

Critical Evaluation of Grade 7 English Learning Modules and their Contribution to Student Learning in a Faith-Based Academy in Southwestern Philippines

Emelita Paronda Elcana¹

¹Graduate Studies Department, Adventist University of the Philippines, Silang Cavite, 4118, Philippines
Email address: 2060723@aup.edu.ph

Abstract— This study examined the effectiveness of the Grade 7 English learning modules used in a faith-based academy and the contribution of the modules to student learning. Anchored on Tyler's curriculum evaluation model, the study assessed the alignment of intended, reflected, enacted, and achieved competencies. An ex post facto design with content analysis was used, involving five English teachers and four English modules, which were evaluated against the Department of Education Curriculum Guide. Achievement results of 103 Grade 7 students from the South Philippine Union Conference (SPUC) Achievement Test were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Findings showed that only 39.5% of the 167 intended competencies were reflected in the modules, while 14.4% were enacted. Students demonstrated proficiency in only two skills: Reading Comprehension and Oral Fluency. Key factors contributing to competency gaps in module implementation were categorized into curriculum-related, teacher-related, and resource-related factors. The study concludes that the modules need revision, with emphasis on the foundation, constructive alignment, and feedback and evaluation principles to ensure curriculum alignment, enriched content, and improved assessment practices.

Keywords— Academic performance, Content analysis, Curriculum alignment, Curriculum implementation, Learning competencies, Learning modules, Module evaluation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The strength of the curriculum, including the quality of instructional materials, largely enables schools to provide systematized and successful learning experiences to students. In the Philippines, the government has continuously developed basic education reforms, most recently the MATATAG Curriculum, to maintain the relevance, alignment, coherence, and responsiveness of classroom instruction to learners' needs.

In ensuring the continuous improvement of school quality across the nation, the Department of Education (DepEd) has appointed the Private Education Assistance Committee (PEAC), through its National Secretariat, to conduct a quality assurance certification that evaluates the compliance of all participating private junior high schools against the set DepEd standards for recognition. This certification process is still being conducted under the MATATAG Curriculum, which reflects the government's priority, mainly because this form of curriculum transition supports educational commitment to accountability and quality assurance. Before a particular

school is certified, PEAC evaluates its suitability, including its facilities and other resources for teaching and learning. This evaluation does not focus solely on resource availability but also on their practical use to promote effective teaching and learning (Private Education Assistance Committee, 2018). One of the evaluation sections covers the quality of instructional materials, which serve as aids to realize curriculum outcomes. Teachers are then directed to provide alternative learning resources that are contextually responsive and aligned with the prescribed standards and performance expectations. Therefore, teachers are similarly urged to develop a school-based learning plan and modules that adhere to DepEd standards and their institution's vision and mission statements.

At a faith-based academy in Southwestern Philippines, Grade 7 English learning modules are self-made and used by teachers alongside textbooks that do not adequately meet the national standards. However, the teachers' self-developed modules have never been formally evaluated for their alignment, relevance, or contribution to students' competency acquisition.

Concerns about low student performance in international and national assessments, such as the National Achievement Test (NAT), the Basic Education Exit Assessment (BEEA), and the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), have raised questions on the implementation of the curriculum (Albano, 2020; Marcelo, 2025; Tolentino, 2025). Teachers have also expressed difficulties in motivating students, particularly in writing tasks, and have noted inconsistencies between classroom activities and curriculum expectations (Department of Education, 2023).

The issue with these learning modules is better explained in terms of students' academic performance. Based on the 2022 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) released by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in December 2023, the Philippines ranked 6th from last in reading comprehension, mathematics, and science (Marcelo, 2025). In fact, in math, reading, and science, Filipino students continue to rank among the worst in the world, according to PISA 2022 findings published in December 2023. When the nation first took the test in 2018, its total score did not significantly improve (Chi, 2024). The

Grade 10 NAT results were reported to be steady in the low mastery range, with mean percentage scores (MPS) of 51.41 in 2013, 53.77 in 2014, 49.48 in 2015, 43.93 in 2016, and 44.1 in 2017 (Aguinaldo, 2019; Albano, 2020). The recent NAT result for the school year 2023-2024 was only 41.12%. (Tolentino, 2025). Furthermore, Region 10 Northern Mindanao, where this particular academy belongs, got an overall MPS of 44.54 in the recent NAT results (Lerongan, 2025). Also, the Basic Education Exit Assessment (BEEA) results for Language and Communication at this academy showed low MPS scores of 43.19 in problem-solving and 35.42 in critical thinking. Moreover, in the classroom, English teachers unanimously complained about the poor academic performance of some students and their low motivation during writing activities. While it is true that there could really be incongruities between what the educational leaders aimed for and what is the reality in the classroom, one cannot deny the fact that the textbooks, syllabi, learning modules, and other selected instructional resources, which basically influence how a particular language curriculum is given in the classroom, have an impact on students' learning.

Although the literature stipulates that instructional materials such as learning modules should result in meaningful learning based on competencies (Alada, 2023; Andres, et. al., 2025; Fernando & Ambayon, 2024; Olipas, 2022), this is not always so because research reveals that misaligned and poorly designed modules lead to low achievement of students and rote memorization (Bull, 2025; Kabilito, 2024; Dela Rosa & Lintao, 2018).

Despite the literature on module development, there is a dearth of empirical evidence evaluating teacher-made learning modules in Philippine basic education, particularly in private faith-based institutions. Only a few studies have explored or attempted to determine the extent of concurrence between the DepEd curriculum, the classroom modules implemented, and actual student competency. Moreover, although the curriculum evaluation models (e.g., Tyler) are well described in the literature, only a few local studies use them as frameworks for evaluating English modules in specific school settings. This gap highlights a lack of research that not only criticizes learning module designs but also relates their levels to measurable student academic performance, which we address in this study. By evaluating the modules' content, pedagogical alignment with learners' requirements, and their contribution to competency development, this study seeks to ensure that the module evaluation procedure supports the government's target of improving learning quality through evidence-based instructional development.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Specifically, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

- (1) *What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses on the use of the English 7 learning modules?*
- (2) *To what extent are the intended learning competencies reflected, enacted, and achieved?*
- (3) *What key factors contribute to competency gaps in module implementation?*

(4) *What principles should guide module revision for improvement?*

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Ralph Tyler Curriculum Evaluation Model

This study utilized Ralph Tyler's model of evaluation, as adapted by Ibeh (2021) and Scaffolding Technology (2023). Ralph Tyler is an American educator and psychologist in the mid-20th century whose curriculum evaluation model is widely used in curriculum development and evaluation. His model emphasizes starting with a clear educational objective and evaluating its effectiveness systematically in a curriculum in terms of its achievement or targeted objectives. The model has four essential steps:

1. Identification of Objectives. This is laying out specific, measurable, and observable objectives, taken from the goals and standards. This is a precise statement of what the students need to know, understand, and do.
2. Selection of appropriate learning experience. This is identifying opportunities for students to express the behavior encoded in the objectives, a condition that encourages or evokes it across different situations.
3. Organization of Learning Experience. This step examines the progression, logical order, and whether activities enable learners to transfer to other situations.
4. Assessment of Effectiveness. This step integrates teacher input, learner performance information, implementation context, and analysis of the module to inform improvement decisions.

