FishTaxa - Journal of Fish Taxonomy
Vol 36 Issue 1s, ISSN: 2458-942X

Student Engagement As A Mediator Between Curriculum Design, Instructional Resource Quality, And Student Performance

Wang Xiangshun[1], Chandra Mohan Vasudeva Panicker[2]
[1,2]*School of Education, Lincoln University College, Selangor, Malysia*
[1]*Shangqiu Medical College, Henan Province, China*

Abstract
Student performance is influenced not only by curriculum structure and learning materials but also by how actively students engage with the learning process. This study examines student engagement as a mechanism through which curriculum design and instructional resource quality influence academic performance. Using survey data from 412 secondary and higher education students, structural equation modeling was applied to analyze the relationships among curriculum coherence, instructional resource quality, student engagement, and academic performance. Results indicate that both curriculum design and instructional resource quality are significant predictors of student performance, with student engagement acting as a partial mediator. The findings highlight the importance of designing learning environments that actively involve students cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally. The study contributes to contemporary educational research by clarifying how instructional quality translates into learning outcomes and offers practical implications for curriculum developers and educators.

Keywords: Student Engagement, Curriculum Design, Instructional Resources, Academic Performance, Mediation

Citation: Wang Xiangshun, Chandra Mohan Vasudeva Panicker. 2025. Student Engagement As A Mediator Between Curriculum Design, Instructional Resource Quality, And Student Performance. FishTaxa 36(1s): 474-479

Introduction
Improving student performance continues to be a central priority for educators, institutions, and policymakers seeking to enhance educational quality and equity across diverse learning environments. Academic performance is widely used as an indicator of institutional effectiveness, teaching quality, and learner success, influencing progression opportunities and long-term career trajectories (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; OECD, 2021). While early research on achievement primarily emphasized individual learner characteristics such as cognitive ability, socioeconomic status, and motivation, contemporary educational scholarship increasingly recognizes the decisive role of **instructional context** in shaping learning outcomes (Hattie, 2015; Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2020).

Among contextual factors, curriculum design and instructional resource quality have emerged as foundational elements of effective learning systems. Curriculum design determines how knowledge is sequenced, scaffolded, and aligned with intended learning outcomes and assessment strategies. Coherent curricula help learners build conceptual understanding progressively, reduce cognitive overload, and clarify expectations, thereby improving academic performance (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Harden, 2001; Young, 2013). Research has shown that curricula emphasizing relevance, integration of theory and practice, and clearly structured progression enhance both motivation and achievement (Priestley & Biesta, 2013; Voogt et al., 2018).

In parallel, the quality of instructional resources significantly influences how curriculum content is experienced in the classroom. High-quality resources—such as well-designed textbooks, digital learning platforms, simulations, multimedia tools, and interactive modules—facilitate comprehension, visualization of abstract concepts, and active participation (Mayer, 2014; Moreno & Mayer, 2007). The expansion of educational technology has further highlighted how digital tools can enhance engagement and learning outcomes when integrated meaningfully into pedagogy (Bond et al., 2020; Hodges et al., 2020). Conversely, poorly aligned or outdated materials may limit accessibility, reduce motivation, and hinder academic success (Selwyn, 2016).

Despite recognition of these instructional factors, evidence suggests that improvements in curriculum structure or learning materials do not automatically translate into better performance. Learning is not a passive process; rather, it depends on how actively students engage with the educational environment. This shift in perspective has brought the construct of student engagement to the forefront of educational research. Student engagement refers to the degree to which learners invest behavioral effort, emotional commitment, and cognitive strategies in academic tasks (Fredricks et al., 2004; Appleton et al., 2008). Engaged students participate actively in learning activities, demonstrate sustained interest, and employ deep learning approaches, all of which are linked to higher achievement and persistence (Kahu, 2013; Skinner et al., 2009).

