

Learner-Driven EFL Curriculum Development at the Classroom Level

Saad Shawer, Deanna Gilmore, and SusanRae Banks-Joseph
Washington State University

This qualitative study examines the learner-directed motives that cause English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers to approach curriculum differently, as curriculum-transmitters, curriculum-developers, or curriculum-makers. This study's conceptual framework was grounded in teacher curriculum development, curriculum implementation, curriculum-making, student cognitive and affective change, and social constructivism. The study made use of the qualitative paradigm at the levels of ontology (multiple curriculum realities), epistemology (interaction with rather than detachment from respondents), and methodology (using idiographic methodology and instruments). The research design involved qualitative case studies (Yin, 1994) as the research strategy and general interviews, pre- and post-lesson interviews, group interviews, and participant observation. Grounded theory was the data analysis approach. Based on work with college students from various countries, the study concluded that learner-directed motives, particularly student schematic, affective, pragmatic, and subject-content needs had significantly driven EFL teachers to implement various curricula. Learner content styles were also found to have an impact on the ways teachers approach curriculum. The results indicated positive relationships between learner-directed motives and the teacher curriculum-developer and curriculum-maker's approaches. In contrast, negative relationships between learner-directed motives and the teacher curriculum-transmitter's approach were established. The study provides recommendations for curriculum development, teacher education and future research.

Why do some teachers opt for developing curriculum, while others do not? Connelly and Clandinin (1988), Clandinin and Connelly (1992, 1998), and Shawer (2003) maintained that teachers approach curriculum in different ways: as curriculum-transmitters, curriculum-developers, or curriculum-makers. No doubt that instructors in general and college instructors in particular are driven by various motives to make different curricular decisions. Such motives should be identified for several reasons. For example, Doyle (1992), Remillard (1999), Eisner (2002), Craig (2006), Schultz and Oyler (2006), and Randolph, Duffy, and Matingly (2007) indicated that different curricular decisions lead teachers to run different curricula which impacts differently on teachers, learners, and the taught curriculum. For similar reasons, Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) encouraged teachers to become researchers not only to develop curricula and improve schools, but also to "generate theories grounded in practice" (p. 15).

In essence, this study's teachers' curriculum development at the classroom level embodies Cohen and Ball's (1999) notion of instructional capacity that means "the interactions among teachers and students around curriculum materials" (p. 2). Cohen and Ball (1999), however, stressed that the teacher plays the pivotal role, since "teachers' knowledge, experience, and skills affect the interactions of students and materials in ways that neither students nor materials can" (p. 4). The outcome of this interaction is the actual curriculum. "Curriculum is often developed in advance, but students' and teachers' interactions with this material comprise the enacted- which is to say, the actual or effective- curriculum" (p. 4). Doyle (1992)

termed the curriculum constructed out of this interaction as the enacted curriculum. Doyle also emphasised that it is teachers who turn curriculum knowledge which is decided on at the institutional level into pedagogy (experienced curriculum).

Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1992) echoed this discussion by suggesting that teachers approach curriculum in three different ways. One category of teachers follows the "fidelity approach," where curriculum knowledge is defined for teachers from outside. This means that curriculum change starts from the centre to the periphery, whereas the teacher's role is restricted to delivering curriculum according to specific instructions. Snyder et al. (1992) indicated that a second category of teachers follows the "mutual-adaptation" approach, which is a process "whereby adjustments in a curriculum are made by curriculum developers and those who use it in the school" (p. 410). Curriculum knowledge does not differ much from the fidelity approach, which outside experts still provide. However, the adaptation approach differs in that it involves changes and adjustments that teachers and developers make. Moreover, curriculum change is no longer linear, as teachers adapt the curriculum. The teachers' role has become active because they adapt curriculum to their contexts.