The Tyler Model of Evaluation focuses on verifying the extent to which educational goals have been accomplished by comparing the correspondence between intended results, learning experiences, and student performance (Tyler, 1949). This model is particularly applicable to module evaluation, as it provides a way to interpret which intended competencies are reflected, enacted, and achieved in instructional materials; all three are central to the present study's analysis comparing intended with implemented competencies.

B. Learning Modules

Learning modules have become an increasingly important component in delivering content to students because of their learning objectives, sequenced tasks, and assessment activities that support teachers during lesson presentation. It becomes a structured instructional basis in which students construct meaning from the content presented. Studies highlighted its importance as it can enable differentiated instruction, sustain learning continuity, especially during disruptions in schooling (Alvares, 2020; Dangle & Sumaoang, 2020), and encourage learner autonomy and personalized pathways (Gunawardena, Bishop, & Avirruppola, 2024).

In addition to their instructional function, learning modules should align with curriculum standards to ensure consistency between intended learning outcomes and classroom practice. Research emphasizes that modules serve as the vehicle for bringing written curricula into the classroom, making alignment a critical factor in their effectiveness (Tian, Fan, Sun, & Bai, 2024). Biggs' concept of constructive alignment

continues to guide educational design, underscoring that learning outcomes, teaching activities, and assessments must reinforce one another to enable deep learning (Biggs & Tang, 2014; Kart & Simsek, 2024; Mahmoud & Hamdoun, 2023; Richards, 2021). Studies in recent years have shown that non-coherent instructional materials result in fragmented learning experiences and shallow skill acquisition, particularly in language learning (Bull, 2025; Kabilito, 2024; Dela Rosa & Lintao, 2018; Wallace & Ke, 2023). When alignment is weak, the implemented curriculum diverges from the intended one, leading to gaps in student mastery (Nevenglosky et al., as cited in Beting, 2024).

III. METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study was an *ex post facto* design complemented by content analysis. According to Silva (2010), an *ex post facto* design involves examining relationships between variables that have already occurred or been established and cannot be manipulated by the researcher. Content analysis was also employed as a methodological strategy to evaluate the four Grade 7 English learning modules systematically and to draw valid patterns regarding the phenomena under study (Bengtsson, 2016).

The data were collected from four instruments—first, the teacher interviews, which identified the modules' perceived strengths and weaknesses. Second, the focus group discussions yielded deeper qualitative insights about how teachers implemented and used the modules in the classroom. Third, the degree to which the module's content matched the academic requirements specified in the DepEd was analyzed through the content analysis, guided by Tyler's (1949) Model of Curriculum Evaluation. Fourth, to obtain objective data on the attainment of the competencies demonstrated by the students, the South Philippine Union Conference Achievement Test (SPUCAT), an institutional assessment tool administered annually, was used. By combining these instruments, the researcher identified gaps between intended and implemented outcomes and established a link between module quality and learner performance.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide a thorough explanation of the perceived effectiveness of the English Grade 7 modules, their alignment with competencies in activities and assessments, and their contribution to students' learning.

4.1 Perceived Strengths and Weaknesses of the English 7 Learning Modules

Analysis of teachers' interviews and focus group discussions revealed three primary strengths and five elemental weaknesses in the Grade 7 English learning modules. The key strengths are: (1) they provided a great degree of guidance for the teachers as lessons, class activities, and assessments were arranged and specified; (2) the format corresponds to logical ways of presenting the lessons; (3) they followed the standards and the generally accepted format that are consistent with the standards set by PEAC and DepEd. The teachers unanimously agreed that the materials provide relief

from heavy preparation and ensure uniformity in instruction across classes. The fundamental weaknesses are: (1) activities that do not match the intended learning competencies; (2) inadequate length of time allocated per competency; (3) lack of "meaning-making" and "transfer" stages that define the depth of understanding; (4) Some competencies are absent from the DepEd curriculum guide; and (5) the curriculum guide itself is overloaded with competencies, lengthening the number of sessions required, making them impossible to complete within the prescribed instructional time.

Perceived strengths emphasize that modules help ensure flow and reduce teachers' work. This principle is based on Purushothaman's (1986) criteria for modular design, emphasizing clarity of objectives, systematic sequencing, and provision of assessments within the learning material (as cited in Padmapriya, 2015). The teachers' acknowledgment that the modules streamlined teaching supports Biggs and Tang's (2014) notion of constructive alignment, in which the design ensures that the learning objectives, activities, and assessments are coherent.

However, the weaknesses indicate that although the modules provided procedural guidance, their depth was somewhat superficial because the competencies were not fully aligned, lacked engagement, and left much room for higher-level order thinking. Sticking to the lower levels of Bloom's taxonomy is manifested in the lack of meaning-making, transfer activities, and assessments. This supports the claim that, to improve student learning outcomes, instructional materials need to be learner-centered, engaging, and pedagogically sound (Biggs & Tang, 2014; Richards, 2021). The absence of the 'meaning-making' and 'transfer' tasks relates to the first Principle of instruction, which highlights that instructional materials must evoke problem-solving skills of students by providing a means to exercise this skill through the activities that enable them to solve real-life problems (Merrill, 2013; as cited in Cloke, 2024).

The concern about overloaded competencies and the disproportionate emphasis was previously identified by Dela Rosa and Lintao (2018) in their study. Additionally, findings from module evaluations in the literature suggest that practical modules should encourage learner autonomy, be guided by interactive learning tasks, and support scaffolding to help students transfer knowledge into authentic situations. Without these elements, modules can make content but not necessarily learning transfer or application (Olipas, 2022; Wiley, 2019). This observation reflects the modules' low efficacy in improving student learning, as students seemed able to remember content but struggled to demonstrate understanding and application on performance-based assessments. Therefore, although the modules were structured, they did not provide learners with opportunities to demonstrate practical applications in real-life situations. The mismatch between the competencies, the curriculum guide, and the classroom learning activities indicates a gap between the intended and the reflected, according to Tyler's law. Hence, the recommendations indicate that learning modules should be structured to align with the developed statement of purpose and to provide coverage and integrated use of basic and

complex skills.

4.2 Extent to Which the Intended Learning Competencies Were Reflected and Achieved

Specifically, the DepEd English Curriculum Guide for Grade 7 lists 184 competencies across four quarters. After consolidating and removing duplicate or repeated entries from the DepEd English Grade 7 Curriculum Guide, a total of 167 unique learning competencies were identified across eight skill areas. These unique competencies served as the analytical framework in determining the degree of representation and alignment of the English 7 learning modules to the intended curriculum.