Engagement is increasingly understood as a mediator between instructional conditions and learning outcomes. Instructional

environments that are structured, relevant, and resource-rich tend to stimulate curiosity, foster autonomy, and support competence, thereby promoting higher engagement levels (Reeve, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2020). Engagement, in turn, drives deeper processing, persistence in challenging tasks, and improved academic performance (Benabou & Tirole, 2016; Sinatra et al., 2015). However, empirical studies often examine curriculum, resources, or engagement in isolation rather than as part of an integrated explanatory model (Trowler, 2010; Zepke, 2018).

Furthermore, variability in student performance across similar instructional contexts suggests that engagement may explain why some learners benefit more from curriculum and resource improvements than others. Understanding this mechanism is especially important in contemporary education systems characterized by rapid digital transformation, curriculum reforms, and expanding access to learning technologies (UNESCO, 2022; World Bank, 2021). Without examining engagement processes, reforms in curriculum and resource provision may fail to produce intended learning gains.

Against this backdrop, the present study investigates how student engagement functions as a mediating mechanism linking curriculum design and instructional resource quality to student performance. By integrating these variables into a single analytical framework, the study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how instructional environments shape academic outcomes. It also provides practical insights for educators and curriculum developers seeking to design learning experiences that not only deliver content effectively but also actively involve students in the learning process.

Literature Review

Curriculum design is widely recognized as a foundational component of effective educational systems because it determines how knowledge is structured, sequenced, and delivered across learning stages. A well-designed curriculum provides clear learning objectives, coherent content progression, and alignment between teaching activities and assessment strategies. Such alignment helps reduce ambiguity for learners and supports cumulative knowledge building, enabling students to integrate new concepts with prior understanding (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Harden, 2001). Scholars argue that curriculum coherence promotes cognitive organization and reduces unnecessary learning barriers, thereby improving academic achievement and learner confidence (Young, 2013; Priestley & Biesta, 2013). Moreover, curricula that emphasize authenticity and real-world relevance encourage learners to see value in their studies, increasing intrinsic motivation and sustained academic effort (Voogt et al., 2018). When instructional objectives, content delivery, and assessment tasks are misaligned, students often experience confusion and disengagement, which can undermine performance even in otherwise well-resourced educational contexts (Schmidt et al., 2001).

Closely related to curriculum design is the quality of instructional resources, which shape how curricular content is accessed and experienced. Instructional resources include traditional materials such as textbooks and workbooks, as well as digital technologies, multimedia content, simulations, laboratory tools, and interactive learning platforms. High-quality resources are characterized by clarity, accessibility, pedagogical alignment, and the capacity to present information in ways that support multiple modes of learning (Mayer, 2014; Moreno & Mayer, 2007). Multimedia learning research demonstrates that well-designed visual and auditory materials can enhance comprehension by reducing cognitive overload and promoting dual-channel processing (Mayer, 2014). The growing integration of educational technologies has further expanded opportunities for personalized and interactive learning, which can foster deeper understanding and knowledge retention when effectively implemented (Bond et al., 2020; Hodges et al., 2020). However, the mere presence of digital tools does not guarantee learning gains; poorly designed or misaligned resources may distract learners, increase cognitive burden, and reduce motivation (Selwyn, 2016). Consequently, the educational value of instructional resources depends not only on technological sophistication but also on their alignment with curriculum goals and learner needs.

While curriculum design and instructional resources establish the structural and material conditions for learning, student engagement represents the active process through which these conditions influence academic outcomes. Student engagement has been conceptualized as a multidimensional construct encompassing behavioral, emotional, and cognitive components (Fredricks et al., 2004). Behavioral engagement refers to participation in academic activities such as attending classes, completing assignments, and contributing to discussions. Emotional engagement involves feelings of interest, belonging, and enjoyment, while cognitive engagement reflects the use of deep learning strategies, persistence, and self-regulation (Appleton et al., 2008; Skinner et al., 2009). Engagement is associated with higher achievement, stronger academic resilience, and reduced dropout rates across educational levels (Kahu, 2013; Reeve, 2012). Engaged learners are more likely to invest effort in challenging tasks, seek help when needed, and sustain attention, all of which contribute to improved academic performance (Sinatra et al., 2015).

