 corresponded to "Strongly Agree." The use of the Likert-scale format enabled the researcher to obtain measurable and systematic responses, thereby facilitating the quantitative analysis and interpretation of the variables investigated in the study.

## Data Gathering Procedure

In this study, data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire administered to teachers teaching subjects outside their specialization. Prior to distribution, the researcher obtained permission from the school administration to follow institutional guidelines and ethical standards (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The purposively selected respondents were provided with clear instructions, and confidentiality of their responses was ensured. Completed questionnaires were collected, checked for completeness, and organized for analysis. This procedure enabled the researcher to systematically obtain firsthand information on teachers' experiences with subject mismatch and the role of leadership strategic planning, ensuring reliable and valid data for the study.

## Results and Discussions

**Research Question 1: What is the level of challenges experienced by teachers in handling subjects outside their specialization in terms of Content knowledge limitations, Instructional preparation and planning, Classroom management, Assessment and evaluation of learners, Workload and time management, Emotional and professional stress**

**Table 1.** Respondents of the Study in Selected National High School

| Department       | Number of Teachers | Number of Teacher-Subject Mismatch |
|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| Filipino         | 21                 | 1                                  |
| English          | 25                 | 2                                  |
| Mathematics      | 25                 | 4                                  |
| ArPan            | 18                 | 6                                  |
| Values Education | 14                 | 10                                 |
| TLE              | 23                 | 2                                  |
| MAPEH            | 20                 | 4                                  |
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>146</b>         | <b>29</b>                          |

Table 1 shows, the total number of the mismatched-teacher in each of the department; Values Education Department has the highest number of teacher-respondents in terms of teacher-subject mismatch which was 10. On the other hand, the Filipino department has the least number of the teacher-respondents in terms of teacher-subject mismatch which was 1. The total number of teacher-respondents were identified and determined the teacher-subject mismatch in selected National High School.

**Table 2.** Level of Challenges Experiences in Content Knowledge Limitations

| Statements                                                                                | Weighted Mean | Description    | Interpretation       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1. I have difficulty explaining advanced concepts in the subject assigned to me.          | 4.66          | Strongly Agree | High                 |
| 2. I feel that my academic preparation is insufficient for the subject I am handling.     | 2.52          | Neutral        | Moderately Low       |
| 3. I need to spend extra time studying the subject content before teaching.               | 2.86          | Neutral        | Moderately Low       |
| 4. I am not fully confident answering students' in-depth questions.                       | 3.52          | Agree          | High                 |
| 5. I rely heavily on textbooks and ready-made materials due to limited subject expertise. | 3.39          | Agree          | High                 |
| <b>Average Weighted Mean</b>                                                              | <b>3.39</b>   | <b>Agree</b>   | <b>Slightly High</b> |



Table 2 shows that teachers generally experience challenges related to subject matter expertise, as indicated by the overall average weighted mean of 3.39, which is interpreted as Slightly High. This means that difficulties in mastering and delivering subject content are evident among the respondents. This implies that there is a need for continuous professional development of teachers' content knowledge. The highest weighted mean was obtained by the statement, "I have difficulty explaining advanced concepts in the subject assigned to me" with a mean of 4.66, interpreted as High. This means that a significant number of teachers have trouble when dealing with complex or hard or advanced topics. This implies that, teachers may not have sufficient mastery of deeper subject concepts, which could affect the quality of instruction. This may be because teachers are assigned to subjects outside their specialization or lack adequate training in advanced content areas. On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean was recorded in the statement, "I feel that my academic preparation is insufficient for the subject I am handling" with a mean of 2.52, interpreted as Moderately Low. This means that teachers are generally uncertain about their academic preparation. This implies that, while some teachers feel prepared, others still have doubts about their readiness. This may be because teachers have basic knowledge of the subject but still feel the need for further enhancement. Furthermore, the statements "I am not fully confident answering students' in-depth questions" (3.52) and "I rely heavily on textbooks and ready-made materials due to limited subject expertise" (3.39) both fall under Slightly High interpretation. This means that teachers tend to depend on available materials and may lack confidence in handling deeper discussions. This implies that, reliance on instructional materials may serve as a coping mechanism due to limited subject mastery. Lastly, the statement "I need to spend extra time studying the subject content before teaching" with a mean of 2.86, Moderately Low, suggests that teachers moderately invest additional time to prepare lessons. This means that preparation is present but not consistently practiced at a high level. This implies that time constraints or workload may affect the extent of teachers' preparation. The findings indicate that while teachers demonstrate some level of preparedness, there are evident gaps in advanced content knowledge and confidence, highlighting the importance of targeted training and support programs.