According to Tyler’s model of evaluation, the very first step in evaluating the curriculum is to ensure that the objectives or learning competencies are previously determined and specified. The learning competencies should also specify the learning content and what is expected of students. In this study, the intended language competencies were already specified by the DepEd. They are divided into different skill areas as shown in the first column of the table below. In the second column of the table below are learning competencies set by the Department of Education. The next step in evaluation, according to Tyler’s model, is to provide the context that allows the student to express the behavior in the objective and that evokes or encourages it. This is now examining and gauging the gaps between the intended and actual outcomes to make changes to the module and narrow those gaps. In the same way, it is the step of finding the discrepancy between the standard or intended and the actual. The third step is to determine whether these activities are in place and in the right, specific order. This is seen in the fourth column: the enacted language competencies. These competencies are evident in the module, but the activities and assessments did not target them. The researcher evaluated the module based on whether the sequencing, logical order, and progression through the activities and lessons were correct. The fifth column in the table below indicates whether the competency was achieved based on the achievement test the students took in this study, which is the fourth step in Tyler’s model of evaluation. In this study, the South Philippine Union Conference (Education Department) Achievement Test (SPUCAT) was used. SPUCAT is held annually for all SPUC academies. Each question was identified as to which competency it tests. This test was evaluated for objectivity, reliability, and validity through pilot testing among academies before it was conducted. Criteria were set: if the mean falls from .5 to 1, the particular competency is achieved. But if the mean is between 0 and .49, this means the learning competency is not achieved. To answer research question 2, Table 1 is created.

Table 1 shows the extent to which the intended competencies from the Department of Education (DepEd) Grade 7 English Curriculum Guide were reflected, enacted, and achieved through the learning modules and student performance. Of the 167 competencies prescribed by the DepEd, only 66 (39.5%) were reflected in the modules, indicating they were explicitly taught and assessed. Another

24 (14.4%) were enacted, present in some form but not clearly developed or measured, and two skill areas were achieved based on the SPUCAT achievement test results: Reading comprehension and Oral fluency. These figures indicate a substantial discrepancy between the intended, enacted, and achieved curricula, implying that the majority of competencies outlined in the national curriculum were not adequately translated into classroom instruction and measurable learning outcomes.

TABLE I. Number of Competencies that are Intended, Reflected, Enacted, and Achieved

| Skills | Learning Competencies Count | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------------|
| | Intended | Concretized (Reflected) | Enacted | Achieved |
| Reading | 30 | 14 | 5 | Achieved |
| Listening | 27 | 10 | 2 | Not achieved |
| Viewing | 14 | 3 | 6 | Not achieved |
| Vocabulary | 19 | 7 | 5 | Not achieved |
| Writing & Composition | 25 | 9 | 4 | Not achieved |
| Literature | 18 | 6 | 1 | Not achieved |
| Oral Fluency | 23 | 13 | 0 | Achieved |
| Grammar Awareness | 11 | 4 | 1 | Not achieved |
| Total | 167 | 66 | 24 | Not achieved |

This result corroborates the findings of several studies. For instance, Nevelongski, Cale, and Aguilar (2019) found notable gaps between curriculum standards and curriculum practice, identifying that alignment is the persistent barrier to successfully attaining the competency. According to Bull (2025), misalignment leads to surface learning, ineffective instruction, low motivation, unfairness, and poor assessment validity, ultimately hampering students' active participation and academic success. The weak alignment evident in the Grade 7 modules parallels the observations of Wallace and Ke (2023) and Nevelongski, Cale, & Aguilar (2019) that fragmented and superficial learning experiences stem from misaligned language-learning materials. Modules evaluated in this study displayed the same pattern: gaps in students’ mastery were influenced by the lack of congruent competencies and assessments.

Furthermore, the finding that Writing, Listening, Viewing, Literature, and Grammar were least reflected, while the Listening and Oral Fluency competencies were mainly represented in the module, mirrors international reports that in curricular implementation, the easier-to-teach skills are usually emphasized at the expense of complex, higher-order skills (Soon & Yunus, 2023; Tran-Thanh, 2025). Overemphasizing lower-order, more teachable and testable skills, a known problem in modular and textbook-driven instruction, results in weak capacity in productive language domains, consistent with the low achievement rates in writing, vocabulary, and grammar found in this study. This scenario denies the learners the equitable exposure needed to develop well-rounded language competence (Aslam et al., 2024).

TABLE III. Summary of Interpretation of the Achievement Test Results by Skills

| Skills | N | Sections | no. of correct responses | % | no. of incorrect response | % | Mean | Interpretation | Over-All Mean | Interpretation |
|-------------------------|----|-----------|--------------------------|----|---------------------------|-----|-------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Reading Comprehension | 10 | SECTION A | 4 | 40 | 6 | 60 | 0.503 | achieved | 0.502 | achieved |
| | 10 | SECTION B | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 0.504 | achieved | | |
| | 10 | SECTION C | 5 | 50 | 5 | 50 | 0.500 | achieved | | |
| Listening Comprehension | 5 | SECTION A | 3 | 60 | 2 | 40 | 0.561 | achieved | 0.467 | not achieved |
| | 5 | SECTION B | 3 | 60 | 2 | 40 | 0.480 | not achieved | | |
| | 5 | SECTION C | 0 | 0 | 5 | 100 | 0.360 | not achieved | | |
| Viewing Comprehension | 19 | SECTION A | 7 | 37 | 12 | 63 | 0.425 | not achieved | 0.395 | not achieved |
| | 19 | SECTION B | 7 | 37 | 12 | 63 | 0.470 | not achieved | | |
| | 19 | SECTION C | 2 | 11 | 17 | 89 | 0.290 | not achieved | | |
| Writing & Composition | 10 | SECTION A | 2 | 20 | 8 | 80 | 0.403 | not achieved | 0.437 | not achieved |
| | 10 | SECTION B | 4 | 40 | 6 | 60 | 0.503 | achieved | | |
| | 10 | SECTION C | 2 | 20 | 8 | 80 | 0.406 | not achieved | | |
| Grammar Awareness | 11 | SECTION A | 3 | 27 | 8 | 73 | 0.412 | not achieved | 0.340 | not achieved |
| | 11 | SECTION B | 1 | 9 | 10 | 91 | 0.305 | not achieved | | |
| | 11 | SECTION C | 2 | 18 | 9 | 82 | 0.303 | not achieved | | |
| Vocabulary | 9 | SECTION A | 2 | 22 | 7 | 78 | 0.336 | not achieved | 0.329 | not achieved |
| | 9 | SECTION B | 0 | 0 | 9 | 100 | 0.317 | not achieved | | |
| | 9 | SECTION C | 1 | 11 | 8 | 89 | 0.333 | not achieved | | |
| Literature | 19 | SECTION A | 6 | 32 | 13 | 68 | 0.389 | not achieved | 0.382 | not achieved |
| | 19 | SECTION B | 4 | 21 | 15 | 79 | 0.368 | not achieved | | |
| | 19 | SECTION C | 6 | 32 | 13 | 68 | 0.389 | not achieved | | |
| Oral Fluency | 7 | SECTION A | 3 | 43 | 4 | 57 | 0.508 | achieved | 0.513 | achieved |
| | 7 | SECTION B | 3 | 43 | 4 | 57 | 0.500 | achieved | | |
| | 7 | SECTION C | 3 | 43 | 4 | 57 | 0.530 | achieved | | |

Legend: N= number of items in the achievement test
 Overall mean- the average of all means from each section
 Scaling : 0-0.49- Not achieved
 0.50-1- Achieved

Table 2 shows the narrower results of this study. The first column indicates the language competencies. All in all, there are 167 competencies. The second column shows the number of items in the achievement test for skills. The third column shows the three sections of the Grade 7 respondents. The fourth column shows the number of correct answers within a particular skill; next, the percentage of the achieved learning competencies and the mean are shown. The gauge for computing the test results in the Achievement test taken by the students is by setting a criterion. Since the goal was to determine whether the overall competencies in a particular category were achieved, the class interval was set based on 1=achieved and 0=unachieved. Therefore, the lowest possible score was 0, and the highest was 1; the difference between the highest and lowest possible scores (1-0) divided by 2 yields .5 as the quotient. This was the criteria for achieved and unachieved: 0.5 to 1 is achieved, and 0 to 49 is unachieved. Each correct item in the test is assigned a 1, and each incorrect item is assigned a 0.

