

## A Critical Analysis of Constructive Alignment within EFL Curriculum

Ejad N. Hamad<sup>1</sup>, Keivan Seyyedi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Soran University-Faculty of Education-English

<sup>2</sup>Department of Translation, Cihan University-Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq Department

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31918/twejer.2473.50>

Published: 23/12/2024

### Abstract

*Constructive alignment (CA) is often promoted as an approach for developing teaching/learning methods, and assessment tools, that specifically address the intended learning outcomes in a way that is often not achievable via conventional classes and assessments. This research study is a critical analysis of constructive alignment within an EFL curriculum developed by English language Departments, at Soran University. In this research study, a mixed-method research design was used to provide procedures for approaching, gathering, and analysing data from various sources. The research instruments included a questionnaire, focus groups, semi-structured interviews, and observations. A questionnaire was delivered to 120 English-language students. Fourteen students agreed to voluntarily take part in the subsequent focus groups, and seven lecturers were recruited for the observations and semi-structured interviews. The results of this empirical research study demonstrate that certain teachers adhere to the CA guiding principles and make an effort to combine the CA fundamental components constructively. On the other hand, most teachers acted less responsibly towards the process and were not successful in translating the CA principles into practice. Hence, it was recommended that all parties involved in educational administrations take CA practices more seriously and pinpoint any obstacle that might prevent a constructive alignment within the curriculum, and thus, provide the best solutions for dealing with the challenges.*

**Keywords:** *Constructive Alignment (CA), Intended Learning Outcomes, Teaching/learning Methods, Assessment Tools, EFL Curriculum*

## A Critical Analysis of Constructive Alignment within EFL Curriculum

Ejad N. Hamad: Assistant Lecturer, Soran University-Faculty of Education-  
English Department: [ijad.hamad@soran.edu.iq](mailto:ijad.hamad@soran.edu.iq)

Keivan Seyyedi: Department of Translation, Cihan University-Erbil, Kurdistan  
Region, Iraq

### 1. Introduction

Constructive alignment was first introduced by (Biggs, 1996). According to the theory of CA, learning objectives should be accomplished via teaching methods and assessment activities which provide students with the opportunity to fulfil and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes. In other words, after defining the learning outcomes of a teaching course, the teaching/learning methods and assessment strategies should then be developed to best meet those objectives and should then assess the extent to which they have been fulfilled (Ali, 2018; Azasu & Berggren, 2015; Biggs, 2014). Ali (2018, p.77) states that “constructive alignment is about ensuring that assessment, teaching, learning, and feedback should be in synchronous with each other and that feedback links well to students’ evidence of demonstrating their achievement of the intended learning outcomes”.

Biggs's (1996) approach to constructivism suggests that meaning is created via learners' learning activities and assessment, rather than being forced or delivered by the teacher. Biggs claims that the curriculum must be focussed on what the students can do for them to be meaningfully engaged and thus bridge the learning gap. In everyday classroom learning, this form of teaching strategy should be expected. The targeted act is that; the intended objectives, the learning method, and the assessment tools are for determining whether the specified standard of the objective has been fulfilled or not (Biggs, 2014). For instance, a driver learner should learn through the act of driving itself until the act of driving can be done satisfactorily.

Constructive alignment within the process of curriculum design and development needs careful planning, where initially the learning objectives of the teaching program are specified in terms of what the learners will be able to perform at the end of the teaching course. This is typically stated as a series of verbal statements. Then the gap between what the learners know or can perform before the course and what is anticipated of them as a product of the course is determined. After the intended learning is defined, the curriculum is then developed. This is said to help facilitate learners to confront their earlier knowledge and make skill-based modifications. The learners' progress through the curriculum is then scrutinized by using assessment tools that are closely

aligned with the course's intended objectives. This gives the teacher an insight she needs to modify the learning environment in the classroom so that the student can more effectively achieve the learning objectives (Smith, 2012).

All in all, a fundamental factor of effective teaching is the alignment of intended objectives with the relevant teaching activities and the associated assessment tools (Biggs, 1996). Yet, until quite recently many teaching institutions were still following the traditional ways of curriculum designing. Moreover, the teaching process in most universities is still formulated in such a manner that is completely at odds with the principles of constructive alignment. For instance, teaching remains constant with lecturing and adopting a teacher-centred approach with an emphasis on the content the lecturer wants to deliver (Biggs, 2014).

However, a few scholars, like Wächter (2004) and Remneland Wikhamn (2016) think that applying the CA framework in curriculum design and development might sometimes bring about some challenges. For example, they contend that translating the CA principles into practice might be time-consuming. Yet the studies that were reviewed in this research demonstrate that constructive alignment is thought to be a fundamental concept to embrace for the effective attainment of the intended learning outcomes.

## **2. The Framework of Constructive Alignment**

Constructive alignment is an educational model that aims at aligning the teaching and learning methods, the assessment activities, and the intended learning outcomes. With the ultimate goal of improving the quality of learning, constructive alignment seeks to ensure that what learners are expected to learn, how they are going to learn, and how they should be examined are all constructively aligned. To put it briefly, the framework of constructive alignment is the “unity between intended learning outcomes (ILOs), learning and teaching activities (LTAs), and assessment tasks (ATs)” (Hamdoun, 2023, p.163).

### **2.1 Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)**

Teachers need to be very specific about the things/learnings they want their students to learn. They should be able to specify how well each lesson is required to be understood. This should be done subject by subject, but first, they need to separate the declarative knowledge and functional knowledge that students can perform after completing each class and also at the end of the teaching program (Biggs, 2014). Declarative information is what students can declare and talk about either verbally or in writing. It is the information that has been acquired and is usually secondary and indirect knowledge. Declarative knowledge is the initial knowledge teachers want their students to develop. However, it is not enough to acquire knowledge only to tell people about it.

What matters most is how to put this declarative knowledge into practice so that it works.

The majority of students are not turning declarative knowledge into functional knowledge if they are not asked to do so. Therefore, teachers should help students learn how to apply and transform declarative knowledge into practice. For instance, teach physicians how to diagnose accurately and lawyers how to make proper legal decisions. Thus, the teacher must set the goals and objectives in a way that obliges students to show and perform the information they have learned rather than just report it in an oral or written exam. So, specifying the level of knowledge teachers expect from their students in each subject and what evidence of understanding would provide teachers with this knowledge can be regarded as the first stage of defining the curricular objectives (Biggs, 2003). Here, the teacher should use appropriate verbs that would suit the level of understanding of each topic and discipline. There are generally two main categories of verbs. They are high-level verbs and low-level verbs. High-level verbs, for example, include verbs such as “reflect,” “hypothesize,” and “resolve”. Low-level verbs, on the other hand, contain words like "describe," "memorized," and "identify". However, to keep teachers on track, the teaching and learning methods and the assessment tools should incorporate the same verbs (Biggs, 2014).

## **2.2 Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)**

Teachers in many teaching contexts still use lecturing and tutorials as the primary modes of teaching and learning. This kind of setting usually produces passive learners who mainly rely on passive listening and memorizing certain information. However, constructivist learning philosophies with their learner-centred orientation try to create productive learning conditions. Instead of using surface learning methods that can encourage students to rely on memorization and knowledge recall, it tries to use strategies that seek to utilize higher-level verbs and in-depth learning strategies that would help learners with long-term learning (Biggs, 2003; Martin et al., 2000).

