ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 11| November 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

PERCEIVED CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT AND TEACHING PRACTICES AMONG ELEMENTARY EDUCATION FACULTY AND STUDENTS AT EASTERN SAMAR STATE UNIVERSITY CAN-AVID CAMPUS

Ma. Cristina Y. Martinez[1], Lanie M. Tapac[2], Marifel Ivy C. Adel[3], Arnalyn G. Aseo[4], Ma. Leonida C. Taniñas[5], Jeralyn D. Obinguar[6]

[1-6]BEED Students, Eastern Samar State University-Can-avid, Can-avid Eastern Samar

ABSTRACT

This study examined perceived curriculum alignment, teaching practices, and their relationship in the Bachelor of Elementary Education program at Eastern Samar State University, Can-avid Campus. A cross-sectional descriptive-correlational survey involved seven faculty members and 23 students during academic year 2026–2027. A researcher-made 40-item questionnaire measured four curriculum-alignment dimensions and four teaching-practice dimensions using a five-point agreement scale. Descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, and Spearman correlation with permutation testing were reported, with Pearson and respondent-status analyses as sensitivity checks. Overall curriculum alignment was rated near the upper response anchor (M = 4.84, SD = 0.19), as were teaching practices (M = 4.88, SD = 0.18). Learning outcomes had the lowest curriculum-alignment mean (M = 4.65), while teaching strategies had the lowest teaching-practice mean (M = 4.77). The overall composites showed internal consistency estimates of .794 and .832, respectively, although several component dimensions had low or negative estimates. Curriculum alignment and teaching-practice scores were positively associated (r_s = .707, 95% CI [.431, .873], $p < .001$). The findings support reviewing outcome communication and instructional alignment, but do not establish causal effects or independently observed teaching effectiveness. Interpretation is limited by the small single-campus sample, ceiling-concentrated responses, and weaknesses in several subscales.

KEYWORDS: *Curriculum Alignment, Teaching Practices, Constructive Alignment, Teacher Education, Faculty and Student Perceptions*

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum alignment connects intended learning outcomes with course content, classroom activities, and assessment. In teacher education, these connections matter because students learn both disciplinary knowledge and examples of instructional practice that they may later adapt in elementary classrooms. A course may have well-written outcomes, yet students may not understand how its lessons and assessments support those outcomes. Examining the experiences of faculty and students can therefore complement reviews of formal curriculum documents.

Constructive alignment provides the conceptual basis for this study. Biggs (1996) connected a constructivist view of learning with the deliberate alignment of objectives, learning activities, and assessment. This perspective directs attention to what students are expected to demonstrate and whether instructional tasks provide opportunities to develop and show that learning. It frames the present variables as related aspects of curriculum implementation, without requiring the assumption that favorable perceptions demonstrate actual learning gains.

Philippine evidence illustrates the value of examining alignment at several levels. Abejuela et al. (2022) assessed 20 undergraduate curricula at a state university through document analysis, curriculum mapping, and focus groups. They found substantial coherence across curriculum components while identifying evaluation methods as an area requiring calibration. Their findings show why broad judgments of alignment should be accompanied by attention to specific components and the evidence used to assess them.

Curriculum mapping also requires examination of relationships across courses and learning outcomes. Frost and Ackrill (2025) describe how gaps can persist within mapping processes even when constructive alignment is the intended approach. Perception surveys can identify areas for further inquiry, but documentary evidence is needed to establish whether course outcomes, activities, and assessments are actually connected. Likewise, Baartman and Quinlan (2024) emphasize assessment arrangements that support learning, rigor, and communication of capability. These perspectives support examining assessment as part of the curriculum rather than as an isolated final task.

At Eastern Samar State University (ESSU), Can-avid Campus, the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program provides a setting for examining faculty and student perceptions of these relationships. Faculty members participate in planning and delivering instruction, while students experience the resulting activities and assessments. Their ratings offer complementary perspectives, although faculty self-appraisals and student appraisals may differ in their reference points. The present study provides local evidence from these two groups and examines whether favorable perceptions of curriculum alignment accompany favorable perceptions of teaching practices.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 11| November 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to determine the perceptions of curriculum alignment and its influence on teaching practices among BEED faculty members and students at Eastern Samar State University (ESSU) Can-Avid Campus.

Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
   - 1.1 Status (Faculty or Student);
   - 1.2 Year level (for students)
   - 1.3 Years of teaching experience (for faculty)?
2. What is the level of curriculum alignment as perceived by the respondents in terms of:
   - 2.1 Learning Outcomes;
   - 2.2 Course Content;
   - 2.3 Teaching and Learning Activities; and
   - 2.4 Assessment Methods
3. What is the level of teaching practices as perceived by the respondents in terms of:
   - 3.1 Lesson Planning;
   - 3.2 Teaching Strategies;
   - 3.3 Classroom Management; and
   - 3.4 Assessment Practices
4. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions of curriculum alignment between BEED faculty and students?
5. Is there a significant relationship between curriculum alignment and teaching practices?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Locale

A quantitative, cross-sectional descriptive-correlational survey was conducted in the BEEd program at ESSU, Can-avid Campus, Can-avid, Eastern Samar, Philippines, during academic year 2026–2027. The design described respondents' perceptions at one time and examined associations between their scores. It did not involve an intervention, repeated measurement, classroom observation, or direct assessment of student achievement.

Respondents and Sampling

The sample comprised 30 respondents: all seven BEEd faculty members included in the faculty census and 23 officially enrolled BEEd students from first through fourth year. The sampling account divided the population by faculty and student status, included the complete faculty group, and selected students randomly from the official enrollment list. The student population size, selection implementation, and number invited were not reported; a sampling fraction and response rate could therefore not be established. Combined estimates weighted each respondent equally and consequently reflected the larger student group more heavily.

Research Instrument and Scoring

The researcher-made questionnaire contained a profile section and 40 substantive items. Twenty items measured perceived curriculum alignment, with five items each for learning outcomes, course content, teaching and learning activities, and assessment methods. The remaining 20 items measured perceived teaching practices, with five items each for lesson planning, teaching strategies, classroom management, and assessment practices. Ratings ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), with 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neutral), and 4 (Agree). Dimension scores were the arithmetic mean of five items; each overall construct score averaged 20 items. Standard deviations described variation across respondents' mean scores.

The source methodology described expert review and pilot testing, but did not provide the number of validators, pilot sample size, or pilot reliability estimates. Internal consistency estimates reported here are those from the completed study sample. The original item groupings were retained. In particular, the teaching-strategies section contained several classroom-management behaviors, and one lesson-planning item read "Learners are well-organized and easy to follow." These features were treated as instrument limitations rather than retrospectively corrected after administration.

The thesis methodology supplied aggregate agreement bands of 1.00–1.80, 1.81–2.60, 2.61–3.40, 3.41–4.20, and 4.21–5.00. This article emphasizes numerical means and the original response anchors rather than converting favorable agreement into claims of verified program quality. No items were reverse-scored, deleted, or imputed in the reported analysis.

Data Gathering and Ethical Considerations

The researchers obtained permission from the relevant campus and program authorities, explained the study to prospective respondents, and sought informed consent. Questionnaires were distributed to faculty members and selected students, with clarification available when needed. Completed forms were collected, checked, encoded, and organized for analysis. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed that they could withdraw without negative consequences. Records were described as confidential, securely stored, and accessible only to the researchers and adviser. The questionnaire included an optional name field; consequently, confidentiality rather than complete anonymity is the appropriate description.

The manuscript included ethics-clearance and completed-study certification text attributed to the university Research Ethics Committee, with initial clearance dated July 20, 2026, and a completion certificate numbered ESSUC-REC-2026-104 dated September 21, 2026. The initial certificate number and signed approval documentation were not established in the material reviewed. These details require confirmation against the issued records before journal submission.

Data Analysis

The completed results reported 1,200 valid item responses from 30 participants, with no missing ratings and all values within 1–5. One faculty teaching-experience entry used an undefined code and was retained as unresolved in the demographic table. Its substantive item responses remained in the analysis. Frequencies, percentages, means, and sample standard deviations summarized the data. Raw-score Cronbach's alpha described internal consistency (Cronbach, 1951).

The completed analysis used Spearman's rank correlation as the primary association measure because ratings

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 11| November 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

were tied and concentrated near the upper response anchor. Permutation testing is appropriate for small-sample Spearman inference (The SciPy community, n.d.). The reported primary and student-only tests used 199,999 random permutations; the faculty test used all 5,040 possible pairings. Tests assessed absolute-statistic extremeness. The overall Spearman confidence interval used 50,000 paired percentile bootstrap resamples. Pearson correlation and status-specific Spearman correlations served as sensitivity analyses; the Pearson interval used Fisher's transformation. The significance level was .05, with independent respondents assumed. The earlier methodology proposed a t test and Pearson correlation; the article follows the analyses documented in the completed results and does not supply an unreported t-test result.