As seen in the tenth column, the overall mean of the reading comprehension category is 0.50, and the oral fluency is 0.51. This indicates that the respondents achieved the competencies in reading comprehension and oral fluency, as shown in the last column. This is because, among the eight skills, the two highest, which include most competencies, were concretized in the modules, are reading comprehension (46.6%) and oral fluency (56.5%). This explains why these two skills were the only ones achieved mainly by the students, according to the test results.

The other six categories were not achieved. In contrast to

what is supposed to be a learning module, the modules did not serve their purpose as the vehicle for achieving the learning competencies because they did not give the highest possible chances of success for students. According to Tyler (1949), in his model of evaluation, even if a program achieves some objectives but still has diminishing effects, it cannot be judged completely successful. This means that although some competencies were reflected, the module cannot still be considered beneficial. True enough to the result of the students' achievement test in this study, the modules were not beneficial to students.

Kabilito (2024), in his study found that the instructional materials significantly impact the academic performance of the students. Because instructional materials are among the key factors in enhancing learning achievement (Irambona & Chang'ach, 2023), these modules need to be revised to be more beneficial to students and improve academic performance.

Obviously, the achievement test results for the Grade 7 learners in this study are not good. This result is no different from the PISA, NAT, and BEEA results presented in the background of this study. Even people leading the education system in the Philippines were alarmed by the current state of students' progress.

“What the hearing showed is that the curriculum that is supposed to be taught ... is not being taught well. The student cannot process the curriculum the right way, so we're seeing low National Achievement Test scores. And what I'm fearing is a student cannot enter college, cannot get a decent job, and cannot have a

good future because of the low NAT scores,” (para 4)

Mr. Gatchalian told the reporters after the Senate committee hearing (Aguinaldo, 2019). Based on these test results, it is not a question of whether to revisit, review, and revise the curriculum and the modules.

4.3. Key Factors Contributing to Competency Gaps in Module Implementation

The results showed that a synergistic interaction among curriculum, teacher, and resource-related factors influenced implementation of the competencies in the Grade 7 English modules.

4.3.1 Curriculum-related Factors

According to the teacher respondents, one reason for the non-realization of some competencies is the misalignment of the activities with the competencies. As the teacher D version said, “... some did not really target what they intend to measure”. Likewise, teacher E cited, “... some also do not hit the domain or the verb that are specified in the competency”. This refers to the activities and assessments the teachers used in the module. In the first question of this study, this was also identified. This reason was also mentioned as one of the module's weaknesses, as discussed in question 1. Mostly, these competencies that were not aligned to the activities were also competencies not achieved. For example, the competency: “distinguish between and among a capsule biography, biographical sketch, and feature article.” The module's activity asked students to read a biographical sketch and answer questions about it. The students were asked to view a video about feature articles and read samples of feature articles. After that, the students were asked to write a feature article (Q3, pp. 8 and 12). Another is “Use the past and past perfect tenses correctly in varied contexts”, but only the past tense was introduced to the students. The past perfect tenses were not introduced, resulting in the non-realization of these competencies (Q4, pp. 9-12).

Tyler's model of curriculum states that alignment between learning objectives/competencies, learning activities, and assessments is essential to keep moving in the right direction. This means that it is simpler to meet the goal when the activities are closely related to the learning competencies and the assessments precisely measure student learning. In contrast, according to Bulkani, Muhammad, and Wahida (2022), misaligned assessments with learning activities and learning objectives or competencies can undermine both students' and teachers' motivation and learning. To cite, the objective said that students “distinguish features of colloquial language (fillers, contractions, etc.) and slang”, but the activity enables students to learn to identify the slang and colloquial words. Consequently, students did not learn or practice the skills needed to distinguish the features of the colloquial language that will be assessed. Alignment in selecting learning activities that directly address the competencies is of utmost concern in the Grade 7 English modules. As Mahmoud and Hamdoun (2023) explain, there are two benefits to aligning activities, assessments, and competencies. For one, alignment increases the likelihood that teachers will give students opportunities to learn and practice what they need to know and

be able to do on the different assessments in the course (or in instruction beyond). Second, aligning assessments and objectives means that “good marks” are more likely to mean “good learning”. A mismatch between objectives and activities leads students to focus on good grades rather than on what they really need to understand.

A further concern is that the curriculum covers too much, given the time available in class. Teachers stated that the number of competencies set per quarter was unattainable given the school calendar and lack of classroom time; “we always run out of time because of the many school activities that were not anticipated as the module was created,” (Teacher B) and “there are several competencies that the student has to achieve but the time is not enough”. (Teacher A). Likewise, Teacher D complained that “there are too many competencies to finish for a quarter”. These comments indicate that curriculum pacing was not sufficiently flexible to accommodate learner differences, school calendar interruptions, and the realities of classroom instruction.

International research also confirms that curriculum overload and unrealistic time allocations act as impediments to curriculum implementation, resulting in superficial lesson delivery (Rudhumbu & Du Plessis, 2020; Palestina, Pangan & Ancho, 2020). Bloom (1976), as cited in Winget & Persky (2022), believed that in the design and construction of materials, one should not lose sight of the fact that learners are faster or slower, rather than thinking of them as good or poor. It can be inferred from his statement that sufficient time is needed when dealing with students' different paces. Given the eight English categories students need to demonstrate, teachers need more time to help students achieve these learning competencies.

Another curriculum concern for teachers was the vagueness of power competencies or priority standards. Teacher B commented, “We are not even sure if the power competencies that we see are really the power competencies that the achievement test makers also consider”. Teacher D further stated that “although we were given guidelines on how to select them, it is still not a guarantee that we all have unified choices which are power and which are not.” In contrast, Teacher A pointed out, “what is seen as power competencies depends on the context of every school”. These remarks indicate a lack of standardization, clarity, and shared understanding of the essential skills to be focused on in the modules.

These observations are similar to those of Palestina, Pangan, and Ancho (2020), who observed that in the Philippines, non-aligned curriculum, such as vague standards, difficulty with context, and overload, is one of the factors that hinder successful curriculum implementation. Related research (Ntumi et al., 2023; Nevelongski, Cale, & Aguilar, 2019) indicates that when teachers are given broad or ambiguous discretion over what to teach in the classroom, it weakens curriculum implementation. Without a unified process and clearly defined criteria, schools may emphasize different competencies, leading to misalignment among instruction, assessment, and achievement tests. In the achievement test used, what the test maker sees as power may

not be the power competencies that the module author sees as power. This means there are test questions that were not emphasized or evident in the module because the module's author considers them outside the scope of the competencies. This ambiguity could have been avoided if the DepEd had set the power competencies or standards in the curriculum itself. If there are specified power competencies, then the teachers, the module makers, and the achievement test makers will have the same basis for what to elaborate on, which learning experience to implement in the classroom, and which competencies to measure. With this, it would be easy to hit the target since the power competencies are specified. Going back to the first step of Tyler's curriculum model, it states that everything that transpires in the classroom must focus on knowledge and skills to enable students to perform and demonstrate the standards. This means that teachers should also focus on the knowledge and skills that will help them better attain the standards.