If we, for example, take the very common declarative verb "explain'. Here, to constructively align the learning activity to the learning outcomes that contain the verb 'explain' and to help learners construct their knowledge, teachers can apply a variety of peer and group working activities such as peer teaching or buzz groups to make sure that every single student does some explanation (Biggs & Tang, 2011a). There are several other ways to promote effective learning activities which can be also scheduled outside the class or what is referred to as extracurricular activities. These can, for instance, include interactive group projects, peer mentoring, peer teaching, and self-directed learning, all of which are excellent sources of appropriate learning activities (Biggs, 2014).

### 2.3 Assessing Students' Learning Outcomes

It is said that inappropriate assessment tools harm teaching more than any other factor. Ramsden (1992), for example, states that as far as students are concerned, the assessment is the curriculum. According to constructive alignment (CA), an effective assessment tool should be a real reflection of the intended learning outcomes. Therefore, an immediate evaluation of assessment activities is of great importance. The effect that a test makes on the student's 'backwash' should always be positive. If the alignment between the assessment strategies and the intended learning outcome is achieved then it will be positive, because the assessment tool will then cover what the course specifically intended to achieve. Moreover, the assessment method should not encourage learners towards adopting low-level learning techniques such as memorization, question detection and other similar tactics (Biggs & Tang, 2011a).

Furthermore, defining ILOs in terms of student marks may not be appropriate, yet the quality of performance is what matters most. This is very important and should be clearly outlined in the intended learning outcomes to compare the students' actual performance to those desired standards. Otherwise, the learning objectives and the assessment tasks are not aligned. Overall, to make the assessment tasks a real indication of the curriculum both the teachers' teaching activities and the learners' learning activities should be directed towards the same direction which is the desired learning outcome (Biggs, 2014).

### 3. Methodology

In this section, the methods used to undertake this academic research will be explained and rationalised. It includes describing and justifying the research design, research participants, research instruments, and data analysis methods.

#### 3.1 Research Design

This research has combined qualitative and quantitative data in a way that more effectively explains research problems and accomplishes the aims of the study (Fetters, 2016). The quantitative work was in the form of a closed-ended questionnaire, while research instruments employed for the qualitative data were semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and observations (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008; Taherdoost, 2021). This triangulation strategy was particularly useful for evaluating the validity of the study by bringing together data from various sources (Carter et al., 2014).

#### 3.2 Research Participants

The sample for both the questionnaire and the focus groups was third-year students from English language departments of two faculties (i.e., the Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Arts, Soran University). The questionnaire was delivered to 120 English-language undergraduates. Sixty of them were from the Faculty of Arts (17 males and 43 females). The other sixty were from the faculty of education (16 males and 44 females). The respondents were between

the ages of 19 and 22. Among the 120 participants, 14 students agreed to voluntarily take part in the subsequent focus groups, taking into account a maximum variation in students' gender, as well as social and geographical backgrounds. Seven lecturers with different educational degrees, areas of expertise, academic titles, and administrative responsibilities were recruited for the observations and semi-structured interviews. Their qualifications include a Doctorate in TESOL, a Master's in TESOL, a Master's in English Linguistics, and a Master's in English Literature. They also held administrative positions including directors of English language departments and representatives of the department's scientific committees.

### **3.3 Research Instruments**

The current research study has used some semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and observations as qualitative research instruments for data collection. Additionally, a survey questionnaire was employed as a quantitative research method. The mixed-methods approach adopted enabled us to gain a deeper understanding of the research problems by comparing and contrasting the data obtained from the various methods applied (Stainton et al., 2010).

#### **3.3.1 Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was to evaluate the degree to which constructive alignment principles were integrated into the EFL teaching syllabuses. It consisted of two sections. The first section of the survey contained demographic information about the students, such as their names, ages, sex, and ethnicity. The second section was made up of both questions and statements based on the Likert Scale. The items of the survey were answered by picking one of the five frequency levels (options). The options were, *never*, *rarely*, *sometimes*, *often*, and *always*. The lowest point receives (1) marks for the item, which is never, while the highest point receives (5) marks, which is always. The other given options, rarely, sometimes, and often take (2) marks, (3) marks, and (4) marks respectively. This means that the mean between 1 'Never' to 5 'Always' is 3.

#### **3.3.2 Focus Groups**

Focus groups were set up to obtain comprehensive details relative to the topic under investigation (Then et al., 2014). The main purpose of focus groups was to better comprehend the research areas and provide more in-depth responses to any issues that the questionnaire did not sufficiently address. Through exchanging thoughts and ideas, focus groups allowed the participants to discuss and expand on one another's opinions. Consequently, it either reinforced their pre-existing convictions or inspired them to form new ones (Doody et al., 2013; Lune & Berg, 2020; Then et al., 2014). Concerning the number of focus groups, many studies recommended saturation as the primary factor in determining the number of focus groups required for a study (Guest et al., 2016). It was evident that the topic was saturated as similar instances and data were repeatedly seen.

Following practical considerations and relevant academic research, the number of each focus group participant was determined. For example, researchers such as Klagge (2018), Krueger & Casey (2015), Patton (2002), and Then et al. (2014) report that the ideal number of participants required for each focus group session is between 6 to 10. Accordingly, each group consists of seven participants. To protect their privacy, the student participants were given pseudonyms as ST1GA, ST2GA.....ST14GB.

### **3.3.3 Interviews**

In this study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with department heads and English language lecturers. The research questions and the pertinent literature were the basis for designing and generating several specific and open-ended interview questions. Slade & Sergent (2022) contend that selecting an appropriate study sample is essential for yielding thorough and worthwhile responses. Duly, seven English language instructors of both genders who held different academic positions and educational degrees consented to take part in the interviews. To maintain their anonymity, the responders were assigned pseudonyms T1, T2...T7.

### **3.3.4 Observations**

This study has applied the direct non-participant observation method. In this form of observation, the observer maintains his role as a guest or an outsider (Kostera, 2007). The use of observation in this study was to get a general overview and idea of teaching conditions and classroom practices. Additionally, observations allowed for a better description of the settings, observing unplanned and natural events, deepening understanding and developing new inquiries to be asked of the participant (Kawulich, 2012). The use of observations was also compatible with the study's research questions. It was to observe the degree to which the constructive alignment's components and details are successfully implemented and the challenges that might be encountered when aligning the CA elements. The number of teachers who agreed to participate in the subsequent interviews determined the number of classroom observations. Thus, seven English language classes from various academic disciplines that are part of two different faculties were selected for the observation.

## **4. Data Analysis**

Thematic analysis was used as one of the qualitative data analysis methods for the data that was collected through, focus groups, semi-structured interviews, and observations. The thematic analysis, as stated by Braun and Clarke (2006, p.79) is "a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data". Moreover, thematic analysis is particularly appropriate for analysing a wide variety of data sources, such as interview transcripts, observation notes, documents, and several other data sources (Mills et al., 2010).

Concerning the quantitative data collected through the questionnaire, the analysis did not require a detailed treatment (Young T.J., 2016). It was analysed by manually entering the raw data into a Microsoft Excel program.

In this section, the findings of the data collection instruments, which included a questionnaire, focus groups, semi-structured interviews, and observations, will be presented. Categories and themes are used to organise the section. Thus, three main themes that emerged from the analysis of the data are demonstrated as follows:

#### **4.1 Learning Outcomes**

This category investigates the way teachers and students perceive the learning outcomes of the instructional modules. It inspects the process of setting learning outcomes and the extent to which teachers can effectively match the learning outcomes of the curriculum to the teaching/learning methods and assessment tools.

