Pedagogical Frameworks and Industry Alignment in Polygraphy Education

Jose Rene A. Cepe
College of Criminal Justice Education, Negros Oriental State University, Dumaguete City 6200, Philippines
Corresponding email: jracepe@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research investigates how polygraphy is taught within the criminology program at Negros Oriental State University (NOrSU) in Dumaguete City, Philippines, emphasizing its practical applicability to the profession. Because polygraph training requires strict adherence to technical procedures, educational methods must ensure clear, step-by-step skill acquisition that mirrors real-world standards. Through a qualitative descriptive approach, the researchers conducted semi-structured interviews with students, faculty, and field professionals. A thematic analysis of the responses revealed that programmed instruction significantly enhanced the learning experience. Participants noted that this method offered clear guidance, logical sequencing, and interactive elements, making difficult technical concepts more accessible. The use of targeted modules, continuous assessments, and built-in feedback loops allowed for autonomous but supervised study. Furthermore, the curriculum accurately represented authentic polygraph operations, ethical considerations, and professional protocols, successfully bridging the gap between classroom theory and professional practice. Ultimately, programmed instruction proved to be an effective educational tool that balances academic rigor with vocational readiness. While limited by its single-site scope, reliance on self-reported data, and small sample size, the study highlights the need for future cross-institutional and objective assessments to validate these instructional outcomes.
Keywords: Instructional Delivery; Programmed Instruction; Polygraphy; Industry Relevance; Criminology Education; Philippine Higher Education

Introduction

Criminology education, particularly in specialized disciplines like polygraphy, requires integrating theoretical foundations with strict procedural and ethical standards (Mapangdol, 2025; Fasco et al., 2024). Conventional lecture-based teaching often struggles to address the cognitive and technical demands of these courses, risking the production of graduates who lack essential practical competencies. To bridge this academic-practice gap, structured pedagogical models are critical. Programmed instruction provides a highly sequenced learning environment characterized by incremental progression, immediate feedback, and self-paced modular delivery (Molenda, 2008; Zendler & Reile, 2018; Dalimunthe et al., 2024).

In the Philippine tertiary landscape, aligning academic instruction with industry expectations is a regulatory imperative. The Commission on Higher Education mandates competency-based frameworks to ensure graduates are professionally ready (Morong & Achas, 2025). Yet, systemic challenges like diverse student preparedness and uneven access to instructional resources persist (Mulaudzi, 2023; Taga, 2025). Programmed instruction directly mitigates these issues by standardizing content delivery and reducing over-reliance on traditional, instructor-dependent lectures (Sadykov et al., 2023; Belmes et al., 2025).

Furthermore, effective instructional delivery—specifically how content is paced, sequenced, and organized—profoundly impacts student engagement and knowledge retention (Sangsawang, 2015; Huang

et al., 2025). In polygraphy, where procedural errors carry severe ethical and legal consequences, breaking complex physiological and operational processes into manageable segments builds necessary learner mastery (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Salo et al., 2024). When academic frameworks authentically mirror professional protocols, students transition more seamlessly into the workforce (Mebert et al., 2020; Akash & Suganya, 2024).

Despite its proven pedagogical utility, empirical research examining programmed instruction within forensic and polygraphy training remains scarce. Consequently, this study investigates how programmed instruction enhances instructional delivery and aligns with industry standards in polygraphy education, offering a structured solution that satisfies both academic rigor and contemporary professional demands.

Methods

Research Design

This study utilized a qualitative descriptive design guided by reflexive thematic analysis to investigate the instructional delivery and industry relevance of programmed instruction in polygraphy. A descriptive approach was chosen because it allows for the examination of authentic, context-bound experiences without experimental manipulation. This design effectively captures the nuanced, experiential realities of teaching and learning technical subjects—specifically regarding instructional clarity, sequencing, and professional alignment—giving voice to stakeholders in a way that quantitative metrics cannot adequately portray.

Research Objectives

This study was guided by the following research objectives and questions, which directed the selection of participants, the development of research instruments, and the analysis of data.

- Research Objectives:

1. To examine how programmed instruction in polygraphy is delivered in criminology education in terms of instructional clarity, organization, sequencing, and learner engagement.
2. To explore how programmed instruction in polygraphy aligns with professional standards, procedural practices, and ethical expectations in criminology practice.