**Table 3.** Level of Challenges Experiences Instructional Preparation and Planning

|    | Statements                                                                                 | Weighted Mean | Description    | Interpretation       |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1. | Preparing lesson plans for this subject requires significant additional effort.            | 4.03          | Strongly Agree | High                 |
| 2. | I find it challenging to select appropriate teaching strategies for this subject.          | 3.24          | Agree          | Slightly High        |
| 3. | I experience difficulty aligning lessons with curriculum standards.                        | 3.32          | Agree          | Slightly High        |
| 4. | I spend more time preparing instructional materials compared to my area of specialization. | 3.42          | Agree          | Slightly High        |
| 5. | I feel uncertain about designing engaging learning activities for this subject.            | 3.37          | Agree          | Slightly High        |
|    | <b>Average Weighted Mean</b>                                                               | <b>3.48</b>   | <b>Agree</b>   | <b>Slightly High</b> |

Table 3 shows, that, the highest weighted mean was 4.03 for the statement "Preparing lesson plans for this subject requires significant additional effort." This means that teachers strongly find lesson planning challenging. This implies that limited content knowledge may lead to increased time and effort in preparation. On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean was 3.24 for "I find it challenging to select appropriate teaching strategies for this subject." This means that teachers experience challenges in choosing strategies but to a lesser extent. This implies that, while teachers have some ability to select strategies, they still need guidance and improvement. Furthermore, the overall average weighted mean of 3.48, interpreted as Slightly High, indicates that teachers experience significant challenges due to content knowledge limitations. This means that lesson preparation and instructional delivery require additional effort. This implies that teachers need support in improving their content knowledge and teaching strategies

**Table 4.** Level of Challenges Experiences in Classroom Management

|    | Statements                                                                      | Weighted Mean | Description    | Interpretation |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1. | I experience difficulty maintaining student engagement in this subject.         | 2.33          | Neutral        | Moderately Low |
| 2. | Students question my authority due to my limited specialization in the subject. | 2.52          | Neutral        | Moderately Low |
| 3. | I find it challenging to manage diverse learning needs in this subject area.    | 3.20          | Slightly Agree | High           |

|                              |                                                                                              |             |                |                       |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| 4.                           | I struggle to respond effectively to unexpected classroom situations related to the subject. | 2.86        | Neutral        | Moderately Low        |
| 5.                           | Classroom discipline becomes more challenging when I lack confidence in the subject.         | 2.89        | Neutral        | Moderately Low        |
| <b>Average Weighted Mean</b> |                                                                                              | <b>2.76</b> | <b>Neutral</b> | <b>Moderately Low</b> |

Table 4 shows, the highest weighted mean was 3.20 for the statement "I find it challenging to manage diverse learning needs in this subject area." This means that teachers have trouble in addressing different learning needs. This implies that varied student abilities require more effective strategies and support. The lowest weighted mean was 2.33 for "I experience difficulty maintaining student engagement in this subject." This means that maintaining engagement is less of a challenge. This implies that teachers are still able to keep students engaged despite some limitations. The overall average weighted mean of 2.76, interpreted as Moderately Low, indicates that teachers moderately experience challenges in classroom management. This means that difficulties are present but not highly evident. This implies that teachers are somewhat able to manage their classes despite limitations.