##### **4.1.1 Questionnaire**

A survey questionnaire was handed to student participants to elicit some precise responses regarding the topic. Table 1 below shows the intended learning outcomes (from item 1 to item 5) as perceived by students:

No	Question item	Total	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD
1.	At the beginning of the course, teachers illustrate the learning outcomes.	120	1	6	24	22	67	4.23	0.98
		100%	0.83%	5%	20%	18.33%	55.83%	84.6%	
2.	The learning outcomes of each unit or lesson are clear and specific.	120	3	18	34	48	17	3.48	0.99
		100%	2.5%	15%	28.33%	40%	14.16%	69.6%	
3.	We can understand the teachers' teaching intentions in the learning process.	120	3	13	53	38	13	3.37	0.90
		100%	2.5%	10.83%	44.16%	31.66%	10.83%	67.4%	
4.	Teachers try to combine and relate	120	4	17	34	41	24	3.53	1.06
		100%	3.33%	14.16%	28.33%	34.16%	20%	70.6%	

	the learning outcomes of each lesson to the learning outcomes of the whole module.	%	%	%				%	
5.	What I learned is in line with the stated learning outcomes.	120 100 %	8 6.66 %	21 17.5 %	50 41.66%	30 25%	11 9.16 %	3.12 62.4 %	1.0 2

Table 1: Intended learning outcomes perceived by students

As it is shown in Table 1, the mean of the first item “*at the beginning of the course, teachers illustrate the learning outcomes*”, was 4.23. This outcome appears to be promising as it shows that the vast majority of students (84.6%) confirm that teachers clarify and explain the general learning outcomes of the instructional module they teach at the very beginning of the course. Teachers often set the first class of the academic year or semester to introduce and explain the different components of the course module including the overall learning outcomes. According to the results elicited from student participants, it is obvious that teachers are attempting to illustrate the learning outcomes of the module, which seems to be a good thing and is consistent with the concepts of constructive alignment since an explicit description of the intended learning outcomes is one of the central CA features (Biggs, 2014; Krathwohl, 2002). The average of the data set concerning the second item “*the learning outcomes of each unit or lesson are clear and specific*” was 3.48. This demonstrates that (69.6%) of student participants believe that teachers are successful in clarifying and specifying the learning objectives of each class. This result again can be considered a positive point for teachers, as it goes in line with the principles of constructive alignment that exhort teachers to be very specific about the things/learnings they want their students to learn (Biggs, 2014). Statement number three, “*We can understand the teachers’ teaching intentions in the learning process*”, recorded 3.37 (67.4%) as a mean. The outcome of this item is quite encouraging as it implies a kind of correlation between the teaching methods used by teachers and the intended learning outcomes because these two components should always be in synchronous with each other (Ali, 2018). The mean of item four “*teachers try to combine and relate the learning outcomes of each lesson to the learning outcomes of the whole module*”, was 3.53. This output displays that a greater number of student participants (70.6%) think that

Soran University teachers most often attempt to connect the general learning objectives for the course module with the learning objectives for each class. Last but not least, question number five, with a mean average of 3.12, reveals that more than half of the participants (62.4%) acknowledge that what they learn during the learning process resembles the stated learning outcomes. However, the targeted act according to CA principles is that; the intended objectives, the learning method and the assessment tools are for determining whether the specified standard of the objective has been satisfied or not (Biggs, 2014).

#### **4.1.2 Focus Groups**

It is said that teachers typically set some very ideal outcomes in their module descriptions, yet when it comes to practice, for whatever reasons, they more often forget about many of those predetermined outcomes. A constructive alignment is therefore of the utmost importance in preventing this mismatch (Biggs, 2014). For example, in response to a question about learning outcomes, an extract from a participant ST3GA (Student Number 3 Group A) depicted how students view the process of teachers setting and pursuing the intended learning outcomes they outlined in their course books. The excerpt says:

Generally, there are some teachers; who have written in Moodle (course book), but they are not applying them in the class.

Particular students claim that they are unable to clearly and visibly see the intended learning objective of particular modules. They believe that fewer than 50% of the overall learning objectives of certain instructional disciplines are eventually met. These claims indicate that the CA principles here are overlooked by some teachers (Biggs, 2014).

Moreover, according to Blumberg (2009), students' advanced awareness of the learning outcomes can help them learn more effectively and feel less anxious. For example, a student (ST14BG) put forward the following comment:

I think that there is a problem, maybe if it was 50% it is going to be okay, but it is less than that. Sometimes teachers don't even talk about the goals of the lessons!

#### **4.1.3 Interviews and Observations**

The findings of teachers' semi-structured interviews corroborate and support the assertions made by the students during the focus groups. They also reported that teachers in their module descriptions define some ideal goals, but when the time comes, they often forget about many of those predefined outcomes (Ahmad & Rao, 2012; Mowlaie & Rahimi, 2010). For instance, the following quotes from Teacher2 further describe the situation:

I believe that teachers, generally, when they set the aims and objectives of the whole module do not very often refer back to them, or they might do that only occasionally and only a few

teachers do that. Only a few teachers try to combine the aims and objectives of each lesson with the aims of the whole module.

Likewise, Teacher 5 believes that aims and objectives are not always mandatory. This may be due to potential situations that teachers may run into. As he said:

You know those course books are not 100% binding; because the situation will change in every class and every semester, we cannot guarantee 100% that all the outcomes mentioned in the course will be achieved, but we try to get these learning outcomes as much as possible.

In contrast to the situation previously portrayed which implies that certain teachers were somehow irresponsible about the process of seeking the general and the more specific educational learning outcomes, the following quotes depict a rather positive image of teachers who seem to be more concerned about this crucial component of the curriculum. Just to name a few, Teacher1 put forward the illustration below:

Usually, at the beginning of the course, I discuss the learning outcomes of the course with my students and help them understand why they need to take this class. For setting module objectives and aims, I usually consider the bigger picture. I mean the general aims and objectives of the department and its major. In this way, I can easily find out how a particular module can serve to complete the bigger picture. The aims and objectives of each lesson and the aims of the whole module all work as one package and should be designed very carefully. All the details in the process are essential as they complete one another.

According to CA, teachers at the very beginning of a teaching course must overtly state and explain the educational aims and objectives of the course and their relationship to the other CA components to raise learners' attention and interest towards them (Ariffin et al., 2018). Payne (2003) also reports that students will strive to comprehend items more thoroughly if they are explicitly stated in the learning objectives. However, when teachers were observed inside their classrooms during the observations, only one teacher started the class by explaining and clarifying the aims and objectives and the learning outcomes of the lecture.

## ***4.2 Teaching/Learning Methods***

This category aims at scrutinizing the participants' perceptions about one more central element of 'constructive alignment' which is the learning and teaching methods.

### ***4.2.1 Questionnaire***

The section initiates with presenting and analysing the results of a questionnaire delivered to undergraduate students. As it is shown in the table below, the items associated with this category start from (item 6 to item 11).