- Research Questions:

a) How do students, instructors, and industry resource persons describe the instructional delivery of programmed instruction in polygraphy in terms of clarity, sequencing, organization, and engagement?
b) How do instructors and industry resource persons perceive the alignment of programmed instruction in polygraphy with professional procedures, standards, and ethical practice?

Research Locale

The research was conducted at Negros Oriental State University (NorSU) in Dumaguete City, a public institution offering a Bachelor of Science in Criminology. NorSU was strategically selected because its curriculum explicitly employs programmed instruction for polygraphy. Operating under Commission on Higher Education (CHED) frameworks, the university provides an ideal environment to study instructional consistency, boasting faculty with professional backgrounds and strong linkages to industry practitioners.

Participants

A purposive sampling technique was employed to select sixteen (16) participants representing three distinct stakeholder groups: ten criminology students, three instructors, and three industry practitioners. Inclusion required direct exposure to polygraphy education or professional practice. This sample size prioritized deep, experiential insights over statistical representativeness, with data collection concluding once thematic saturation was achieved across the participant groups.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews and open-ended questionnaires, offering both consistency and the flexibility to probe deeper. The instruments assessed two primary constructs: instructional delivery (e.g., clarity, sequencing, engagement) and industry relevance (e.g., ethical and procedural alignment). Tools were adapted from validated instructional evaluation frameworks and subjected to expert review for content validity. Methodological credibility was further reinforced through data triangulation across the three participant groups.

Data Gathering Procedure

Following institutional approval and the acquisition of written informed consent, data were collected primarily via one-on-one, audio-recorded interviews lasting 30 to 60 minutes. Open-ended questionnaires were utilized when face-to-face scheduling conflicts arose. Interviews were conducted in English or Filipino to maximize participant comfort, and recordings were transcribed verbatim. While time constraints precluded participant transcript review, immediate follow-up questions were utilized during sessions to confirm meaning and intent. The researcher maintained strict neutrality throughout the process.

Data Analysis

Reflexive thematic analysis was employed to iteratively identify patterns and meanings within the qualitative data. The researcher manually conducted familiarization, open coding, and theme development, continuously comparing responses to capture both shared and unique perspectives. To ensure analytical rigor and credibility, the process incorporated peer debriefing and the maintenance of a detailed audit trail and reflexive journal.

Findings and Discussion

Clarity and Comprehensibility

"The vocabulary utilized in the modules is straightforward and highly accessible."

"The assigned educational tasks are transparent and accompanied by thorough instructions."

"This represented the students' initial experience with this specific format of programmed curriculum."

Instructional clarity was identified as a foundational characteristic of the programmed polygraphy modules. Across all participant demographics, the coursework was consistently described as highly accessible. Students frequently pointed to the straightforward vocabulary and transparent descriptions as pivotal to their academic success. Because the explanations were sufficiently robust, the majority of students found they could navigate the coursework with very little instructor intervention. Faculty members corroborated this, noting that the structured, direct nature of the modules significantly mitigated student confusion. Industry professionals further stressed that such lucidity is critical in polygraph training, a field where operational mistakes carry severe real-world repercussions. Ultimately, respondents linked this clarity to easier information processing, less apprehension during initial exposure to complex topics, and a boost in learner self-assurance.

These results imply that in programmed instruction, clarity is not just a stylistic formatting choice but a vital pedagogical tool that drives how learners interact with intricate material. In a specialized field

like polygraphy—which demands the mastery of physiological functions, technical jargon, and procedural reasoning—ambiguous teaching can lead to superficial and fragmented knowledge. The participants' preference for explicit, simple instruction reinforces the idea that clear design is foundational. This perspective is supported by Garay Abad and Hattie (2025), who maintain that presentation clarity heavily impacts both student understanding and overall instructional success. By preemptively addressing potential areas of confusion, well-structured materials encourage deeper intellectual engagement.

The finding that students could progress independently aligns with Montejo's (2023) assertion that strong instructional delivery embeds necessary scaffolding directly into the text. Instead of relying on a teacher's constant presence, the modules themselves provide the necessary framework for autonomous learning. This built-in clarity also shaped the students' first impressions; they reported feeling unintimidated by the technical content. This echoes the programmed instruction philosophy of McDowell (2025), which advocates for the gradual rollout and reinforcement of concepts so that learners feel the material is conquerable from the start, thereby fostering persistence.