Doyle (1992) concurred with Snyder et al. (1992) that a third creative category of teachers adopts the "enactment" approach, where curriculum is "jointly created and jointly and individually experienced by students and teacher" (pp. 428-429). Herein, the curriculum may or may not hinge on the external curriculum; while curriculum knowledge becomes an ongoing process of construction rather than a product.

Curriculum change is no longer about implementing or adapting curriculum, but “a process of growth for teachers and students, a change in thinking and practice” (p. 429). The teacher’s role ranges from using, adapting, and supplementing external curriculum to making curriculum. Wells (1999) maintained that this enactment approach reflects social constructivism.

Constructivism and Teachers’ Curriculum Development

Pollard and Triggs (1997) determined that teachers’ curriculum development is grounded in social constructivism that assumes that “people learn through an interaction between thought and experience and the sequential development of more complex cognitive structures” (p. 211). Furthermore, Terwel (1999) maintained that in this constructivist curriculum, knowledge acquisition is “active and strategic, focused on many factors, including problems of understanding, diversity of expertise, learning styles and interests” (p. 196). In addition, Terwel (2005) suggested that successful curriculum projects help students to develop through constructing curriculum out of their present experiences.

Vygotsky’s (1978) zone of proximal development acts as the main drive for teachers’ curriculum development, where the teachers’ role is to explore “the distance between the [students’] actual developmental level as determined by independent problem-solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). Constructivist teachers build on learners’ current understanding, interests, and needs (Richardson, 1997). Wells (1999) further suggested that constructivist teachers look for a “window of potential learning that lies between what... [students] can do unaided and what... [they] can achieve with help. It is when appropriately pitched in this zone that instruction can optimally benefit the learner” (p. 296).

Investigators (Gudmundsdottir, 1990; Heaton, 1993; Lee, 1995; Marker & Mehlinger, 1992; Remillard, 1999; Shawer, 2001, 2003; Woods, 1991) found that teachers develop curriculum to respond to student needs, motivation and performance. Further studies (Beck & Kosnik, 2001; Clemente, Ramirez, & Dominguez, 2000; Eldridge, 1998) revealed that effective teachers are those who develop curriculum to respond to their contexts. Despite the apparent importance of learner-directed factors, previous researchers have not studied the relationship between teachers’ curriculum approaches and learner-directed motives. The study takes learner-directed/ centered motives as any student-related factors which lead teachers to supplement, adapt, or even change the official curriculum to match students’ characteristics.

Precisely, this study sought to answer these two research questions:

1. What are the learner-directed motives that lead teachers to transmit, develop, or make their curriculum?
2. How do the learner-directed motives and teacher curriculum approaches (transmitter/developer/ maker) correlate?

Method

The study used the qualitative paradigm to explore rather than verify the differences between teacher curriculum conceptualizations, experiences, and strategies in their different contexts. The positivist standardization of context variables was neither consonant with the study’s ontological perspective (multiple curriculum realities; Jackson, 1992); nor with its epistemological standpoint (interaction with rather than detachment from respondents; Clarke, 1999; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Parker, 1997). This is why qualitative case-studies (methodology/strategy) were used to embody these qualitative principles in order to retain the holistic nature of the phenomena in their natural context by studying teachers in their settings with emphasis on natural observations (Stake, 1995; Yin 1994).

Design and Procedure

The primary (first) author arranged for meetings with teachers through college directors, where he explained the research purpose and relevance to teachers and assured them of complete confidentiality and anonymity (Sapsford & Abbott, 1996). As a result, a timeframe was established allowing fieldwork to extend over three months at each college. Sampling was purposive to address the case-study criteria; where every case was selected “because it serves the real purpose and objectives of the researcher of discovering, gaining insight, and understanding into a particular chosen phenomenon” (Burns, 2000, p. 465).