4.3.2 Teacher-related factors

A few of the teacher-respondents' responses can also be classified as a teacher factor. Lack of teacher confidence and mastery of the content was a recurring theme in the interviews. These limitations prevented teachers from successfully teaching some of the competencies embedded in the modules. Teacher A shared, "*I do not know how to explain the lesson to the students in a way that students get it easily... I skipped this competency because I did not know how students could get this.*" Similarly, teacher B confessed, "*Honestly, it was my first time to encounter genus-species (hyponymous) term. I was not familiar with it.*" Teacher C added, "*... because I was new, I was in a period of establishing my identity to my students, so I needed to present them a valid and clear description. Because the information was not available, I decided to skip that lesson.*" Teacher D further admitted, "*I honestly admit, there was one time, I was not confident teaching the content because I did not really know how to teach the topic. So, I deferred teaching the lesson and proceeded to another lesson.*"

These responses indicate a pattern of content avoidance, especially for unfamiliar ideas. Kaiser & Konig (2025) claimed that teachers with advanced experience are better performers in the actual classroom than novices. Experienced teachers can respond flexibly to classroom situations. Given that the teacher-respondents have only 1–5 years of teaching experience, their content mastery and pedagogical flexibility may not yet be fully refined, potentially influencing how they translate the modules into their classroom. The fundamental requirement for teaching is a deep and thorough understanding or mastery of the subject matter itself. As St. Augustine puts it, "You cannot give what you do not have" (para. 4) (Limos, 2025). This clearly suggests that in order to teach a subject effectively, a teacher must already be knowledgeable and proficient in it. Content knowledge is a core aspect of teacher expertise; it affects the choice of activities, the clarity of explanations, the quality of children's responses, and assessment for learning. Buchmann (1984) strengthened this by explaining that it is unreasonable for teachers to be good planners of lessons or evaluators of work if they do not have

knowledge about the content, and insufficient teacher knowledge will lead to inaccurate or superficial learning on behalf of students (as cited in Karami, 2016; Limos, 2025).

The second theme among teacher-related factors is teachers' attitudes towards teaching, which also affects students' learning experience. Teacher D said, "*I don't like teaching writing in class because students find it hard. I don't know if my students really understand what I teach, but every time I asked them, they said they understand but their performance in the test do not show they understand.*" Teacher E echoed this sentiment, "*Sometimes because of the many activities and responsibilities that the teacher assumes, especially in a boarding school, I get too tired and lazy to prepare for my class. I lack time to prepare the needed materials for my lesson presentation, so when I didn't have a choice, I opted for a lecture which most students dislike.*" These quotes provide concrete evidence of how teacher beliefs, motivation, fatigue, and affective disposition influenced the quality of instruction and the opportunity to learn.

These responses reflect the teacher's attitude towards teaching; thus, they are categorized as a teacher factor. Ekperi, Onwuka, and Wike (2019) observed that the teacher's attitude shapes the classroom atmosphere, which the teacher often establishes. As a key factor in determining behavior, attitude affects how a teacher interacts with students, which, in turn, impacts those students' academic achievement. Further, they established that when teachers' attitude is positive, it is passed on to students because, as they teach, they have energy and create a non-threatening, welcoming atmosphere, thus transmitting it to students and, in turn, helping them succeed. The classroom teacher remains the primary source of learning for students, regardless of the materials offered, the regulations implemented, or the curriculum updated. More importantly, pupils learn better when teachers have a positive attitude toward the material and the students.

4.3.3 Resource-related factors

The presence and sufficiency of school infrastructure were also found to be important determinants of non-attainment of competencies. Teachers stated that missing or faulty educational materials negatively impacted the provision of instruction and the student learning experience. According to Teacher A: "*There were some instances when the facilities – e.g., speaker, HDMI or VGA cord, the room for speech and listening, microphones, etc. were not available, which lessened the quality of the understanding of our students.*" "*I'll never forget one experience,*" she recounted. "*I was supposed to let my students watch a video for emphasis, but a speaker was not available. I had to allow students to gather in groups and let them watch the video one at a time, while other groups completed activities. These slowed our pace because they cannot view the video together at the same time. That meeting, we didn't finish the lesson intended for that meeting.*"

Teacher B also faced similar limitations: "*I had the PowerPoint presentation ready before the class; however, my HDMI cord was malfunctioning. I could not borrow from a teacher because they, too, were using it in their classes. I wasn't able to use the PowerPoint I prepared, but I tried to*

discuss it using the chalk...” While reflecting on an emitted event that was related to a case of classroom technology, Teacher C reported, “*I was already prepared for class. But I did not know that the audio in the LED TV was malfunctioning. So, I had to use a VGA connector and connect it to a speaker. However, I did not find any VGA. Frustrated, I let my students view the clip without any sound, and later explained it to them. I know I was inefficient because it could have been different if they had seen the video with the clear audio. The result of my assessment of them made me more frustrated!*” Teacher E outlined the impact of a lack of resources on her instructional choices and said: “*.....especially when I don't have time to prepare for needed materials – speaker, cutouts, cord connector, I usually opt for a lecture, which I think was a really ineffective strategy for Grade 7*”.

These stories illustrate that poor infrastructure not only impedes lesson pace and teaching methods but also learning quality, especially for skills that require auditory, visual, and multimodal input. Many studies have shown that school facilities influence students' academic success. Andres et. al. (2025), “Research: Defining High-quality Instructional Materials for Math” (2025), Uwitatse, Niyibizi, and Mutarutinya (2023) noted the importance of providing essential resources that facilitate student learning, i.e., textbooks, learning materials, teaching facilities, technology aids and facilities, and laboratories are among the essential tools and materials. As Alada (2023) and Fernando and Abayon (2024) highlighted, appropriate tools and materials led to a better understanding of concepts and improved skill performance. Engaging students with the required tools and materials led to greater understanding of concepts and improved skill performance. Although teachers may improvise changes to lessons to accommodate facility constraints, these changes often result in lower-quality lesson plans, fewer opportunities for students to learn the material required by their competencies, and slower progress toward meeting required targets.