Additionally, clear instruction optimizes cognitive efficiency. As Sozio et al. (2024) argue, a lucid presentation minimizes extraneous cognitive load, freeing up mental bandwidth for genuine comprehension rather than wasting it on deciphering poor instructions. In a demanding discipline like polygraphy, mitigating this cognitive burden is essential. Finally, as Mensah et al. (2025) suggest, explicit guidance acts as a silent partner, steering learners through difficult content. In this study, clarity served as the bedrock that allowed other instructional features—like sequencing and mastery checks—to operate successfully. While these observations are localized to one criminology program, they indicate that programmed clarity is a strong catalyst for comprehension and confidence in specialized vocational education.

Systematic Sequencing and Learning Progression

"The educational modules follow a logical and systematic order."

"The progression of the material is intuitive enough that students can navigate it independently, requiring minimal faculty intervention."

"Every assignment functions effectively as a distinct, self-contained educational component."

The deliberate arrangement of the lessons demonstrated a calculated effort to steer students through a logical educational journey. Respondents continuously noted that the curriculum was appropriately ordered, with concepts introduced sequentially rather than as disconnected fragments. This meticulous structure is vital in polygraphy, where a firm grasp of foundational theories must precede the application and interpretation of data. The feedback indicates that the instructional delivery actively scaffolded the students' cognitive progression from elementary ideas to sophisticated analytical skills.

In technical disciplines, mastering the basics is a prerequisite for procedural application. The participants' descriptions of a curriculum that smoothly transitions from physiological foundations to complex interpretative duties illustrate an intentional scaffolding process. The fact that students could advance with limited assistance proves that the lesson sequence itself acted as an embedded guide. This aligns with the theory that well-designed learning progressions make the educational logic transparent, thereby reducing the need for constant teacher intervention (Duschl et al., 2011). In polygraphy, where rigorous reasoning and precise execution are mandatory, this built-in guidance prevents students from tackling advanced interpretation before they have solidified their foundational knowledge.

Educators implied that this structured flow also alleviated their teaching burdens. This relates to the findings of Castro et al. (2024), who noted that instructors teaching outside their primary expertise face significant hurdles in material preparation and delivery, often leading to mismatched teaching methods. The current study suggests that meticulously sequenced programmed materials can offset these difficulties by providing a standardized, unambiguous instructional pathway. While teacher expertise remains important, structured sequencing introduces pedagogical consistency into highly technical subjects.

Beyond sheer clarity, users emphasized the continuity between modules. Many observed that new lessons organically expanded upon preceding ones, solidifying prior concepts before introducing novel information. This cumulative design embodies the educational principle that learning is most robust when new data is anchored to pre-existing knowledge (Rea et al., 2022). Rather than viewing the modules as disjointed tasks, students experienced them as a unified progression—a crucial pedagogical benefit in a profession where disjointed knowledge can trigger ethical or procedural failures.

Crucially, this sequencing facilitated a mastery-based learning model. The ability to treat each task as an independent unit meant that advancement was dictated by genuine comprehension rather than mere task completion. This mirrors the mastery principles inherent in programmed instruction, where a student must secure one concept before advancing to the next, prioritizing depth over speed (Darling-Hammond et al., 2024; Bobis et al., 2021). While the single-site nature of this study means these insights are context-bound, they clearly show how the theoretical benefits of programmed instruction actually operate within polygraphy training. The structured progression proved essential for cultivating both clarity and vocational readiness.

Organization and Coherence Learning Tasks

"The educational materials directly correspond to specific phases of the module."

"The resources are structured flexibly, allowing learners to initiate assignments at their own optimal pace."

"Individual activities can be absorbed as isolated, standalone segments."

Participants consistently highlighted the tight correlation between the learning materials and the specific lesson stages, noting a pervasive sense of module coherence. This tight alignment implies highly intentional instructional design, where every assignment is engineered to fulfill a distinct educational objective. Tasks were never perceived as arbitrary; they were integral to the broader lesson framework. This level of coherence is what Garba and Abdulhamid (2024) identify as a hallmark of proficient instructional delivery. Furthermore, Lestari and Yusuf (2025) note that when objectives and activities are perfectly aligned, conceptual fragmentation drops and learning outcomes improve. The current findings support this, as learners recognized the specific purpose behind every embedded task.