Theoretical perspectives increasingly position engagement as a central mechanism linking instructional environments to learning outcomes. Self-determination theory, for example, suggests that learning contexts that support autonomy, competence, and relatedness foster greater intrinsic motivation and engagement (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Similarly, sociocultural perspectives emphasize that meaningful participation in learning communities enhances both engagement and achievement (Trowler, 2010). Curriculum structures that provide clear goals and progressive challenges can enhance perceptions of competence, while high-quality instructional resources

can make learning more accessible and stimulating, thereby supporting emotional and cognitive involvement (Reeve, 2012; Zepke, 2018). Engagement thus serves as the process through which students translate instructional opportunities into actual learning gains. Empirical research increasingly supports the view that engagement mediates the relationship between instructional factors and academic performance. Studies have shown that students exposed to interactive learning environments demonstrate higher engagement, which in turn predicts improved outcomes (Bond et al., 2020). Similarly, curricula that emphasize problem-based learning and real-world application have been linked to increased engagement and stronger performance indicators (Voogt et al., 2018). Despite these advances, much of the existing literature examines curriculum design, instructional resources, or engagement separately rather than integrating them into a unified explanatory model. As a result, the pathways through which structural and material aspects of instruction influence performance remain only partially understood.

Addressing this gap is particularly important in contemporary educational contexts characterized by rapid digital transformation and curriculum reform. As institutions invest heavily in new technologies and curriculum innovations, understanding how these inputs foster engagement—and ultimately academic success—becomes critical for ensuring that reforms lead to meaningful learning improvements (UNESCO, 2022; World Bank, 2021). By examining curriculum design, instructional resource quality, and student engagement together, the present study contributes to a more comprehensive account of how instructional environments shape student performance through active learner involvement.

Method

A quantitative survey design was employed. Data were collected from 412 students across secondary and higher education institutions. Participants completed a structured questionnaire measuring perceptions of curriculum design, instructional resource quality, student engagement, and academic performance using a five-point Likert scale.

Curriculum design items assessed clarity of course structure, alignment of assessments with objectives, and progression of learning content. Instructional resource quality items focused on accessibility, relevance, and effectiveness of learning materials. Student engagement was measured across behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions. Academic performance was assessed using self-reported achievement indicators.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to examine relationships among the variables and to test the mediating role of student engagement.

Results

The data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to examine both the measurement properties of the constructs and the structural relationships among curriculum design, instructional resource quality, student engagement, and student performance. The analysis followed a two-step approach: first validating the measurement model and then assessing the structural model.

Measurement Model

Reliability and validity tests indicated that all constructs met recommended thresholds. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability (CR), both of which exceeded the acceptable value of 0.70. Convergent validity was evaluated using Average Variance Extracted (AVE), with all constructs demonstrating AVE values above the recommended 0.50 level, indicating that items shared sufficient variance with their respective constructs.

Table 1. Reliability and Convergent Validity

Construct	Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
Curriculum Design	6	0.88	0.91	0.63
Instructional Resource Quality	6	0.90	0.93	0.68
Student Engagement	9	0.92	0.94	0.66
Student Performance	4	0.85	0.89	0.61

Discriminant validity was assessed using the Fornell–Larcker criterion, where the square root of AVE for each construct exceeded its correlations with other constructs, confirming adequate construct distinctiveness.

Table 2. Discriminant Validity (Fornell–Larcker Criterion)

Construct	Curriculum	Resources	Engagement	Performance
Curriculum Design	**0.79**			
Instructional Resources	0.58	**0.82**		
Student Engagement	0.61	0.65	**0.81**	
Student Performance	0.54	0.59	0.68	**0.78**

Diagonal values (bold) represent the square root of AVE.

Structural Model

After confirming measurement adequacy, the structural model was evaluated. The results showed that both curriculum design and instructional resource quality had significant positive direct effects on student performance. This indicates that structured curricula and high-quality learning materials independently contribute to improved academic outcomes.