RESULTS

Respondent Characteristics

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Characteristic	n	%
Sex (N = 30)		
Male	13	43.33
Female	17	56.67
Status (N = 30)		
Faculty	7	23.33
Student	23	76.67
Student year level (n = 23)		
First year	4	17.39
Second year	9	39.13
Third year	5	21.74
Fourth year	5	21.74
Faculty teaching experience (n = 7)		
Less than 1 year	1	14.29
1–5 years	4	57.14
6–10 years	0	0.00
More than 10 years	1	14.29
Unresolved: raw code 5	1	14.29

Note. N = 30 except where a subgroup denominator is specified. Percentages may differ from 100 because of rounding. One faculty experience response used an undefined code and could not be assigned to a stated category.

Seventeen respondents were female (56.67%), and 13 were male (43.33%). Students constituted 76.67% of the sample. Second-year students formed the largest student subgroup (n = 9, 39.13%). Four faculty members reported 1–5 years of teaching experience. The unresolved experience category affects demographic completeness but does not require discarding otherwise complete substantive ratings.

Curriculum Alignment and Teaching Practices

Table 2. Curriculum alignment and teaching practice scores by respondent status

Measure	Faculty M (SD)	Students M (SD)	Combined M (SD)
Learning outcomes	4.63 (0.45)	4.65 (0.48)	4.65 (0.47)
Course content	4.86 (0.38)	4.91 (0.16)	4.90 (0.22)
Teaching and learning activities	4.94 (0.10)	4.90 (0.16)	4.91 (0.15)
Assessment methods	4.89 (0.20)	4.92 (0.18)	4.91 (0.18)
Curriculum alignment (overall)	4.83 (0.24)	4.85 (0.18)	4.84 (0.19)
Lesson planning	5.00 (0.00)	4.84 (0.35)	4.88 (0.31)
Teaching strategies	4.77 (0.27)	4.77 (0.34)	4.77 (0.32)
Classroom management	4.94 (0.15)	4.94 (0.13)	4.94 (0.13)
Assessment practices	4.91 (0.11)	4.94 (0.14)	4.93 (0.13)
Teaching practices (overall)	4.91 (0.12)	4.87 (0.20)	4.88 (0.18)

Note. Faculty n = 7; students n = 23; combined N = 30. Dimension scores average five items, and each overall score averages 20 items. M = mean; SD = sample standard deviation. Combined estimates weight respondents equally.

Overall perceived curriculum alignment was M = 4.84 (SD = 0.19), and overall teaching practices were M = 4.88 (SD = 0.18). Both means were close to the upper response anchor. Teaching and learning activities and assessment methods shared the highest curriculum-alignment mean (M = 4.91), whereas learning outcomes had the lowest (M = 4.65). Classroom management had the highest teaching-practice mean

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 11| November 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

(M = 4.94), followed by assessment practices (M = 4.93), lesson planning (M = 4.88), and teaching strategies (M = 4.77).

The item on clearly explaining learning outcomes received M = 4.50 (SD = 0.73), below the item on preparation for the future profession (M = 4.80, SD = 0.48). Encouraging active participation received M = 4.97, while the perceived accuracy of assessment in measuring learning received M = 4.77. These are descriptive differences and were not subjected to tests of differences between items.

Within teaching practices, promoting active student engagement received M = 4.97, while maintaining an orderly classroom in the teaching-strategies section received M = 4.57. The classroom-management items on managing behavior and applying rules fairly, together with assessment-practice items on clear instructions and using results to improve teaching, each received unanimous ratings of 5. Timely feedback received M = 4.87 (SD = 0.43), and fair assessments aligned with lesson objectives received M = 4.83 (SD = 0.38).

Of the 1,200 ratings, 1,069 (89.08%) were 5, 97 (8.08%) were 4, and 34 (2.83%) were 3; no ratings of 1 or 2 were reported. The inferential sample remained 30 respondents. Faculty and student means were descriptively close for overall curriculum alignment (4.83 and 4.85) and teaching practices (4.91 and 4.87). These similarities do not establish statistical equivalence or the absence of a group difference.