No	Question item	Total	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD
6.	Teachers help us to exchange our knowledge and experiences.	120 100 %	2 1.66%	16 13.33 %	37 30.83%	38 31.66 %	27 22.5 %	3.6 72%	1.0 2
7.	Teachers view us as independent and self-directed learners.	120 100 %	13 10.83 %	20 16.66 %	41 34.16%	28 23.33 %	18 15%	3.15 63%	1.1 8
8.	Teachers welcome our comments on their ideas.	120 100 %	7 5.83%	30 25%	37 30.83%	22 18.33 %	24 20%	3.21 64.2 %	1.1 9
9.	Teachers show enthusiasm and excitement about their teaching modules.	120 100 %	4 3.33%	15 12.5 %	71 59.16%	18 15%	12 10%	3.15 63%	0.8 8
10.	The different components of learning modules such as (seminars, lectures, tutorials, etc.) are well aligned.	120 100 %	6 5%	22 18.33 %	39 32.5%	32 26.66 %	21 17.5 %	3.33 66.6 %	1.1 1
11.	The teaching/learning methods help improve our analytical thinking, practical abilities, and comprehension of the subject.	120 100 %	11 9.16%	17 14.16 %	43 35.83%	37 30.83 %	12 10%	3.18 63.6 %	1.0 8

Table 2: Teaching/learning methods perceived by students

The output of item number six “*teachers help us to exchange our knowledge and experiences*” was 3.6 (72%) as a mean. This seems to be positive and is in line with the CA key tenets as it suggests that lecturers generally aim at assisting students in working together; sharing their knowledge and experience; and ultimately constructing their knowledge (Biggs, 2014). The mean of the next item, which is item number seven, “*teachers view us as independent and self-directed learners*”, was 3.15 (63%). The resulting figure of this item is also considered to be advantageous and is compatible with the basic notions of CA (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Boulton-Lewis, 1995). Students’ response to item number eight which states, “*Teachers welcome our comments on their ideas*” had a mean score of 3.21. This outcome shows that more than half of student participants (64.2%) believe that teachers are giving them the chance to question and comment on teachers' ideas. This, according to CA, will help learners show their unique ability and expand their critical thinking (Joseph, 2015; Vrasidas, 2000). The results of item number nine show that more than half of students 3.15 (63%) think that teachers show enthusiasm and excitement about their teaching modules. This product is particularly favourable since a teacher’s lack of enthusiasm and engagement could create a very teacher-centred classroom, which is seemingly against CA’s core principles (Ariffin et al., 2018; Jani et al., 2020). The last two items belonging to this category, item number ten and item number eleven, scored 3.33 (66.6) and 3.18 (63.6%) respectively. Item number ten states that “*the different components of learning modules such as (seminars, lectures, tutorials, etc.) are well aligned*”, whereas item number eleven says that “*the teaching/learning methods help improve our analytical thinking, practical abilities, and comprehension of the subject*”. Due to the positive scores they recorded, both of these items are seen as rather encouraging.

#### **4.2.2 Focus Groups**

Constructive alignment emphasises the utilisation of teaching methods that are supportive in relating ideas, using evidence, and engaging in reflective and critical thinking to help learners build their knowledge of the material being studied (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Entwistle, 2018; Joseph & Juwah, 2012; Hailikari et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022). In response to a question posed concerning this idea, one of the student respondents (ST1GA) made the following comment:

I don’t think that there is an alignment, because as long as I remember the only thing that teachers do is just try to make us memorise things.

Another student (ST3GA) went on to support the above assertion by saying:

Unfortunately, nowadays most of the teachers focus only on that, they want their students to memorize things.

One factor contributing to this defect is the teachers' use of outdated teaching strategies. It is believed that traditional teaching methods do not help students develop their critical thinking skills or build their knowledge (Armarego, 2009; Zhang et al., 2022). For example, one of the learners (ST4GA) said that “*many teachers use traditional ways, or the old ways to teach English. It is wrong for me because it will decrease the students' interest in the class*”.

According to CA's views, a supportive learning environment will assist students to develop their critical thinking skills and use deep learning approaches. On the other side, an obstructive learning environment may force students to employ surface learning strategies or fragmented knowledge (Larkin & Richardson, 2013; Lindblom-Ylänne et al., 2018). Students' perceptions regarding this issue were relatively negative. They think that the learning environment is not helpful. The excerpts that follow capture the opinions of the majority of the students:

As for the environment, I don't think it is really good. I don't think so because sometimes the teachers do not do such things to make the students much easier to understand and the classroom environment does not make it much easier. (ST1GA)

In addition, there should always be collaborative planning by teachers to develop purposeful lectures that can help students acquire, understand, and retain information, and accomplish and perform the desired learning outcome (Smith, 2012). The teaching activities and assignments activities should constantly help learners to become aware of the learning objectives (Ali, 2018; Biggs, 2014; Azasu & Berggren, 2015). Overall, the student's impressions of this matter were not encouraging. For instance, ST2GA argued that:

In my opinion, not all of the teachers have a good lesson plan. First, they teach them then they have some activities for their students, so the students can understand, and retain the information then by the end of the class they can perform the information that has been given by the teacher. Fifty per cent of the teachers apply this...

The teaching/learning activities and the assessment activities, in the opinion of student participants, are often chosen at random by teachers and do not guide students towards the learning outcome. This contradicts the CA's basic values (Ali, 2018). Yet, few teachers effectively align with them. For example, two student respondents reported:

I don't think that there is a good alignment. You cannot find your aims and goals via what we do inside the faculty (class)... I cannot find the aims of the teaching/learning activities. (ST4GA)  
I think most of the teachers, their teaching methods and assignments are somehow close to supporting the learning

process but we have some other teachers who just teach!  
(ST2GA)

Further, students' group and team working activities, practical sessions, and extracurricular assignments are examples of some teaching and learning procedures that are strongly advocated by CA (Biggs, 2014; Biggs, 2003; Hailikari et al., 2021). However, our results imply that only a minority of teachers are genuinely striving to execute this crucial aspect of the learning process. This, in the opinion of the students, is a result of the employment of teacher-centred approaches. The comments below further support this claim:

I think teachers are helpful to the students by having group discussions and presentations to help their students learn more effectively. Some teachers give extracurricular activities, but not all of them. Only a few of them... (ST2GA)

I think that most of the students get bored in terms of participating in the class because the majority of the time teachers apply teacher-centred, not student-centred methods.  
(ST13GB)

It can be concluded that while most lecturers have difficulties aligning between the many components of constructive alignment, certain excellent teachers can do so.

#### **4.2.3 Interviews and Observations**

Here, it was important to understand how the instructors felt about this crucial part of the research. First, some encouraging perceptions were inferred from what some teachers said. For example, Teacher1 said:

That is an essential part of any teacher's job. I usually try to assess my activities and make sure that all of them are aligned with the course outcomes.

On the other hand, some negative comments from certain teachers were also received, as Teacher2 and Teacher3 respectively mentioned:

Sometimes the teaching/learning activities can serve in achieving the learning outcome and sometimes not.

Personally speaking, the learning outcomes don't reflect the assessments and the activities practised in the classroom precisely and accurately.

Therefore, for a positive alignment, students should be assisted in performing tasks that are likely to elicit the necessary understandings, and they must present verification showing that their learning has been in line with the stated objectives (Biggs, 2003; Houghton, 2004). Teacher1, for instance, said that:

I mostly rely on inductive approaches to learning because I believe that learning implicitly is more effective. I try to choose activities that are aligned with the learning outcomes.

Yet, a few other teachers had different opinions. As an illustration, Teacher4 noted:

Unfortunately, I can see that many of the teaching staff focus on lecturing which is more traditional.

Teacher2 likewise added that:

The majority of teachers, I believe, use teacher-centred methods such as lecturing and tutorials as the main methods of teaching and learning.