Respondents also explained that breaking the curriculum into focused, segmented units alleviated feelings of cognitive overload. Instead of wrestling with massive blocks of dense text, students tackled targeted tasks aimed at specific competencies. This mirrors the arguments of Liu (2024), who posits that segmenting information into digestible pieces enhances cognitive processing and reflective study. In polygraphy—a field requiring meticulous analytical precision—this organized segmentation reduces mental strain and fosters systematic reasoning.

Alongside this coherence, participants valued the framework's flexibility. The setup allowed students to tackle tasks when they felt mentally prepared, striking a balance between structured order and self-pacing. Hendrickx et al. (2023) propose that this structured autonomy—where students navigate freely within defined boundaries—boosts learner ownership. The findings here suggest that the module's organization provided a predictable, supportive pathway without feeling overly rigid, allowing students to self-regulate their learning effectively. Both faculty and students agreed that this organizational coherence drove purposeful progression, ensuring resources consistently reinforced the overarching educational goals (Hu et al., 2025). While broader generalizations require further empirical exploration, these findings suggest that coherent task organization within programmed instruction supports clarity and autonomy in technically demanding subjects (Vaghela & Parsana, 2024).

Engagement, Interaction, and Support

"The format serves as a highly engaging and stimulating educational tool."

"The integrated inquiries are carefully and precisely formulated."

"The embedded answer keys are essential instruments for students to assess their own proficiency."

"The provided timeframes are entirely adequate for completing the assignments."

The programmed materials were repeatedly described as fostering a highly interactive and engaging learning atmosphere. Participants found the curriculum motivating, drawn in by the interactive elements interwoven throughout the text. This engagement was rooted in meaningful cognitive interaction rather than superficial entertainment. The structured inquiries were cited as primary tools for prompting deep reflection. Instead of asking for simple rote memorization, the questions forced students to synthesize the information and apply it to polygraphy scenarios. This type of active cognitive processing is vital for analytical disciplines (Sulaiman & Abdulla, 2024; Ajogbeje, 2023). Educational tasks must push learners to apply knowledge practically (Fisher et al., 2025). The questioning strategies utilized in these modules successfully replicated the analytical demands of actual polygraph examinations.

The embedded feedback mechanisms were equally vital. Participants pointed to the answer keys and correction guides as crucial self-assessment tools that had to be mastered before advancing. This systematic feedback allowed students to independently validate their knowledge, reinforcing correct concepts and immediately neutralizing misunderstandings. The academic literature heavily emphasizes the power of timely feedback in solidifying learning (Ajogbeje, 2023; Fisher et al., 2025). In this context, the feedback acted as a surrogate dialogue between the text and the student, sustaining comprehension even in the absence of a live instructor.

Appropriate time allocation further supported this engagement. The adequate timeframes allowed for deliberate, reflective engagement rather than rushed guesswork. Shirk (2020) notes that self-paced environments foster deeper understanding when students are afforded the time to practice and reflect. In this curriculum, the combination of reasonable pacing, reflective questioning, and immediate feedback cultivated a mastery-oriented ecosystem. By demanding active participation and self-correction, the instructional design successfully built the procedural confidence and analytical judgment required for polygraphy.

Industry Alignment and Professional Relevance

"The curriculum transcends mere theory by mapping out the sequential steps of a real-life polygraph test, underscoring the operational significance of every phase for the learner."

"Navigating the exercises fosters caution and accountability in students, as the curriculum actively embeds ethical principles directly into the operational steps."

The alignment with real-world industry standards was a dominant theme, particularly championed by the faculty and industry practitioners who understand the realities of polygraph work. These respondents stressed that the modules accurately mirror the ethical safeguards, procedural steps, and professional rigor of genuine polygraph exams. This was apparent in the curriculum's emphasis on meticulous documentation, systematic procedures, and constant ethical reminders.