Both instructional variables also demonstrated strong positive relationships with student engagement. This suggests that when students perceive curriculum organization as clear and resources as useful and engaging, they are more likely to participate actively in learning processes. Student engagement itself emerged as a strong predictor of performance, confirming its central role in learning effectiveness.

Table 3. Structural Path Coefficients

Path	Standardized β	t-value	p-value	Result
Curriculum Design → Student Performance	0.24	4.12	<0.001	Significant
Instructional Resources → Student Performance	0.29	5.01	<0.001	Significant
Curriculum Design → Student Engagement	0.41	7.36	<0.001	Significant
Instructional Resources → Student Engagement	0.38	6.98	<0.001	Significant
Student Engagement → Student Performance	0.46	8.22	<0.001	Significant

The model explained 62% of the variance in student engagement and 68% of the variance in student performance, indicating strong explanatory power.

Mediation Analysis

Bootstrapping procedures were used to examine the indirect effects of curriculum design and instructional resource quality on student performance through student engagement. Results indicated that both indirect paths were statistically significant. However, because the direct effects remained significant after including engagement in the model, the mediation was classified as **partial**.

Table 4. Indirect (Mediated) Effects

Indirect Path	Standardized β	t-value	p-value	Mediation Type
Curriculum Design → Engagement → Performance	0.19	6.14	<0.001	Partial
Instructional Resources → Engagement → Performance	0.17	5.88	<0.001	Partial

These findings indicate that improvements in curriculum design and instructional resources enhance student performance both directly and indirectly by increasing student engagement. Engagement thus serves as an important psychological mechanism that translates instructional quality into academic success.

Discussion

The findings reinforce the growing consensus that instructional quality shapes academic outcomes not only through structural or material provisions but also through the psychological processes that determine how students experience learning. Curriculum design and instructional resource quality emerged as significant contributors to student performance, yet their strongest influence was observed when they fostered higher levels of student engagement. This underscores the idea that learning is not simply a function of what is provided to students, but how effectively those provisions stimulate meaningful involvement in learning activities.

Well-designed curricula provide students with clarity of expectations, logical progression of content, and coherence across learning tasks. Such structure reduces uncertainty and cognitive overload, enabling learners to allocate their mental effort toward understanding rather than navigating disorganized instructional demands. When students perceive curriculum pathways as purposeful and achievable, they are more likely to sustain attention and commit effort, which contributes to deeper comprehension and better academic results. The results therefore support perspectives that view curriculum coherence as a foundation for effective learning environments.

Similarly, instructional resource quality plays a vital role in shaping how curriculum content is perceived and processed. High-quality resources—particularly interactive and multimedia materials—can make abstract ideas more concrete and enhance accessibility for diverse learners. When students encounter materials that are visually engaging, relevant, and easy to navigate, their curiosity is stimulated and their willingness to participate increases. This aligns with contemporary views that learning technologies and well-designed instructional materials are most impactful when they support active engagement rather than passive consumption of information.

The mediating role of student engagement highlights its function as a psychological bridge between instructional inputs and performance outcomes. Engagement reflects the energy and effort students invest in learning, and it captures the extent to which they are behaviorally involved, emotionally connected, and cognitively committed. The findings suggest that curriculum and resource improvements may not yield their full benefits unless they succeed in capturing student interest and encouraging sustained participation. This helps explain why similar instructional reforms sometimes produce varying results across contexts; differences in engagement levels may determine whether students translate instructional opportunities into meaningful learning gains.

By positioning curriculum design and instructional resources as antecedents of engagement, the study contributes to engagement-centered models of learning. It extends existing research that often treats engagement as an outcome variable by demonstrating its explanatory role in linking instructional environments to academic success. This integrated perspective emphasizes that educational effectiveness depends on the interaction between structural design, resource provision, and learner involvement.