Apart from the equipment itself, the school environment and learning conditions also influenced the attainment of competencies. This is how one Teacher A relayed that struggle: “*The hardest task for us was listening because we didn't have a space on its own to conduct that. While you are in a listening or video-viewing class, some classrooms next to you will also be noisy as students enjoy those activities*”. “School Climate Literature Summary” (2020) defined school climate as the total set of conditions in schools that are important for learning and teaching, including the physical environment and interpersonal relations. Freiberg and Stein (1999) noted that the “heart and soul” of the school is its environment, which affects how students and teachers articulate themselves (as cited in Yang & Zhou, 2025). Further, school climate is a factor that contributes to the tone in school, including the quietness students need to learn, especially in the development of listening or viewing skills. Noise is an obstacle to comprehension. Noise, including outside noise from neighboring classrooms, can distract students from what they are listening to. Gheller et al. (2024)

reported that children had difficulty focusing during a listening task due to noise, indicating that environmental sounds impair comprehension, disrupt focus, and influence test performance. When learning facilitative spaces are not provided, particularly in auditory contexts, listening is compromised by competition between sound stimuli, leading to inefficient storage and retrieval and lower accuracy.

4.5 Principles to Guide Module Revision for Improvement

Based on the evaluation of the modules in this study, the following principles should be considered for certain aspects of the current Grade 7 modules. These principles are the foundation, constructive alignment, and feedback and evaluation principles.

Everything starts with and goes back to the foundation. This principle emphasizes that the learning module should be guided and supported by the standards expressed in the curriculum. In the same way, since classroom activities depend on the curriculum guide, the curriculum guide must be of primary concern. As reported in Question 3 of this study, the curriculum guide is one aspect that needs to be revisited and reviewed. The evaluation results of this study are consistent with those of Dela Rosa and Lintao (2018), which indicate that the curriculum guide is problematic. This study found that overlapping, repetitive, and excessive competencies are insufficient for the time allotted. Teachers felt that the content was inadequate for developing multilingualism and multiliteracies (particularly media literacy) and multiculturalism, and that highlighting grammar skills was problematic to teach.

When revising instruction guides, the first step (basic level) is to verify that each guide aligns with the curriculum guide and learning principles. As Hwa, Kaffenberger, and Silberstein (2020) note, designers need to establish learning goals before choosing or developing instructional resources. Green (2023) reinforces this by asserting that materials design needs to begin with a research-based understanding of what is to be taught. Without it, materials are likely to be either poorly matched or irrelevant. In this study, the term ‘Foundation principle’ is adopted to denote the first and essential step in developing and revising instructional materials. Tyler's Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction emphasized that well-founded module or instructional materials begin with a clear interpretation of the curriculum guide, serving as a blueprint for planning lessons, structuring learning activities, and designing assessments. Learning materials derived from curriculum documents inherit the problems when the curriculum documents are confusing, lack coherence, or are not usable.

Undeniably, because these curriculum guides serve as the basis for lesson planning, activity formulation, strategy design, and evaluation of learning, they must adhere to language standards to ensure the materials are fundamentally aligned with their aims. Thus, examining the appropriateness of these curriculum guides in their refurbished versions may improve the classroom modules and learning materials. English-language instruction nationwide would improve once the problems are resolved, enabling language teachers to provide

high-quality instruction. (Dela Rosa & Lintao, 2018).

The second principle is the need to enhance constructive alignment—the coherence among intended competencies, classroom activities, and assessments. In the evaluation of the modules, it is reflected that some activities did not target the competencies. In other words, the module's activities and assessments did not align with the learning competencies. The University of Tasmania (2021) explains that alignment plays a critical role in deep learning, where the ideal state is that students are best served when outcomes, teaching strategies, and assessment align. In the field of language teaching, alignment also helps in bringing balance between developing reception and production skills (Richards, 2021).

The current literature supports the idea that alignment increases student success. Evidence suggests that when curriculum, instruction, and assessment are complementary, students perform at higher levels of competence and achieve a more profound understanding (Biggs & Tang, 2014; Tian, Fan, Sun, & Bai, 2024). In language teaching, alignment can ensure that receptive and productive skills are studied in a structured manner rather than asymmetrically, as in the modules examined in the present study. In addition, when modules or lessons are well-aligned, i.e., what is taught and assessed directly corresponds to what is intended, students are better guided, more engaged in meaningful tasks, and thus attain higher levels of learning performance and mastery (Kart & Simpek, 2024; Mahmoud & Hamdoun, 2023; Richards, 2021). Module reform must therefore ensure that every activity directly supports the development of essential competencies and their transfer to real-world situations. In the same way, aligned assessments must be designed to measure competencies in an authentic, meaningful way. What is also required is an equal share of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and viewing tasks in order to prevent an overemphasis on the easier-to-deliver skills at the expense of more cognitively demanding ones.

The third principle that should inform the revision of the Grade 7 English modules is the Feedback and Evaluation Principle, which enables instructional improvement. The modules also did not include any self-assessment. According to the constructive alignment principle, learners construct their own learning through relevant learning activities (“Teaching and Learning Constructive Alignment”, 2021). The teacher's job is to create an environment for learning through activities to help learners take more responsibility for their own learning and monitor future directions.

Furthermore, according to Biggs, Tang, and Kennedy (2022), faulty assessment practices do more harm by misaligning teaching with the outcomes. Biggs went on to say that both the learner's and the teacher's activities are focused on the same objective when the evaluation reflects the curriculum. Just from the assessments alone, the students will learn the curriculum. To improve this aspect of the module, the principles of feedback and evaluation will be incorporated.

The feedback and evaluation principle states that learning must promote the learner's self-assessment. This means that self-assessment activities should be built into the module so students can monitor, reflect, and assess their own learning

and performance. Further, it also emphasizes that assessment is a learning experience that must be evident in the modules. Effectiveness assessment goes beyond just measuring achievement; it must also function as a learning experience and a basis for improvement. Feedback for language learning should be continuous, diagnostic, and goal-specific so that students are aware of their progress and can monitor what to do next (D’Brot & Brandt, 2024; Ojogbeje, 2023). To have an impact on learning, feedback should incorporate formative assessment components that promote self-monitoring, introspection, and goal-setting (Center for Research on Learning & Teaching, 2021). This supports learner autonomy and metacognitive skills, critical to developing lasting language proficiency.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

In light of the intended-reflected-enacted-achieved curriculum, this study measured and determined the effectiveness of Grade 7 English learning modules. Based on the teachers' responses, three strengths and five weaknesses of the modules were identified. From the teachers' perspective, the modules are essentially defective. Although the modules were helpful in their instruction, the perceived strengths outweigh the perceived weaknesses. Of the competencies, only 39.5% were well represented in the modules, and achievement performance showed that students achieved only 2 of 8 skills, suggesting a strong need to improve the modules on the remaining skills. As evidenced by the teachers' responses on the status of the modules presented in the results and discussion, the learning modules did not serve their purpose. They did not provide a significant learning experience for students to construct their own learning through relevant, aligned activities.

The curriculum, the teachers, and the facilities were identified as factors in the non-attainment of the competencies. These factors are holistic in nature. Simply put, all the elements of the education system are essential for determining the quality of students' learning experiences, students' achievement, and the quality of education as a whole.

Based on the findings above, the Foundation principle, Constructive alignment principle, and Feedback and evaluation principle need to be emphasized in the module revision process leading to the production of the revised modules. The foundation principle states that everything starts with and returns to the foundation. This refers to the important role of the standards or the learning competencies expressed in the curriculum. The Constructive alignment principle emphasizes aligning activities with the learning competencies, aligning assessments with the learning competencies, and ensuring the appropriateness of the activity to students' level. To ensure that both the learner's and the teacher's efforts are aligned with the same objective, the feedback and evaluation principle emphasizes the need for reflection in assessment. Moreover, the principle stated that the module should include self-assessment exercises to help students monitor, reflect, and evaluate their own performance and learning.