The materials actively reinforced professional accountability by embedding mastery checks and decision-making scenarios that replicate real-world pressures. These elements ensured students didn't just memorize steps, but actually internalized professional judgment. This shows that ethics were not treated as an isolated or abstract chapter, but as a continuous thread woven into the procedural training. The mastery checks simulated the professional expectation that examiners must strictly adhere to both ethical and operational standards. Consequently, the programmed instruction served as a direct bridge to the workforce, injecting industry logic directly into the academic setting.

Broadly, these findings demonstrate that effective instructional delivery must include professional contextualization. By modeling step-by-step procedures and demanding rigorous documentation, the modules prepared students for professional discipline. The integration of structure, engaging tasks, and industry-validated content ensures that classroom learning translates directly into vocational readiness. Ultimately, successful instructional delivery in this technical field relies on the seamless fusion of pedagogical clarity with strict professional alignment.

Conclusion

This qualitative study demonstrates that programmed instruction provides a highly structured, effective framework for teaching polygraphy within criminology programs. By utilizing clear language, logical sequencing, and embedded feedback, the modules enable students to master complex technical concepts independently while reducing the need for constant instructor supervision. Furthermore, the curriculum strongly aligns with industry standards by integrating real-world procedures, ethical safeguards, and professional accountability directly into the learning process, effectively bridging the gap between academic theory and vocational practice.

To maximize these benefits, institutions should continuously refine instructional materials, train faculty in facilitative teaching, and maintain active industry partnerships. However, these findings are limited by a single-site design and reliance on subjective participant perceptions. Future research should prioritize multi-institutional comparisons and objective performance metrics to fully validate the long-term educational and professional impacts of programmed instruction in specialized criminology education.

Acknowledgements

The author affirms that this study was independently carried out and reflects personal academic effort and critical analysis. All concepts, interpretations, and discussions presented in this paper were carefully developed by the author throughout the research process. Any use of artificial intelligence tools was strictly limited to minor language refinement, such as improving grammar and clarity of expression. These tools were not involved in developing the research ideas, conducting the analysis, interpreting the findings, or composing the substantive sections of the manuscript. The author fully assumes responsibility for the authenticity, accuracy, and originality of the entire work, including its analyses, interpretations, and conclusions.

References

Abuhassna, H., & Alnawajha, S. (2023). Instructional design made easy! Instructional design models, categories, frameworks, educational context, and recommendations for future work. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education, 13*, 715–735. https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe13040054

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

Akash, R., & Suganya, V. (2024). Bridging the gap between industry needs and student skills for quality education through SDGs: An industry-academia collaboration in curriculum development. *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review, 4*, e03616. https://doi.org/10.47172/2965-730X.SDGsReview.v4.n04.pe03616

Belmes, M. G. D., Abellana, A. L., & Orongan, R. C. (2025). Emotional well-being and organizational commitment of teachers instructional delivery. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9*, 3979–4032. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0285

Blyznyuk, T., & Kachak, T. (2024). Benefits of interactive learning for students' critical thinking skills improvement. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 11*, 94–102. https://doi.org/10.15330/jpnu.11.1.94-102

Bobis, J., Russo, J., Downton, A., et al. (2021). Instructional moves that increase chances of engaging all students in learning mathematics. *Mathematics, 9*, 582. https://doi.org/10.3390/math9060582

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., et al. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? *Journal of Research in Nursing, 25*, 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Castro, F. L. T., Ventura, B. L. O., Estajal, R. S., et al. (2024). Teachers handling multiple subject areas: Difficulties and adaptive attributes in the delivery of instructions. *Environment and Social Psychology, 9*, 2520. https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2520

C.T., A. M., & Ilankumaran, M. (2023). Programmed instruction is a system for sustainable development of language skills. *Migration Letters, 20*, 1643–1654. https://doi.org/10.59670/ml.v20iS9.6028

Dalimunthe, H., Dewi, I., Yunita, Y., et al. (2024). Building a supportive learning environment: The role of psychology in increasing student motivation and engagement. *OPSearch American Journal of Open Research, 3*, 934–939. https://doi.org/10.58811/opsearch.v3i4.107

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., et al. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*, 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Darling-Hammond, L., Schachner, A. C. W., Wojcikiewicz, S. K., et al. (2024). Educating teachers to enact the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 28*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2022.2130506

Duschl, R., Maeng, S., & Sezen, A. (2011). Learning progressions and teaching sequences: A review and analysis. *Studies in Science Education, 47*, 123–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2011.604476

Fasco, P., Asiimwe, S., Ssekabira, G., et al. (2024). Enhancing student engagement and learning outcomes: Effective strategies in institutional pedagogy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 5*, 758–767.