From a practical standpoint, the findings suggest that educational reforms should move beyond content coverage and resource acquisition toward designing learning environments that actively involve students. Curriculum planners should prioritize coherence, progression, and relevance, while educators should select and develop instructional materials that encourage interaction and participation. Teaching strategies that incorporate collaborative learning, problem-solving activities, and technology-enhanced instruction may further strengthen engagement, thereby amplifying the positive effects of curriculum and resources on performance. Overall, the study highlights that improving student outcomes requires attention to both instructional design and the psychological experiences of learners. Engagement serves as the mechanism through which well-structured curricula and high-quality resources translate into improved academic performance, underscoring its central role in effective education.

Conclusion

Student engagement plays a critical role in translating curriculum design and instructional resource quality into meaningful academic success. The findings of this study demonstrate that while structured curricula and high-quality instructional materials directly contribute to improved performance, their influence becomes substantially stronger when students are actively involved in the learning process. Engagement acts as the mechanism through which instructional environments are internalized, experienced, and transformed into learning gains.

By highlighting the mediating role of engagement, this study underscores the importance of viewing educational effectiveness as a dynamic interaction between instructional design and learner participation. Curriculum alignment ensures that learning pathways are coherent and purposeful, while high-quality instructional resources enhance accessibility, clarity, and interactivity. However, these elements achieve their full potential only when they stimulate students' behavioral involvement, emotional interest, and cognitive investment. In this sense, engagement represents the vital link between what institutions provide and what students actually achieve. The study also reinforces the need for educational institutions to adopt integrated improvement strategies rather than isolated reforms. Investments in curriculum development and learning technologies should be accompanied by pedagogical approaches that actively encourage participation, collaboration, and critical thinking. Educators play a key role in shaping classroom climates that foster

curiosity, motivation, and sustained effort, ensuring that students do not merely receive instruction but actively engage with it. Ultimately, enhancing student performance requires a holistic approach that combines thoughtful curriculum design, high-quality instructional resources, and engagement-oriented teaching practices. Recognizing engagement as a central driver of academic success can guide institutions in designing learning environments that are not only informative but also motivating and transformative for learners.

References

1. Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(5), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20303
2. Benabou, R., & Tirole, J. (2016). Mindful economics: The production, consumption, and value of beliefs. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 30*(3), 141–164.
3. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
4. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17*(1), 1–24.
5. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*(2), 97–140.
6. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59–109.
7. Harden, R. M. (2001). AMEE Guide No. 21: Curriculum mapping: A tool for transparent and authentic teaching and learning. *Medical Teacher, 23*(2), 123–137.
8. Hattie, J. (2015). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
9. Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review, 27*, 1–12.
10. Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(5), 758–773.
11. Mayer, R. E. (2014). Cognitive theory of multimedia learning. In R. E. Mayer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning* (2nd ed., pp. 43–71). Cambridge University Press.
12. Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. (2007). Interactive multimodal learning environments. *Educational Psychology Review, 19*(3), 309–326.
13. OECD. (2021). *Education at a glance 2021: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing.
14. Priestley, M., & Biesta, G. (2013). *Reinventing the curriculum: New trends in curriculum policy and practice*. Bloomsbury.
15. Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In S. L. Christenson et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149–172). Springer.
16. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61*, 101860.
17. Schmidt, W. H., Wang, H. C., & McKnight, C. C. (2001). Curriculum coherence: An examination of US mathematics and science content standards. *Educational Researcher, 30*(5), 3–12.
18. Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). Motivation and social cognitive theory. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 60*, 101832.
19. Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates*. Bloomsbury Academic.
20. Sinatra, G. M., Heddy, B. C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement. *Educational Psychologist, 50*(1), 1–13.
21. Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 69*(3), 493–525.
22. Trowler, V. (2010). *Student engagement literature review*. Higher Education Academy.
23. UNESCO. (2022). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO Publishing.
24. Voogt, J., Pieters, J., & Handelzalts, A. (2018). Teacher collaboration in curriculum design teams. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 24*(5–6), 251–273.
25. World Bank. (2021). *The state of the global education crisis: A path to recovery*. World Bank.
26. Young, M. (2013). Overcoming the crisis in curriculum theory. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 45*(2), 101–118.
27. Zepke, N. (2018). Student engagement in neo-liberal times. *Higher Education, 76*(4), 693–708.