**Table 5.** Level of Challenges Experiences in Assessment and Evaluation of Learners

|                              | <b>Statements</b>                                                                | <b>Weighted Mean</b> | <b>Description</b> | <b>Interpretation</b> |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.                           | I find it difficult to design appropriate assessments for this subject.          | 2.79                 | Neutral            | Moderately Low        |
| 2.                           | I am uncertain about the accuracy of the test items I construct.                 | 3.24                 | Agree              | Slightly High         |
| 3.                           | I experience difficulty evaluating higher-order thinking skills in this subject. | 3.20                 | Agree              | Slightly High         |
| 4.                           | I am unsure whether my grading standards are aligned with subject expectations.  | 2.93                 | Neutral            | Moderately Low        |
| 5.                           | I need additional guidance in developing assessment tools for this subject.      | 4.02                 | Strongly Agree     | High                  |
| <b>Average Weighted Mean</b> |                                                                                  | <b>3.24</b>          | <b>Agree</b>       | <b>Slightly High</b>  |

Table 5 shows, the highest weighted mean was 4.02 for the statement "I need additional guidance in developing assessment tools for this subject." This means that, teachers strongly need assistance in creating assessment tools. This implies that, limited expertise affects their ability to design effective evaluations. On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean was 2.79 for "I find it difficult to design appropriate assessment for this assessment." This means, that teachers moderately experience difficulty in designing assessments. This implies that while they can create assessments, they still require improvement and guidance. The overall average weighted mean was 3.24, interpreted as Slightly High, indicates that teachers experience challenges in assessment and evaluation. This means that difficulties in designing and evaluating assessment are evident. This implies, that teachers need support in improving their assessment skills.

**Table 6.** Level of Challenges Experiences in Workload and Time Management

|                              | <b>Statements</b>                                                                      | <b>Weighted Mean</b> | <b>Description</b>    | <b>Interpretation</b> |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.                           | Handling this subject increases my overall workload.                                   | 3.62                 | Agree                 | Slightly High         |
| 2.                           | I spend excessive time preparing for this subject compared to others.                  | 3.24                 | Agree                 | Slightly High         |
| 3.                           | Managing multiple subjects outside my specialization affects my efficiency.            | 4.72                 | Strongly Agree        | High                  |
| 4.                           | I experience difficulty balancing preparation time with other school responsibilities. | 4.60                 | Strongly Agree        | High                  |
| 5.                           | I feel physically exhausted due to the additional demands of this assignment.          | 4.02                 | Strongly Agree        | High                  |
| <b>Average Weighted Mean</b> |                                                                                        | <b>4.04</b>          | <b>Strongly Agree</b> | <b>High</b>           |

Table 6 shows, the highest weighted mean was 4.72 for the statement "Managing multiple subjects outside my specialization affects my efficiency." This means that teacher strongly experience decreased efficiency when handling subjects beyond their specialization. This implies that, workload and subject mismatch significantly impact their performance. The lowest weighted mean was 3.24 for "I spend excessive

time preparing for this subject compared to others." This means, that teachers still experience this challenge, but to a lesser extent. This implies that while time preparation is an issue, other factors like multiple subjects handling have a greater impact. The overall average weighted mean of 4.04, interpreted as High, indicates that teachers experience serious challenges in workload and time management. This means, that the demands of handling the subject greatly affect their time and responsibilities. This implies that, teachers are heavily burdened and need support in managing their workload.

**Table 7.** Level of Challenges Experiences in Emotional and Professional Stress

| Statements                                                                 | Weighted Mean | Description           | Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1. I feel anxious when teaching this subject.                              | 2.62          | Neutral               | Moderately Low |
| 2. I worry about my performance when observed by supervisors.              | 4.62          | Strongly Agree        | High           |
| 3. I experience reduced confidence in my teaching abilities.               | 3.42          | Agree                 | Slightly High  |
| 4. I feel professionally inadequate when handling this subject.            | 2.86          | Neutral               | Moderately Low |
| 5. Teaching outside my specialization affects my overall job satisfaction. | 3.60          | Agree                 | Slightly High  |
| <b>Average Weighted Mean</b>                                               | <b>4.04</b>   | <b>Strongly Agree</b> | <b>High</b>    |