Fisher, D. P., Brotto, G., Lim, I., et al. (2025). The impact of timely formative feedback on university student motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 50*, 622–631. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2449891

Garay Abad, L., & Hattie, J. (2025). The evolving definition of quality: How teacher experience and subject domain shape perceptions of instructional materials. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, 1671376. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1671376

Garba, S., & Abdulhamid, L. (2024). Students' instructional delivery approach preference for sustainable learning amidst the emergence of hybrid teaching post-pandemic. *Sustainability, 16*, 7754. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16177754

Garil, B. A., Entong, M. B. M., Muarip, V. C., et al. (2024). Language delivery styles in academic trainings: Analysis of speaker's emotional connection to audience for lasting learning. *Forum for Linguistic Studies, 6*, 326–342. https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i3.6533

Goldman, S., & Pellegrino, J. (2015). Research on learning and instruction: Implications for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 2*, 33–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732215601866

Habiatan, E. (2019). Bachelor of Science in Criminology program: Extent of compliance on the policies and standards prescribed by the Commission on Higher Education. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences, 8*, 113–135.

Hendrickx, M., Schüler-Meyer, A., & Verhoosel, C. V. (2023). The intended and unintended impacts on student ownership when realising CBL in mechanical engineering. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 48*, 340–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2022.2101433

Hu, K., Tang, D., & He, H. (2025). The mediating role of learning engagement in the relationship between master's students' learning motivation and scientific research and innovation capability. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, 1604792. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1604792

Huang, Q., Muhamad, M. M., & Che Nawi, N. R. (2025). Impact of instructional design on students' critical thinking and engagement in online English reading classes: Mediating role of motivation and

moderating role of language proficiency. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, 1644126. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1644126

Inarda, A. (2023). Promoting outcomes-based instructional materials: Testing the effectiveness of print modules for business students. *European Journal of Educational Research, 12*, 1257–1268. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.12.3.1257

Kotsoglou, K. N., & Biedermann, A. (2024). Polygraph-based deception detection and machine learning: Combining the worst of both worlds? *Forensic Science International: Synergy, 9*, 100479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsisyn.2024.100479

Legarde, M. A. A., Mundo, M. D., Chavez, J. V., et al. (2025). Empowering learning engagement in higher education with active learning experiences in STEM classrooms. *Environment and Social Psychology, 10*, 3878. https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i9.3878

Lestari, S., & Yusuf, F. N. (2025). Aligning assessment practices with learning objectives: A case of EFL classes in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 10*, 145–163.

Liu, D. (2024). The effects of segmentation on cognitive load, vocabulary learning and retention, and reading comprehension in a multimedia learning environment. *BMC Psychology, 12*, 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-023-01489-5

Mahmudah, F., & Santosa, B. (2021). Vocational school alignment based-on industry needs. *Journal of Vocational Education Studies, 4*, 36. https://doi.org/10.12928/joves.v4i1.3611

Mapangdol, E. B.-o. (2025). Criminology internship program of Mountain Province State Polytechnic College. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 36*, 698–707. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2024.2329689

McDowell, J. (2025). From anxiety to agency: Enhancing student confidence and engagement with assessments via the SkillSense programme. *Cogent Education, 12*, 2554323. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2554323

McLeod, S. (2024). *Reflexivity in qualitative research*. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27391.73121

Mebert, L., Barnes, R., Dalley, J., et al. (2020). Fostering student engagement through a real-world, collaborative project across disciplines and institutions. *Higher Education Pedagogies, 5*, 30–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2020.1750306

Meng, S. (2023). Enhancing teaching and learning: Aligning instructional practices with education quality standards. *Research Advances in Education, 2*, 17–31. https://doi.org/10.56397/RAE.2023.07.04

Mensah, E. K., Saayir, P. T., & Kwao Tettey, R. (2025). The nexus between instructional effectiveness of teachers and students' academic performance: A survey on senior high school accounting teachers. *Cogent Education, 12*, 2476287. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2476287

Molenda, M. (2008). The programmed instruction era: When effectiveness mattered. *TechTrends, 52*, 52–58. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-008-0136-y

Montejo, H. B. (2023). Research findings: Dynamics for effective instructional delivery. *Industry and Academic Research Review, 4*, 235–240.