Internal Consistency

Table 3. Internal consistency of the questionnaire scores

Measure	Items	Cronbach's α	Zero-variance items
Learning outcomes	5	.793	None
Course content	5	.638	None
Teaching and learning activities	5	-.022	None
Assessment methods	5	.353	17
Curriculum alignment (overall)	20	.794	17
Lesson planning	5	.801	None
Teaching strategies	5	.667	None
Classroom management	5	.047	32, 33
Assessment practices	5	.204	37, 39
Teaching practices (overall)	20	.832	32, 33, 37, 39

Note. N = 30. Raw-score alpha estimates retain all original items. A negative estimate is reported as calculated. Zero-variance items received identical ratings from every respondent.

The overall curriculum-alignment and teaching-practice composites had alpha estimates of .794 and .832. However, the component estimates varied considerably. Teaching and learning activities had a negative estimate (α = −.022); classroom management (α = .047), assessment practices (α = .204), and assessment methods (α = .353) also had low estimates. Five items had zero variance. Overall alpha values therefore should not be used to imply that every dimension forms a dependable scale. The negative activity-dimension estimate reflects slightly negative average inter-item covariance, rather than a negative association between the two study constructs.

Relationship between Curriculum Alignment and Teaching Practices

Table 4. Association between the overall construct scores

Analysis	n	Coefficient	95% CI	p
Combined: Spearman (primary)	30	.707	[.431, .873]	< .001
Students: Spearman (sensitivity)	23	.703	—	< .001
Faculty: Spearman (sensitivity)	7	.699	—	.110
Combined: Pearson (sensitivity)	30	.755	[.543, .877]	< .001

Note. r_s denotes Spearman correlation and r denotes Pearson correlation. CI = confidence interval. Primary and student p values used 199,999 random permutations; faculty p used all 5,040 pairings. The primary CI used 50,000 paired percentile bootstrap resamples; the Pearson CI used Fisher's transformation. Dashes indicate intervals not estimated.

The primary correlation was positive and statistically significant, r_s = .707, 95% CI [.431, .873], p < .001. Respondents who gave higher curriculum-alignment ratings tended to give higher teaching-practice ratings. The null hypothesis of no monotonic association was rejected at .05 under the stated independence assumption. Pearson sensitivity analysis also showed a positive association, r(28) = .755, 95% CI [.543, .877], p < .001.

The student-only Spearman correlation was .703 (p < .001). The faculty correlation was similar in magnitude and direction, r_s = .699, but its exact permutation p value was .110. With only seven faculty respondents, this nonsignificant result does not establish the absence of an association. A significant result in one subgroup and a nonsignificant result in another also do not establish that the subgroup associations differ.

DISCUSSION

Perceived Alignment and Instructional Practice

The positive relationship between overall scores is consistent with constructive alignment as a framework for connecting curriculum intentions with instructional practice (Biggs, 1996). Respondents who perceived clearer connections among curriculum components also tended to view teaching practices more favorably. The evidence concerns their paired

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 11| November 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

perceptions, however, and does not show that alignment caused changes in instruction. Overlapping item content and the use of one agreement questionnaire for both constructs may contribute to the relationship.

The findings extend local discussion of alignment by bringing faculty and student perspectives into the same descriptive account. Abejuela et al. (2022) examined alignment using curriculum documents and qualitative evidence, while this study captured respondents' judgments within a single teacher-education program. The approaches are complementary: favorable perceptions may identify perceived coherence, while curriculum mapping and document review can test whether the intended relationships are present in course designs. Agreement between these evidence sources was not assessed here.

Outcome Communication and Assessment

Learning outcomes received the lowest curriculum-alignment mean, with clarity of explanation the lowest item within that dimension. This pattern identifies outcome communication as a practical subject for review despite generally favorable ratings. Faculty can make outcomes visible in lesson introductions, assignment instructions, and feedback, and ask students to explain how a task relates to an intended outcome. Frost and Ackrill's (2025) account of possible gaps in curriculum mapping supports examining specific connections rather than relying on an overall positive label.

The favorable assessment ratings also require qualification. Perceived assessment accuracy was lower than the items addressing alignment with lessons and outcomes, and several assessment items showed little or no variation. Baartman and Quinlan (2024) argue for assessment systems that support learning while providing rigorous evidence of capability. In this setting, reviewing rubrics, student work, task coverage, and feedback would provide evidence beyond agreement ratings. Such a review could examine whether positive perceptions correspond to opportunities to demonstrate the stated competencies.

Measurement and Interpretation

High means and dependable measurement are separate issues. The low or negative alpha estimates for several dimensions limit their interpretation as internally consistent scales. Uniformly favorable responses restricted variation, while overlapping teaching-strategy and classroom-management content weakened the conceptual distinction between those sections. These weaknesses support revising and revalidating the instrument before repeated use; they do not justify deleting inconvenient items retrospectively from the reported analysis.