However, teachers who use conventional teacher-centred strategies like lecturing and tutorials usually produce passive learners and do not help improve learners' critical thinking (Martin et al., 2000).

### 4.3 Assessment Tools

This section displays and analyses the data collected from the participants about this dynamic component of the constructive alignment strategy.

#### 4.3.1 Questionnaire

Table 3 below illustrates the assessment tools (from item 12 to item 16) as perceived by student participants.

No.	Question item	Total	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Mean	SD
12.	The assessment methods guide toward memorization.	120 100 %	4 3.33 %	10 8.33 %	21 17.5%	28 23.33 %	57 47.5 %	4.03 80.6 %	1.1 3
13.	The assessment methods guide toward knowledge construction, understanding, and a deep approach to learning.	120 100 %	42 35%	32 26.66 %	19 15.83%	22 18.33 %	5 4.16 %	2.3 46%	1.2 3
14.	The assessment strategies used by teachers, such as (tests, examinations, assignments, etc.) are appropriate.	120 100 %	8 6.66 %	23 19.16 %	48 40%	28 23.33 %	13 10.83 %	3.12 62.4 %	1.0 5
15.	The assessment system includes quantitative scoring	120 100 %	57 47.5 %	23 19.16 %	16 13.33%	14 11.66 %	10 8.33 %	2.14 42.8 %	1.3 4

	with qualitative feedback.								
16.	The course assessment methods can serve as a reflection of the student's learning process.	120 100 %	9 7.5 %	16 13.33 %	33 27.5%	39 32.5 %	23 19.16 %	3.42 68.4 %	1.1 5

Table 3: Assessment tools perceived by students

In response to item number 12 which says “*the assessment methods guide toward memorization*”, the majority of student respondents (80.6%), with a mean score of 4.03, believe that the assessment tools guide toward memorization. On the other hand, in response to the question that is comparable to the first one which states “*the assessment methods guide toward knowledge construction, understanding, and a deep approach to learning*”, only 46% of the students believe that the assessment tools are beneficial in enabling learners to construct their knowledge and understanding. This item with a mean score of 2.3 suggests that teachers or the relevant authorities are typically not using the most efficient assessment techniques. These two items intrinsically contradict the core concepts of constructive alignment and do not seem to be at all positive (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Item number 14 tried to explore the appropriateness of the assessment strategies applied by teachers. The question asks whether the assessment strategies used by teachers, such as (tests, examinations, assignments, etc.) are appropriate or not. The question has scored 3.12 as a mean. This seems to be relatively optimistic as more than half of respondents (62.4%) agreed that the assessment tools are appropriate. However, an assessment that is appropriate and matches the employed teaching methods does not necessarily mean to be productive or positive as well, because as Biggs (2014) claims the quality of performance is what matters most. There should be an actual performance of the desired qualities by the students, otherwise, the learning objectives and the assessment tasks are not aligned (Biggs, 2014). The mean of item number 15 “*the assessment system includes quantitative scoring with qualitative feedback*” was 2.14, which appears to be negative as only (42.8%) of students declare that instructors provide them with qualitative feedback in addition to quantitative scoring. Vrasidas (2000), for example, contends that the assessment scheme according to constructivism’s viewpoints entails qualitatively assessing the structure of the learner's knowledge. Finally, the student’s reflection on item number sixteen with the statement that says “*the course assessment methods can serve as a reflection of the student’s learning process*” was rather encouraging since more than half of them (68.4%) thought

that the testing means reflects the learning process regardless of the efficiency of the learning/teaching methods exploited in the learning process. The average score of the item was 3.42. Generally, in an aligned curriculum, assessment methods should always reflect the student's learning process (Jani et al., 2020). The offered assessment criteria must indicate how the learning outcomes can be fulfilled at different levels of achievement (Biggs, 2014; Biggs & Tang, 2011).

#### **4.3.2 Focus Groups**

During the focus groups, students expressed their opinions on this topic in both positive and negative ways. They stated that some competent instructors can handle this important matter quite skilfully, while other teachers may approach it negatively. For instance, ST2GA and ST3GA gave the following account of their experience:

For assessment, it depends on the teachers, because for some teachers I have good feedback about the assessment. But for some other teachers, we just have to memorise to pass the exams. (ST2GA)

More than 75% of assessments are memorization, while teachers can bring some questions that help students to focus on their meaning, depending on their brain, and how they think. (ST3GA)

Yet, according to CA, methods of assessment should never motivate learners to use low-level learning strategies like memorising, recalling, question detecting, and so forth (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Hailikari et al., 2021). Assessments should urge students to build their understanding and develop their critical thinking skills (Biggs & Tang, 2011).

#### **4.3.3 Interviews and Observations**

The opinions of teachers about this essential component of constructive alignment were also investigated. For example, Teacher2 commented on this issue by saying:

I am not very satisfied with assessment strategies especially the mid-term and the final exams. These two main assessment tools applied in our university are not very helpful in helping students construct their knowledge or understand and comprehend the things they have studied, yet they push them to focus on memorization.

Teacher5 also said:

This is a relative subject. You know some of our modules, the assessment of some modules is good, and you can have your quizzes, seminars, presentations, reports, etc...they are very effective, but there are some modules again just like listening, speaking, and grammar there is no one hundred per cent correct assessment for them...

However, there were also some delightful remarks made about this issue. For example, one of the PhD holders (Teacher1) stated that for the assessment to effectively support and serve the learning outcomes; *“I usually use diverse assignments and projects to make sure that learning outcomes are attained”*.

Furthermore, to address the inadequacies of summative evaluation and one-shot tests, one of the heads (Teacher6) stated that:

I assess my students with various assessment tools such as quizzes, midterm examinations, seminars, projects, writing essays and paragraphs, and reports. I also sometimes ask the students to create a poster.

Moreover, during the observations, it was noticed that some teachers are genuinely attempting to implement some formative assessments within their classes, as evidenced by their questioning of students, elicitation of feedback, active daily participation of students, setting up quizzes, and students' presentations of seminars.

## **5. Results and Discussion**

The key findings of this research study will be discussed in this section. The items are developed to ascertain whether a constructive alignment between the learning outcome, teaching methods, and assessment tools exists or not. Thus, the chapter is organised around these three main elements.

### **5.1 Learning Outcomes**

According to the study's findings, more than half of the teachers in the context of the inquiry follow the CA guidelines regarding learning outcomes. For instance, they designate the first lecture of the academic year for introducing, explaining, and rationalising the very general learning outcomes of the module they teach. Then, they make an effort to be specific and clear about the learning goals they want their students to attain and perform for each lesson. It seems that teachers most often strive to combine the specific learning objectives of each class with the broader learning objectives of the subjects they are teaching. Most significantly, the research also showed that more than half of instructors try to employ teaching methods that are more likely to yield the desired outcomes. What they have listed as learning outcomes is what they want students to learn. This appeared to be a good thing since it suggests that the learning objectives and the instructional strategies are in some way constructively aligned. In the same way, the literature claims that applying the CA principles will help students achieve their learning objectives more effectively (Thota & Whitfield, 2010).

Unlike the above, which can be viewed as a rather favourable result as it goes with the main tenets of CA, the findings also reveal that certain teachers were ineffective in making the module's learning objectives clear and visible to the learners. The results also show that while teachers define some ideal objectives

in the module descriptions, they are more likely to overlook many of those predetermined outcomes when putting lessons into practice. This kind of mismatch between what teachers claim to apply inside the classroom and what they implement is often detected and reported by many researchers, such as Ahmad and Rao (2012) and Mowlaie and Rahimi (2010). Biggs (2003) also reported that the teaching course books of certain higher education institutions often include a description of a teaching environment in which learners, by the end of the course, can effectively achieve the intended learning outcomes, yet in reality, many of those outcomes are not eventually met. He attributed this deficiency to the lack of constructive alignment within the curriculum components.