Recommendations

The study recommends that the modules be revised comprehensively, beginning with the curriculum guide, to ensure that competencies are realistic and time-bounded. Teachers should be given training in module development, alignment strategies, and student-centered assessment design. The school administration should invest in upgrading instructional facilities to support multimedia and interactive learning. Finally, a cyclical evaluation system should be established to regularly assess and update learning materials based on actual classroom outcomes and student performance data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Godiva Eviota-Rivera for her steadfast professional guidance and thoughtful insights that significantly strengthened this study. I also extend my appreciation to the South Philippine Union Conference (SPUC) for granting permission to administer the SPUC Achievement test, making this research possible.

REFERENCES

[1] Aguinaldo, C.A. (2019, March 6). K to 12 review finds declining test scores, skills mismatch. *BusinessWorld*. <https://www.bworldonline.com/editors-picks/2019/03/06/218344/k-to-12-review-finds-declining-test-scores-skills-mismatch/>

[2] Ajogbeje, O. J. (2023). Enhancing classroom learning outcomes: The power of immediate feedback strategy. *International Journal of Disabilities, Sports and Health Sciences*, 6(3), 453–465. <https://doi.org/10.33438/ijds.1323080>

[3] Alada, J. (2023). Effectiveness of developed learning material and students' english performance: Bases for enhancement. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 8(6): 605-612. <https://www.scribd.com/document/659692832/Effectiveness-of-Developed-Learning-Material-and-Students-English-Performance-Bases-for-Enhancement>

[4] Albano, E. Jr. (2020, November 20). Senior high students score lowest in national assessment history. *The Manila Times*. <https://www.manilatimes.net/2020/11/26/campus-press/senior-high-students-score-lowest-in-national-assessment-history/801503#:~:text=Senior%20high%20students%20score%20lowest,lowest%20in%20national%20assessment%20history>

[5] Alvarez, AV. Jr. (2020). The phenomenon of learning at a distance through emergency remote teaching amidst the pandemic crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 144-153. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1289949.pdf>

[6] Andres, J.P., Barrios, A. J. R., Eleazar, K.S., Fruelda, L.M.D., Gansit, J.M., Nolia, M.I., Panganiban, L.A.E., Quinton, A.S.S., Tores, R.M., Galay-Limos, J.A. (2025). Instructional materials, class engagement, and academic performance of Bachelor of Elementary Education students in Divine Word College of San Jose. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 14(11), 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2025.25508>

[7] Aslam, P., Mushtaq, Q., Noor, F., Maqbool, S., Khan, N.Y., & Sarfranz, J. (2024). The literature review on curriculum implementation problems. *Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research*, 4(2), 497-501. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61919/jhrr.v4i2.844>

[8] Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001>

[9] Beting, K. M. (2024). Analysis of the Alignment of K to 12 Most Essential Learning Competencies, Instruction, and Assessment Tools in Statistics and Probability. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(12), 276–292. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0504>

[10] Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2014). *Teaching for quality learning at university (5th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill Education. Retrieved from https://cetl.ppu.edu/sites/default/files/publications/-John_Biggs_and_Catherine_Tang_Teaching_for_Quali-BookFiorg-pdf

[11] Biggs, J., Tang, C., & Kennedy, G. (2022). *Teaching for quality learning at university (5th ed.)*. McGraw Hill.

[12] Bulkani, B., Muhammad, S., Wahidah, W. (2022). The discrepancy evaluation model in the implementation of online learning (on the basis of parents' perceptions). *The Education and Science Journal*, 24(2): 116-137. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358566282_The_discrepancy_evaluation_model_in_the_implementation_of_online_learning_on_the_basis_of_parents_perceptions

[13] Bull, D.A. (2025). Impact of curriculum misalignment and assessment practices on student learning outcomes in higher education: A PRISMA guided qualitative content synthesis. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Innovations*, 13(3), 65-87. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16262451>

[14] Calhoun, C., Sahay, S., & Wilson, M. (2021). *Instructional Design Evaluation*. Design for Learning: Principles, Processes, and Praxis. https://edtechbooks.org/id/instructional_design_evaluation

[15] Center for Research on Learning & Teaching. (2021.). Research-based principles of learning & teaching strategies. University of Michigan. https://crlt.umich.edu/gsis/p4_7

[16] Chi, C. (2024, June 19). Philippines ranks at the bottom of new PISA test on creative thinking. *Philstar Global*. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2024/06/19/2364001/philippines-ranks-bottom-new-pisa-test-creative-thinking>

[17] Cloke, H. (2024). *Merrill's first principles of instruction: Unleashing the power of proble-solving*. Growth Engineering. <https://www.growthengineering.co.uk/merrills-first-principles/>

[18] Dangle, Y.R.P., & Sumaoang, J.D. (2020). *The implementation of modular distance learning in the Philippine secondary public schools* [Paper presentation]. 3rd International Conference on Advanced Research in Teaching and Education. Dublin, Republic of Ireland. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354373719_The_Implementatio_n_of_Modular_Distance_Learning_in_the_Philippine_Secondary_Public_Schools

[19] Daniah, M., Jabir, M., & Hala, Y. (2023). *The effectiveness of the senior high school learning modules with an integrated guided inquiry approach*. In A. A. Patak & A. H. Hasim (Eds.), *Proceedings of the W-SHARE 2022 (ASSEHR Vol. 762, pp. 166–174)*. Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-084-8_23

[20] D'Brot, J. & Brandt, W.C. (2024). *Applying continuous improvement principles: Implementing evaluation practices*. Rockville, MD: Region 5 Comprehensive Center at Westat. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED663669.pdf>

[21] Dela Rosa, J.P.O., Lintao, R.B. (2018). Guided or misguided?: Teachers' evaluation of an English curriculum guide in the Philippines. *Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 6, 56-81. <https://ajels.ust.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/3-Guided-or-misguided-Teachers-evaluation-of-an-English-curriculum-guide-in-the-Philippines.pdf>

[22] Department of Education. (2023). *General shaping paper*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/GENERAL-SHAPING-PAPER-2023.pdf>

[23] Ekperi, P. M., Onwuka, U., & Wike, N. Y. (2019). Teachers' attitude as a correlate of students' academic performance. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 3(1), 205–209. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330841436_Teachers'_Attitude_as_a_Correlate_of_Students'_Academic_Performance

[24] Fernando, L.L.J., Ambayon, C.M. (2024). Reading comprehension module and students' achievement in literature. *International Journal of Social Sciences and English Literature*, 8, 32-36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55220/2576683x.v8.196>

[25] Gheller, F., Spicciarelli, G., Scimemi, P., Arfe, B. (2024). The effects of noise on children's performance: A systematic review. *Researchgate*, 55(3). DOI: 10.1177/00139165241245823

[26] Green, B. (2023). Five principles for language learning materials development. *ORTESOL Journal*, 40. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1402220.pdf>