The status-specific results provide a limited check on whether the combined correlation depended entirely on mixing faculty and students. Positive coefficients in both groups suggest a similar direction, but the small faculty group leaves considerable uncertainty. Neither similar group means nor similar subgroup coefficients establishes equivalence. Faculty and students may also evaluate different courses, instructors, or experiences, and the questionnaire did not establish a common instructional unit for every rating.

Limitations

The study involved a small sample from one campus and one program, limiting generalization. The cross-sectional design cannot establish temporal order or causal influence. Both constructs were measured through the same respondent questionnaire, making common response tendencies and social desirability plausible alternative explanations. Shared classroom or instructor experiences may also violate the independence assumption; clustering was not addressed in the available analysis. Ceiling-concentrated responses restricted differentiation, and several subscales had weak internal consistency.

The student sampling frame size, response rate, exact collection dates, detailed validation records, pilot estimates, and reproducible analysis settings were not fully documented. One faculty experience code remained unresolved. The planned comparison of faculty and student alignment perceptions lacked a reported inferential result and remains unanswered beyond descriptive means. No classroom observations, curriculum audits, student achievement measures, or professional-readiness outcomes were included. Consequently, the results should be read as exploratory evidence about perceptions within this sample.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the empirical findings generated from the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The BEED program at ESSU Can-Avid Campus exhibits a strong degree of constructive alignment. The intended learning outcomes, course content, learning activities, and assessment tools are systematically synchronized, ensuring that academic expectations directly match classroom delivery.
2. Faculty members demonstrate exemplary teaching practices, particularly in classroom management, constructive feedback mechanisms, and objective-driven lesson planning. These practices foster an orderly, supportive, and active learning environment that builds pedagogical confidence among pre-service teacher candidates.
3. The alignment between institutional curriculum design and teacher instructional delivery plays a critical role in equipping student teachers with the knowledge, skills, values, and professional readiness necessary for successful field study and teaching internships.
4. While all dimensions were evaluated as "Strongly Agree," lower relative scores in teaching strategies and learning outcome clarity indicate minor opportunities to further enhance active learning techniques and explicit outcome orientation during introductory coursework.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the conclusions, the following actionable recommendations are proposed:

1. Maintain and support existing Outcome-Based Education (OBE) frameworks while conducting periodic syllabi reviews to sustain tight alignment between course contents and professional licensing requirements. Allocate instructional resources toward

modern educational technology and teaching tools to support faculty in expanding active learning strategies in the classroom.

2. Continue providing timely, formative evaluation feedback to students, as this practice was identified as a core strength of instructional delivery.Incorporate a broader range of student-centered, interactive teaching strategies (e.g., inquiry-based learning, problem-based simulations) to further improve engagement in pedagogical courses. Spend initial class sessions explicitly explaining course learning outcomes to ensure first- and second-year students clearly understand competency targets from the outset.
3. Utilize detailed course learning outcomes as self-assessment benchmarks to monitor personal progress and domain readiness throughout their academic timeline. Actively participate in micro-teaching and field study opportunities to translate strong theoretical content knowledge into practical classroom execution.
4. Conduct longitudinal studies tracking BEED graduates into their actual teaching placements to measure how perceived curriculum alignment directly impacts downstream professional licensure exam performance and actual workplace teaching efficiency. Replicate the study using larger sample sizes across multiple campuses to compare instructional delivery variations across different regional teacher education institutions.

REFERENCES

1. *Abejuela, H. J. M., Castillon, H. T., & Sigod, M. J. G. (2022). Constructive alignment of higher education curricula: The case of a Philippine state university. Asia Pacific Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 20, 48–72. https://doi.org/10.57200/apjsbs.v20i0.288*
2. *Baartman, L. K. J., & Quinlan, K. M. (2024). Assessment and feedback in higher education reimagined: Using programmatic assessment to transform higher education. Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 28(2), 57–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2023.2283118*
3. *Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. Higher Education, 32(3), 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871*
4. *Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16(3), 297–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555*
5. *Frost, D., & Ackrill, R. (2025). The multiple dimensions of curriculum mapping: Designing a comprehensive outcomes-based framework. London Review of Education, 23(1), Article 17. https://doi.org/10.14324/LRE.23.1.17*
6. *The SciPy community. (n.d.). spearmanr. In SciPy reference guide. https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.stats.spearmanr.html*