The displeasing thing concerning the issue of setting and seeking learning outcomes is having teachers who lack good planning and who are not very concerned about this important facet of the educational process. For example, some responses elicited from the participants indicate that some teachers do not have their own goals or do not play any role in setting the aims and objectives of their disciplines. They simply receive a prepared course book without updating it or making any contributions to it. Additionally, because the teaching authority does not regularly observe teachers, many of them do not abide by their module descriptions. Yet, according to CA, a teacher should be the lesson planner and the conductor of learning activities that seek out the intended learning outcomes (Jani et al., 2020). Given that learning outcomes are one of the ultimate CA prerequisites, teachers should be very precise and specific in setting and pursuing the learning outcomes (Biggs, 2014; Biggs, 2003; Smith, 2012).

Through the above discussions, it became clear that some teachers are very conscious of the process of defining, clarifying, combining, and connecting the various learning outcomes with other CA key parts. On the other hand, some instructors behave less efficiently towards this process and are consequently held accountable for any errors that are made.

### ***5.2 Teaching/Learning Methods***

Though the results of the questionnaire are above average levels (60.9%) and hence fall short of our expectations, they may still be viewed as favourable outcomes. As a whole, the findings of the questionnaire show that the majority of teachers are acting according to the CA's basic principles (Biggs, 2014; Martin et al., 2000; Vrasidas, 2000). On the other hand, there are also a large number of teachers who do not follow the CA in their classroom practices. Participants in the study believed that one of the factors contributing to this problem is the teachers' use of traditional teaching methods. This belief is also backed up by other researchers, such as Armarego (2009) and Zhang et al. (2022), who assert that conventional teaching approaches do not truly assist

students in improving their ability to think critically or to expand their understanding.

An obstructive learning environment was another constraint some student and teacher participants touched upon. Some of them believe that the educational environment is not very encouraging. Such a setting violates the CA principles as it forces learners to adopt surface learning techniques and thus only acquire some fragmented knowledge (Larkin & Richardson, 2013; Lindblom-Ylänne et al., 2018). Furthermore, Joseph and Juwah (2012) claim that a CA model is a useful framework for improving students' skills since it gives students ample opportunities for practising via group working activities, practical sessions, and other similar activities. Yet, when scrutinising the participants' perceptions about this central facet of teaching and learning practices, many complaints were received. According to the findings, only a small number of instructors try to comply with these important CA requirements. Participants declared several factors that went beyond this flaw, including teacher-centred methods and an absence of experienced instructors.

It was also worth checking the extent to which the stated learning outcome has been accomplished by the learners or not. This can be exceeded by asking learners not only to recall the information but also to perform tasks that are more likely to prove that the required standards have been met (Biggs, 2003; Houghton, 2004). A careful examination of participants' impressions of this issue was not very captivating and fell short of expectations. Yet some competent teachers consistently receive praise for their work. This orientation was even more explicitly articulated when some participants declared that some teachers lack a firm plan for aligning the three CA main pillars and that the lessons are often taught randomly. On the flip side, they also named a few teachers who effectively managed to align between them.

Overall, two groups of lecturers were recognised during the discussion above. The first group included lecturers who work hard to maintain the CA tenets through the employing of deep approaches to learning that are far more probable to yield the desired understanding, boost critical thinking and knowledge construction in learners, and encourage them to take greater ownership of their education (Boulton-Lewis, 1995). The second group are teachers who continue to use very conventional teaching techniques and are more likely to apply teacher-centred approaches. This conclusion matches the findings of a research project conducted by Kazar and Mede (2015), who report that the CA segments in one English language course were not effectively aligned.

### ***5.3 The Assessment Tools***

According to CA, the instruments for assessment should stimulate students to use in-depth learning strategies that work well for their knowledge construction

(Biggs & Tang, 2011). However, the respondents' overall impressions of this concept were not particularly positive and were at odds with the CA's claimed fundamental principles, as the majority of respondents think that the assessment methods are not greatly productive in assisting students build their knowledge and instead encourage them to only memorise some fragmented knowledge. This conflicts with the key concepts of CA because, as Rhind (2006) states, the assessment should be completely consistent with what Biggs advocates in his model of CA. Rhind (2006) further added that, for the assessment to be valid and compatible, it must incorporate knowledge and performance rather than merely cover some sub-component abilities.

Within the CA framework, what counts most are the constructive traits that the test should possess, the positive backwash it has on the learners, and the extent to which the assessment activity can successfully define the learner's quality of performance (Biggs, 2014). By and large, concerning this concept, more than half of student respondents reported that the assessment tools applied, such as tests, examinations, assignments, and so forth, were appropriate. This finding initially seemed to be positive on its own, but because it lacked other characteristics that the constructivism theory emphasises, it can be acknowledged as only partially favourable. Additionally, the assessment scheme should combine qualitative comments with quantitative grading. For instance, Vrasidas (2000) argues that constructivism-based evaluation necessitates qualitatively weighing the learner's performance. The findings, however, showed that the majority of teachers do not give students qualitative comments along with quantitative grading.

For a better accomplishment of the specified learning objectives and to ensure that the assessment activities are in line with the teaching and learning strategies, a driven attempt is being made by the educational authority in the setting under consideration to employ a range of assessment instruments, such as seminars, presentations, assignments, and projects. Nevertheless, according to our findings, it appears that summative assessments and one-shot tests are still the most dominant ones. The above discussion and the classroom observations we had conducted helped us to conclude that some committed teachers are indeed seeking to incorporate several formative forms of assessment activities within their courses, as was documented in their implementation of assessment activities such as question-response activities, feedback elicitation, active daily participation of students, daily quizzes, students' discussions and presentations of seminars, and so forth. This finding is supported by the literature, which says that an assessment method that fosters student active engagement is highly effective at inspiring students to take on deep learning strategies (Hailikari et al., 2021). On the other side, some other teachers fail to act in a manner compliant with CA guidelines. They, for example, do not have any formative assessment

activities, and the classes are almost entirely teacher-centred sessions. This deficiency, however, is criticised by many scholars. For instance, Yanik (2007) makes the point that inactive assessment instruments can prevent the required learning objectives from being successfully met.

## 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

One of the most crucial aspects of the educational system that requires continual research, updating, and development is the curriculum. Inquiries about a constructive alignment among the different elements of the curriculum have long been an issue of daily debate among decision-makers, instructors, and students alike. Determining the shortcomings of the existing curriculum can provide useful insights and the best alternatives for how to handle the difficulties.

This study, thus, adopted a mixed-methods research design to investigate students' and teachers' perspectives on constructive alignment within an EFL teaching curriculum. The study primarily aimed to investigate the extent to which teaching and learning activities, assessment tasks, and the intended learning outcomes are all constructively aligned. The research revealed some statistically significant findings that can be labelled as follows:

- Some teachers in the context under study adhere to the CA principles and make an effort to constructively align the CA's basic elements. For instance, they take great care in determining, defining, clarifying, and combining the various learning objectives of the modules they teach. They strive to implement in-depth and impactful teaching and learning strategies that are more likely to yield the required understanding, strengthen students' critical thinking and knowledge construction, and encourage them to take more ownership of their learning. They also attempt to put some supportive assessment activities into place to make the assessment methods well aligned with the teaching and learning methods and to better achieve the predetermined learning outcomes.
- Most of the teachers behave less responsibly towards the process as a whole and are ineffective in successfully aligning the CA central elements. For instance, they continue using the very traditional teaching strategies that encourage students to adopt surface learning strategies like memorising and information recall. Additionally, the assessment practices applied by them are thought to be unproductive and do not reflect the fundamental requirements of the CA.