Table 7 shows, the highest weighted mean was 4.62 for the statement "I worry about my performance when observed by supervisors." This means that teachers strongly feel pressure during observations. This implies that, lack of confidence and subject mastery may increase anxiety. Furthermore, the lowest weighted mean was 2.62 for "I feel anxious when teaching this subject." This means that anxiety is moderately experienced. This implies that, while teachers do feel some anxiety, it is not as strong as the pressure from evaluations and observations. The overall average weighted mean of 4.04, interpreted as High, indicates that teachers experience significant emotional and professional stress. This means that handling the subject greatly affects their well-being. This implies that teachers need emotional and professional support.

## Ethical Considerations

This study ethical standards were upheld to protect participants' rights and welfare. Specifically, permission was obtained from the school administration, and teachers were informed about the purpose of the study, while ensuring that participation was voluntary and that they had the option to withdraw at any time (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Moreover, confidentiality and anonymity of responses were maintained, and the data were used solely for research purposes. In addition, the researcher adhered to ethical principles in reporting and interpreting the findings, therefore ensuring honesty, transparency, and integrity throughout the study.

## Conclusion

The study concluded that teacher-respondents in the selected national high school experience difficulties in explaining advanced concepts, indicating a need to strengthen their content knowledge. They also struggle with lesson preparation and assessment, highlighting the importance of additional guidance and training. Furthermore, managing diverse learning needs and balancing workload remains a challenge, suggesting the need for improved time management and effective strategies. In addition, teachers face emotional and professional stress, particularly during classroom observations, emphasizing the need for support systems to enhance their confidence and overall well-being.

## Reccomendations

Based on the findings, the study recommends that education leaders and administrators provide valuable insights and feedback to guide decision-making and develop strategies that improve the alignment between teachers' qualifications and the subjects they teach. Furthermore, school heads may use this study as a reference in implementing appropriate interventions, such as adjusting teaching assignments and providing professional development opportunities. In addition, teachers are encouraged to continuously attend trainings and workshops to enhance their subject expertise and improve classroom discussions, while also advocating for better alignment between their qualifications and teaching assignments. Finally, future researchers may conduct similar studies to further contribute to existing literature and explore the issue of teacher-subject mismatch in different school contexts.

## References

- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2016). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Bryson, J. M. (2018). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Caparosso, P. L., & Pepito, H. C. (2025). Pinagtagpo pero 'di tinadhana: A phenomenological inquiry of mismatched teachers in senior high school. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(5), 670–686.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863>
- Department of Education. (2022). *School-based management framework and guidelines*. Department of Education.
- Department of Education. (2023). *Teacher deployment and assignment report*. Department of Education.
- Dinham, S. (2007). *Leading learning and teaching: Reflections on the work of school principals*. Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Du Plessis, A. E. (2013). *Out-of-field teaching practices: What educational leaders need to know*. Sense Publishers.
- Du Plessis, A. E. (2017). *Out-of-field teaching practices: What educational leaders need to know*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3983-9>
- Garcia, M. T. (2018). Challenges encountered by out-of-field teachers in secondary schools. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 6(2), 45–53.
- Grayson, J. L., & Alvarez, H. K. (2008). School climate factors relating to teacher burnout: A mediator model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(5), 1349–1363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.06.005>
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0957823111116699>
- Hobbs, L. (2013). Teaching out-of-field as a boundary-crossing event: Factors shaping teacher identity. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 11(2), 271–297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-012-9333-4>
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Out-of-field teaching and the limits of teacher policy*. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Who controls teachers' work? Power and accountability in America's schools*. Harvard University Press.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Perda, D. (2010). Is the supply of mathematics and science teachers sufficient? *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(3), 563–594. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210370711>
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53(1), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910120033628>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2018). *Effective teacher policies: Insights from PISA*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301603-en>
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1059–1069. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001>
- Villanueva, R. P. (2020). Coping mechanisms of teachers handling subjects outside their specialization. *Philippine Journal of Educational Studies*, 12(1), 88–102.