Morong, A. E., Jr., & Achas, H. S. P. (2025). Compliance among higher educational institutions offering Bachelor of Science in Criminology programs in Region 10: A case study. *Mediterranean Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 9*, 62–74. https://doi.org/10.46382/MJBAS.2025.9308

Mulaudzi, I. (2023). Factors affecting students' academic performance: A case study of the university context. *Journal of Social Science and Policy Implications, 11*, 18–26.

Oblianda, J., & Nestor, C. N. (2024). Mapping of course outcomes: Basis for an enhanced criminology educational plan. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Review, 7*, 84–106. https://doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v7i12.2414

Öncü, S., & Bichelmeyer, B. (2021). Instructional practices affecting learner engagement in blended learning environments. *Participatory Educational Research, 8*, 210–226. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.21.62.8.3

Rad, D., Paraschiv, N., Kiss, C., et al. (2024). Physiological reactions profiling in polygraph testing: Insights from fuzzy C-means clustering analysis. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica, 21*, 365–377. https://doi.org/10.12700/APH.21.10.2024.10.23

Rea, S. D., Wang, L., Muenks, K., et al. (2022). Students can (mostly) recognize effective learning, so why do they not do it? *Journal of Intelligence, 10*, 127. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence10040127

Reyes, J., Silorio, J., Lazaga, M., et al. (2025). Awareness of DOrSU Cateel campus criminology students on the implementation of RA 11131. *Davao Research Journal, 16*, 76–83. https://doi.org/10.59120/drj.v16i3.446

Rogers, M. (2021). Teaching-to-learn: Its effects on conceptual knowledge learning in university students. *International Journal of Innovative Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 2*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJITLHE.289863

Ruslin, R., Mashuri, S., Sarib, M., et al. (2022). Semi-structured interview: A methodological reflection on the development of a qualitative research instrument in educational studies. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education, 12*, 22–29.

Sadykov, T., Kokibasova, G., Minayeva, Y., et al. (2023). A systematic review of programmed learning approach in science education. *Cogent Education, 10*, 2189889. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2189889

Salo, P., Francisco, S., & Olin Almqvist, A. (2024). Understanding professional learning in and for practice. *Professional Development in Education, 50*, 444–459. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2311108

Sangsawang, T. (2015). Instructional design framework for educational media. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 176*, 65–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.445

Seno, I. M., & Paglinawan, J. (2024). Institutional support and content relevance on instructional quality of basic education teachers. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development, 9*, 974–980.

Shinija, N. A. (2024). *Descriptive research design*. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19205.36325

Shirk, J. (2020). Designing a self-paced learning experience to support learner self-regulation. *Journal of Teaching and Learning with Technology, 9*, 29527. https://doi.org/10.14434/jotlt.v9i1.29527

Sozio, G., Agostinho, S., Tindall-Ford, S., et al. (2024). Enhancing teaching strategies through cognitive load theory: Process vs. product worked examples. *Education Sciences, 14*, 813. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14080813

Sulaiman, A. H., & Abdulla, S. (2024). The use of active learning strategies to foster effective teaching in higher education institutions. *Zanco Journal of Humanity Sciences, 28*, 140–157.

Taga, J. R. (2025). Differentiated instruction in tertiary classrooms: A systematic review of evidence from global and Philippine contexts. *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research, 9*, 60–69.

Thake, A. M. (2025). Curriculum design and professional alignment in public policy graduate programs: A case study of post-experience professionals. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2025.2484095

Vaghela, V., & Parsana, D. (2024). Teaching and learning: Fostering student engagement, critical thinking, and lifelong learning skills. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30*, 66–73. https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i6(S).5324

Wordu, H., Akor, V., & Ojorka, V. (2018). Instructional delivery models and academic performance of agricultural science students in senior secondary schools in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Evaluation, 4*, 72–82.

Zendler, A., & Reile, S. (2018). The effect of reciprical teaching and programmed instruction on learning outcome in computer science education. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 58*, 132–144.