- [27] Gunawardena, M., Bishop, P., Aviruppola, K. (2024). Personalized learning: The simple, the complicated, the complex, and the chaotic. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 139, 36, 104429. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104429>
- [28] Hwa, X., Kafferberger, M., Silberstein, J. (2020). *Aligning levels of instruction with goals and the needs of students (ALIGNS): Varied approaches, common principles*. Rise Program. <https://riseprogramme.org/publications/aligning-levels-instruction-goals-and-needs-students-aligns-varied-approaches-common.html>
- [29] Ibeh, A.I. (2021). Curriculum theory by Ralph Tyler and its implication for 21st century learning. *Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 4(2): 52-61. Retrieved from <https://share.google/Bbm7vwaA4NqAojefX>
- [30] Irambona, A., Chang'ach, J.K. (2023). Institutional materials and their influences on students' academic performance: A case study of post-basic school English curriculum in Burundi. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 8(3), 310-323. <https://jeltl.org/index.php/jeltl/article/view/1184>
- [31] Kaiser, G., & König, J. (2019). Competence measurement in (mathematics) teacher education and beyond: Implications for policy. *Higher Education Policy*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-019-00139-z>
- [32] Kart M. & Simsek, H. (2024). Defining competencies in curriculum and instruction and developing a new competency model. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03917-2>
- [33] Kabilito, I.J. (2024). The influence of Instructional materials on student' academic achievement. *Research Invention Journal of Law, Communication and Languages*, 3(2), 30-33. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382265195_The_Influence_of_Instructional_Materials_on_Students'_Academic_Achievement
- [34] Karami, A. (2016). What makes a good teacher? Needs and necessities: A survey of recent literature on teacher's subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 6(2), 241-250. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v6i2.8826>
- [35] Lerongan, D.S. (2025). Teachers' scholastic achievement test and students' national achievement test in English: Basis for proficiency training design. *International Journal of Research and Innovation In Social Science (IJRISS)*, 9(2), 336-345. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9020028>
- [36] Limos, D.K.G. (2025). *An insight on the teacher's intellectual responsibility to his/her students*. Department of Education. <https://www.depedscom.com/an-insight-on-the-teachers-intellectual-responsibility-to-his-her-students/>
- [37] Mahmoud, W., Hamdoun, A. (2023). Constructive alignment approach: Enhancing learning and teaching. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies: Education, Learning, Training & Development* 4(2),162-170. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0173>
- [38] Marcelo, E. (2025, April 12). Philippine participates anew in PISA; Better results seen. *The Philippine Star*. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2025/04/12/2435379/philippine-participates-anew-pisa-better-results-seen>
- [39] Nevelongski, E.A. Cale, C., Aguilar, S.P. (2019). Barriers to effective curriculum implementation. *Research in Higher Education Journal*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1203958.pdf>
- [40] Ntumi, S., Agbenyo, S., Tettech, A., Yalley, C.E., Yeboah, A., Nimo, D.G (2023). Teacher preparedness and implementation of the national pre-tertiary education curriculum framework in Ghana. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 13(1), 251-269. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1403550.pdf>
- [41] Olipas, C.N. P. (2022). Students' evaluation of the instructional learning modules for application development and emerging technologies course. *Puissant- A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 4, 1074-1089. Retrieved from <https://puissant.stepacademic.net/puissant/article/view/66/73>
- [42] Padmapriya P.V. (2015). Effectiveness of self-learning modules on achievement in biology among secondary school students. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, 4(2), 44-46. <https://ijepr.org/panel/assets/papers/179ij12.pdf>
- [43] Palestina, R.L. Pangan, A.D., Ancho, I.V. (2020). Curriculum implementation facilitating and hindering factors: The Philippines context. *International Journal of Education*, 13(2), 91-92. <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/ije/article/view/25340>
- [44] Private Education Assistance Committee. (2018). *Philippine copyright 2018* (2018-19 CAI). PEAC Official Website. <https://peac.org.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/2018-2019-THE-FINAL-CAI-1.pdf>
- [45] *Research: Defining High-quality Instructional Materials for Math*. (2025). National School Boards Association. <https://www.nsba.org/resources/asbj/asbj-august-2025/august-2025-research-defining-high-quality-instructional-materials-for-math>
- [46] Richards, J. C. (2021). *Curriculum development in language teaching (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
- [47] Rudhumbu, N., Du Plessis, E.C. (2020). Factors influencing curriculum implementation in accredited private universities in Botswana. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education: Emerald Publishing Limited 2050-7003*. retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350807946_Factors_influencing_curriculum_implementation_in_accredited_private_universities_in_Botswana
- [48] Scaffolding Technology. (2025). *Tyler's Model of Curriculum Evaluation*. <https://scaffoldingtechnology.co.in/tylers-model-of-curriculum-evaluation/>
- [49] *School Climate Literature Summary*. (2020). The Aspen Institute. <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Aspen-Institute-School-Climate-Literature-Review.pdf>
- [50] Silva, C. (2010). Ex post facto study. In *Encyclopedia of research design* (Vol. 0, pp. 466-466). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288.n145>
- [51] Soon, M. H., & Yunus, M. M. (2023). Revisiting communicative language teaching approach in teaching ESL speaking skills. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(6), 1515–1523. Retrieved from <https://share.google/mUmpJiATaVjkXf6EZ>
- [52] University of Tasmania. (2021). *Teaching and Learning Constructive Alignment*. Teaching & Learning: Unit Design. <https://www.teaching-learning.utas.edu.au/unit-design/constructive-alignment>
- [53] Tian, P., Fan, Y., Sun, D., & Bai, Y. (2024). Alignment between curriculum standards and assessment in understanding chemical reaction principles at upper-secondary schools. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 23(3), 550–569. <https://doi.org/10.33225/jbse/24.23.550>
- [54] Tolentino, A.J. (2025). NAT 2024 results show 'low proficiency' among grade 12 students across all regions. *Explained PH*. Retrieved from <https://explained.ph/nat-2024-results-show-low-proficiency-among-grade-12-students-across-all-regions/>
- [55] Tran-Thanh, V. (2025). Recent trends in english language in Vietnam: Navigating policy, practice, and societal shifts. *English Today* 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078424000506>
- [56] Tyler, R.W. (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- [57] Uwitatse, M. C., Niyibizi, O. & Mutarutinya, V. (2023). Accessing the use of instructional materials on the learner's academic performance in mathematics: A case of selected ordinary level secondary schools of Musanze District, Rwanda. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 7(4), 12 – 19. <https://jriiejournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/JRIIE-7-4-002.pdf>
- [58] Wallace, M.P., Ke, H. (2023). Examining the content alignment between language curriculum and a language test in China. *TEFLIN Journal*, 34, 116-135. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v34i1/116-135>
- [59] Wiley, C. (2019). Standardised module evaluation surveys in UK higher education: Establishing students' perspectives. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 61, 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.02.004>
- [60] Winget, M., Persky, A.M. (2022). A practical review of mastery learning. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 86(10). doi: 10.5688/ajpe8906
- [61] Yang, Y., & Zhou, D. (2025). The effect of inclusive school climate on job burnout among elementary school inclusive teachers: The mediating role of teaching efficacy under the ecosystem theory. *Education Sciences*, 15(5), 634. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15050634>