Thus, based on the justifications and effects we have just covered, it is clear that teachers are required to better follow the CA principles if they are to achieve all of the desired educational aims and objectives (Mamaril et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2013). Besides, stakeholders in the educational administrations should take the constructive alignment practice more seriously among teachers (Jani et al., 2020), because, as Yusoff et al. (2014) state, exposure to an accurate practical application of the constructive alignment model will motivate students to continue excelling in the area of education and will result in obtaining better academic achievements.

### References

- Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2012). Inconsistencies in English language teaching in Pakistan: a comparison between public and private institutions. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(15), 95–105.
- Ali, L. (2018). The design of curriculum, assessment and evaluation in higher education with constructive alignment. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 5(1), 72–78. <https://doi.org/doi:10.20448/journal.509.2018.51.72.78>
- Ariffin, S., Alias, N., Othman, K., & Yusoff, H. (2018). Exploring students' self-evaluation on their learning outcomes through an integrated cumulative grade point average reporting mechanism. *International Scholarly and Scientific Research & Innovation*, 12(6), 811–815.
- Armarego, J. (2009). Constructive alignment in SE education: Aligning to what? In H. Ellis, S. Demurjian, & J. Naveda (Eds.), *Software Engineering: effective teaching and learning approaches and practices* (pp. 15–37). ACM.
- Azasu, S., & Berggren, B. (2015). Using constructive alignment to improve student research and writing skills: a case study of a master's program in real estate management. *International Journal of Learning and Change*, 8(1), 83. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1504/ijlc.2015.069076>
- Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, 32(3), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00138871>
- Biggs, J. (2003). Aligning teaching for constructing learning. *Higher Education Academy*.

- Biggs, J. (2014). Constructive alignment in university teaching. *HERDSA Review of Higher Education, 1*, 5–22.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. McGraw-Hill/Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2008). *Completing your qualitative dissertation is a roadmap from beginning to end*. SAGE.
- Blumberg, P. (2009). Maximizing learning through course alignment and experience with different types of knowledge. *Innovative Higher Education, 34*(2), 93–103. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/s10755-009-9095-2>
- Boulton-Lewis, G. (1995). The SOLO taxonomy is a means of shaping and assessing learning in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development, 14*(2), 143–154. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1080/0729436950140201>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 41*(5), 545–547. <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.onf.545-547>
- Doody, O., Slevin, E., & Taggart, L. (2013). Focus group interviews in nursing research: Part 1. *British Journal of Nursing, 22*(1), 16–19. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2013.22.1.16>
- Entwistle, N. (2018). *Student learning and academic understanding: A research perspective with implications for teaching*. Academic Press.
- Fetters, M. D. (2016). Haven't we always been doing mixed methods research? Lessons learned from the development of the horseless carriage. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 10*(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689815620883>
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & McKenna, K. (2016). How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for nonprobability sample sizes. *Field Methods, 29*(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822x16639015>

- Hailikari, T., Virtanen, V., Vesalainen, M., & Postareff, L. (2021). Student perspectives on how different elements of constructive alignment support active learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 1469787421. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/1469787421989160>
- Hamdoun, W. M. (2023). Constructive alignment approach: Enhancing learning and teaching. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, 4(2), 162–170. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0173>
- Houghton, W. (2004). *Engineering subject centre guide: Learning and teaching theory for engineering academics*. Engineering subject centre, Loughborough University.
- Jani, M., Latif, A., Talib, R., & Is, N. (2020). The implementation of constructive alignment at the teacher's education institute using Rasch analysis. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(11), 659–665. <https://doi.org/doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.11.120>
- Joseph, S. (2015). Curriculum politics in higher education: What educators need to do to survive. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n3p14>
- Joseph, S., & Juwah, C. (2012). Using constructive alignment theory to develop nursing skills curricula. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 12(1), 52–59. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.nepr.2011.05.007>
- Kawulich, B. (2012). Collecting data through observation. In C. Wagner, B. Kawulich, & M. Garner (Eds.), *Doing Social Research: A global context* (pp. 150–160). McGraw Hill.
- Kazar, S. G., & Mede, E. (2015). The perceptions of ESP students' target needs: A case study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 2526–2530. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.574>
- Klagge, J. (2018). Guidelines for conducting focus groups. *Research Theory & Techniques*, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.33817.47201>
- Kostera, M. (2007). *Organizational ethnography: Methods and inspirations*. Sage.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212–218.

[https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104\\_2](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_2)

- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). *Focus Groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Sage.
- Larkin, H., & Richardson, B. (2013). Creating high challenge/high support academic environments through constructive alignment: Student outcomes. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(2), 192–204.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2012.696541>
- Lindblom-Ylänne, S., Parpala, A., & Postareff, L. (2018). What constitutes the surface approach to learning in the light of new empirical evidence? *Studies in Higher Education, 44*(12), 2183–2195.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1482267>
- Lune, H., & Berg, B. L. (2020). *Qualitative research methods for the Social Sciences*. Pearson India Education.
- Mamaril, M., Cox, L., & Vaughan, M. (2018). Weaving evaluation into the Waipā ecosystem: Placing evaluation in an indigenous place-based educational program. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 56*, 42–51.  
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2017.10.005>
- Martin, E., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P., & Benjamin, J. (2000). What university teachers teach and how they teach it. *Instructional Science, 28*(387–412).
- Mills, A. J., Durepos, G., & Wiebe, E. (2010). *Encyclopedia of case study research*. Sage.
- Mowlaie, B., & Rahimi, A. (2010). The effect of teachers' attitude about communicative language teaching on their practice: Do they practice what they preach? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 1524–1528.  
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.359>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Payne, D. (2003). *Applied educational assessment*. Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Piaget, J. (1962). *Theory of cognitive development*. P. F. Collier.

- Ramsden, P. (2023). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. Routledge.
- Remmeland Wikhamn, B. (2016). Challenges of adopting constructive alignment in action learning education. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, 14(1), 18–28. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1080/14767333.2016.1251880>
- Rhind, S. M. (2006). Competence at graduation: Implications for assessment. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, 33(2), 172–175. <https://doi.org/doi:10.3138/jvme.33.2.172>
- Slade, S., & Sergent, S. R. (2022). *Interview Techniques*. In StatPearls. StatPearls Publishing.
- Smith, R. J. (2012). *Alignment of intended learning outcomes, curriculum and assessment in a middle school science program (PhD)*. Edith Cowan University.
- Stainton, A., Johnson, J., & Borodzicz, E. (2010). Educational validity of business gaming simulation: A research methodology framework. *Simulation & Gaming*, 42(5), 705–723. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046878109353467>
- Taherdoost, H. (2021). Data collection methods and tools for research: A step-by-step guide to choosing data collection technique for academic and business research projects. *Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 10(1), 10–38.
- Then, K. L., Rankin, J. A., & Ali, E. (2014). Focus group research: What is it and how can it be used? *Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*, 24(1), 16–22.
- Thota, N., & Whitfield, R. (2010). A holistic approach to learning and teaching introductory object-oriented programming. *Computer Science Education*, 20(2), 103–127. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2010.486260>
- Vrasidas, C. (2000). Constructivism versus objectivism: Implications for interaction, course design, and evaluation in distance education. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 6(4), 339–362.
- Wächter, B. (2004). The Bologna process: developments and prospects.