The sample was initially determined as 6 English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers who depart from curriculum materials. This involved 2 teachers who had both training (EFL qualifications) and experience (more than three years). Two trained teachers were also needed, but they had to have no teaching experience (less than two months), in order to assess the impact of the experience factor. In contrast, 2 experienced teachers who had no training (EFL qualification) were also needed to assess the impact of the training factor.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), theoretical sampling completely changed the original sampling plan in line with the emerging themes into

three new categories of teachers: curriculum transmitters, developers, and makers. *Curriculum-transmitters* delivered prescribed curriculum materials and topics (the student's textbook and the teacher's guide) without introducing new materials or topics and without making significant changes or adaptations. *Curriculum-developers* developed curriculum through prescribed curriculum materials and topics, introduced new materials and topics, and made significant curriculum changes and adaptations. *Curriculum-makers* developed curriculum without reference to official curriculum materials and topics. The following paragraphs explain how the three categories of teachers emerged and developed.

The primary researcher started with 3 teachers who were originally selected as trained and experienced in EFL teaching, and who usually used and developed curriculum materials (according to the original sampling plan). Only 1 teacher met the criteria of the original sample, but the other 2 differed in that they developed curriculum without using curriculum materials. They assessed student needs and the resulting topics constituted their curriculum. The primary researcher needed a third of this type. He could find 3 in addition to these 2. He started observing the 3 teachers, but chose 1 and stopped observing the other 2, due to time constraints. The initial analysis of the data gathered from these 3 teachers (2+1) showed their curriculum development without using curriculum materials. These three teachers were categorized as *curriculum-makers*.

The reader may remember that 1 teacher was left from the first 3 teachers whom the primary researcher started with who used, supplemented, and adapted curriculum materials. Three more were needed, since that was the study's original sample and purpose. Five were found who (through interviews) met the criteria of the original sample, but classroom observation showed that only 4 were a match. These 4 teachers in addition to the 1 who differed from the first 3 (1+4) were termed *curriculum-developers*.

Again, the reader may remember the teacher who closely transmitted the textbook content and who was different from the 5 teachers. Because this teacher approached curriculum differently, 2 more were needed to allow for comparisons, but only 1 teacher was found. These 2 teachers (1+1) were termed *curriculum-transmitters*.

This way, theoretical sampling provided the rationale for choosing to study different teachers in these identified categories. In open coding/ sampling, all that the teachers offered was studied to allow for themes to emerge that broadened the study's scope in axial coding into three categories instead of one. In selective coding, categories were saturated by returning to the field to collect specific data for addressing certain

aspects of the emerging themes (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Consequently, the 3 teachers who developed curriculum without using curriculum materials constituted the *curriculum-makers'* category; the 5 who developed curriculum through developing prescribed materials formed the *curriculum-developers'* category, whereas the 2 teachers who made no significant curriculum developments fell into the *curriculum-transmitters'* category.

Data Collection

One-to-one interviews, group interviews, and participant observation were the research tools. One-to-one interviews involved general and pre/ post-observation interviews. General interviews (Appendix A) were used to reveal each teacher's motives behind her particular curriculum approach. Interviews were semi-structured to probe for and follow up on the responses, allow for interaction and clarify meaning (Blaikie, 2000). Pre- and post-observed lesson interviews (Appendix B) were to clarify the rationales behind selecting each lesson, validate observational data as well as to uncover the elements of everyday planning and how and why teachers decided on them. Post-lesson interviews were to identify why teachers changed lesson plans and to discuss emerging issues derived from each observed lesson.

Group interviews (Appendix C) were necessary to compare students' responses (with each other and with teacher responses) about how teachers approached curriculum; to draw conclusions about emerging issues in their presence; and to validate the data collected from teachers (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000; Morgan, 1988; Watts & Ebbutt, 1987). Each general interview lasted for about 65 minutes and were all conducted at each teacher's college. Pre- and post-lesson interviews were short "checking" exercises, ranging between 3 to 10 minutes.