*European Journal of Education*, 39(3), 265–273. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2004.00182.x>

Wang, X., Su, Y., Cheung, S., Wong, E., & Kwong, T. (2013). An exploration of Biggs' constructive alignment in course design and its impact on students' learning approaches. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(4), 477–491. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1080/02602938.2012.658018>

Yanik, A. E. (2007). *A study of English language curriculum implementation in 6th, 7th and 8th grades of public primary schools through teachers' and students' perceptions (Doctoral dissertation)* [Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey]. <https://doi.org/doi:https://hdl.handle.net/11511/17283>

Young T.J. (2016). Questionnaires and surveys. In Zhu Hua (Ed.), *Research methods in intercultural communication: A practical guide* (pp. 165–180). Wiley.

Yusoff, Y. M., Fuaad, N. F. A., Yasin, R. B. M., & Tawil, N. M. (2014). Achievement of program outcomes in outcome-based education implementation—a meta-analysis. *Paper Presented at the Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operational Management*, 1939–1749.

Zhang, H., Su, S., Zeng, Y., & Lam, J. F. (2022). An experimental study on the effectiveness of students' learning in scientific courses through constructive alignment—a case study from an MIS course. *Education Sciences*, 12(5), 1–338. <https://doi.org/doi:10.3390/educsci12050338>

#### پوخته

گونجانندی بنیادنه، یه‌کێکه له ریگاکانی پهروه‌دهیی، که بانگه‌شه بو ئه‌وه ده‌کات؛ ده‌بیت هه‌میشه سازانیکی بنیادنه له نیوان پیکهاته سه‌رمکیه‌کانی مه‌نه‌جی خویندن هه‌بیت بو ئه‌وه‌ی به‌باشترین شیوه ئامانه‌کانی خویندن به‌ده‌ستبه‌یندرین. ئه‌و پیکهاته سه‌رمکیانه‌ش بریتین له ریگاکانی وانه‌وتنه‌وه و فیربوون، ئامرازه‌کانی هه‌سه‌نگاندن، و ئامانه‌کانی فیربوون. ئه‌م توێژینه‌وه‌یه هه‌ولده‌دات له دوخی 'گونجانندی بنیادنه' له یه‌کێکه له مه‌نه‌جه‌کانی خویندنی زمانی ئینگلیزی وه‌کو زمانی بیانی سه‌ر به زانکو سووران بکوڵینه‌وه. ئه‌م توێژینه‌وه‌یه ریگه‌ی هه‌مه‌جووری بو کوکرده‌وه و شیکرده‌وه‌ی داتا‌کانی به‌کاره‌یناوه. ریگاکانی‌ش بریتی بوون له راپرسی، چاوپیکه‌وتنی به‌کو‌مه‌ل له‌گه‌ل قوتابییه‌کان، چاوپیکه‌وتن له‌گه‌ل ماموستا‌کان و چاودیریکردنی ماموستا‌کان. سه‌ره‌تا راپرسییه‌که بو (۱۲۰) قوتابی نێردرا. دواتر له نیوان ئه‌و ژماره‌یه (۱۴) قوتابی ئاماده‌بیا‌ن ده‌ربری بو ئه‌وه‌ی به‌شیوه‌یه‌کی

خوبه‌خشانه به‌شداری له دوو چاوپیکهوتتی به‌کۆمهل بکهن. دواتریش ههوت مامۆستا ده‌ستنیشانکران بۆ چاوپیکهوتن و چاودیریکردنیان. ئەنجامه‌کانی ئەم لیکۆلینه‌وهیه ده‌ریده‌خهن که هه‌ندیک له مامۆستاکان پابه‌ندن به‌ بنه‌ماکانی 'گونجاندنی بنیادنهر' و هه‌ولده‌دن به‌ شیوه‌یه‌کی کاریگهر گونجان له نیوان پیکهاته سه‌ر مکیه‌کانی مه‌نه‌جی خویندن دروستبکهن. له لایه‌کی تریشه‌وه، ئەنجامه‌کان ئەوه‌ش ده‌ریده‌خهن که‌وا زۆریه‌ی مامۆستاکان سه‌رکه‌وتوو نه‌بوون له جیه‌جیه‌کردنی بنه‌ماکانی گونجاندنی بنیادنهر. له ژێر رۆشنایی ئەم ئەنجامانه، ئەم توێژینه‌وهیه چه‌ند پێشنیازیکی ده‌خاته پێش کاربه‌ده‌ستان و بریار به‌ده‌ستانی بواری په‌روه‌ده‌یی. یه‌کێک له‌و پێشنیازانه‌وه‌یه، که زیاتر گرنگی به‌ بنه‌ماکانی گونجاندنی بنیادنهر بدریت له نیوان مامۆستاکان و ئەو به‌ر به‌ستانه‌ی، که رێگرن له به‌رده‌م گونجاندنی بنیادنهر به‌ جوانی ده‌ستنیشانبکهرین و رێگه‌ چاره‌سه‌ری گونجاویان بۆ پێشنیازبکهریت.

### مُلخَص

یعدّ التوافق البناء من الطرق التربوية التي تدعو إلى التوافق والانسجام التام و البناء بين المكونات الرئيسية للمناهج الدراسية والتي تتضمن كل من طرق التدريس والتعليم، أدوات التقييم، والنتائج التعليمية وذلك من أجل الحصول الأميز على النتائج التعليمية المرجوة، يحاول البحث دراسة حالة (التوافق البناء) لإحدى المناهج الدراسية لمتعلمي اللغة الانجليزية كلغة أجنبية في جامعة سوران. وقد تم استخدام التصميم البحثي المختلط وذلك من أجل جمع وتحليل البيانات من مصادر مختلفة، وتضمنت أدوات البحث كل من الاستبان، مجموعات التركيز، مقابلات، ومراقبة المعلمين، وفي البدايه قد تم توزيع الاستبان على ١٢٠ طالباً من طلاب اللغة الانجليزية، وقد وافق ١٤ طالبا -ضمن هذا العدد- على أن يشاركو بشكل طوعي في مجموعات التركيز، وأما بالنسبة لمقابلة المعلمين ومراقبتهم، فقد وافق سبعة من المعلمين للمشاركة فيهما وذلك بشكل طوعي أيضاً. وقد أظهرت نتائج هذه الدراسة البحثية التجريبية بأن بعض المعلمين يلتزمون بمبادئ التوافق البناء ويحاولون جاهداً التوافق بين المكونات الأساسية للمناهج الدراسية، ومن جهة أخرى، أظهرت النتائج أيضاً بأن معظم المعلمين لم يكونوا موفقين في ترجمة المبادئ الأساسية إلى ممارسة فعلية داخل الفصول الدراسية. وعلى هذا الأساس، يوصي البحث جميع الأطراف المعنية بأخذ مبادئ منهج التوافق البناء محمل الجد، وتحديد العوائق التي تحول دون الملائمة البناءة بين المكونات الرئيسية للمنهج الدراسي وبالتالي تقديم الحلول المناسبة للتعامل مع التحديات.