Data trustworthiness (validity) and dependability (reliability) were handled in different ways. Interviews were transcribed verbatim (Kvale, 1996) and content validated (Bloom, Fischer, & Orme, 1995) through 10 experienced teachers who modified the wording and number of some items. Four educational researchers matched the research purpose with the interview questions. Piloting led to adding some questions and adapting a few others. Further developments in the research focuses led to other changes to interview questions (Cohen et al., 2000).

Participant observation was to provide natural pictures of the context where teachers constructed curriculum, validate meanings, and capture the interactions (Yin, 1994). Each teacher was observed between 15 to 22 times. Narrative records of

observations were made (Stake, 1995). Data dependability and trustworthiness were maintained through methodological triangulation, where observations and interviews were directed to gather the same information. Tape-recordings of classroom procedures helped in capturing class interactions as accurately as possible (Cohen et al., 2000). The results were given to teachers who accepted our interpretation of the data (Davies, 1999).

Data Analysis

Grounded theory was used to generate theory in a process of open, axial and selective coding. Open coding that included line-by-line, whole-paragraph and whole-document analyses resulted in: naming concepts, assigning categories, and developing properties (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Concepts were developed by naming events through three techniques: “in-vivo,” “abstracting,” and “borrowing from the literature.” In-vivo concepts were taken from the respondents’ words, like textbook as “skeleton.” Through abstracting, events were named on the basis of what was understood from the data, like “schematic needs.” Borrowing from the literature occurred when the data matched a “literature” concept that “worked” and “fitted,” like “material-writing.” The data was examined and whatever fell under a named concept was named after it (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Categories were developed through connecting related concepts under a wider concept. Concepts like “predetermined content-style,” “combined content-style,” and “unpredictable content-style” were grouped under the “content-style” category. Properties were the group of concepts falling under one category. Axial coding involved grouping sub-categories developed in open coding around one axis (category). Selective coding involved refining, connecting, and integrating categories into a coherent theory that reflected all elements of analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

The Context of the EFL Curriculum

This section highlights the context of teachers who were based in three different international language centres (colleges). The categories developed from the analysis were used to present the data around teacher experience and class population; teacher training; teacher development; curriculum framework; and student grouping.

Teacher Experience and Class Population

Mark, Linda, Carol, Leslie, and Mary worked in Centre One. Mary was in her 40s and taught EFL for 8 years. Her intermediate level class included 11 females

and 6 males. Mark was in his 30s and taught EFL for 3 years. His classroom was comprised of 10 upper-intermediate students, 4 males and 6 females. Leslie was in her fourth decade and taught English as a Foreign Language (EFL) for 10 years. Her intermediate level class had 9 females and 8 males. Linda was also in her 40s and taught EFL for eight years. Her advanced class was comprised of 8 males and 7 females. Carol (also 40-years old) taught EFL for 11 years. Her pre-advanced class was comprised of 7 males and 8 females.

Terry and Shelly who were in their 50s worked in Centre Two. Terry taught EFL for 9 years. His upper-intermediate class was comprised of 16 students, mostly females. Shelly taught EFL for 20 years. Her pre-intermediate classroom included 10 students, predominantly females. Ericka, Nicole, and Rebecca worked in Centre Three. Rebecca was 50 years old and taught EFL for 20 years. Her pre-intermediate classroom was comprised of 7 females and 9 males. Nicole and Ericka were in their 30s. Nicole taught EFL for 7 years. Her advanced class was comprised of 6 females and 5 males. Ericka taught EFL for 7 years. Her pre-advanced class also involved 6 females and 5 males.

Teacher Training

All teachers completed EFL training before starting to teach in Centre One. Mary received the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) Diploma in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), while Leslie received a degree in linguistics. Linda received a bachelor’s degree in modern language studies, and a Post-Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) and certificate in TEFL, while Carol received a PGCE and the RSA Diploma. Mark obtained the Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA) and the Diploma in English Language Teaching to Adults (DELTA) in EFL. In Centre Two, Terry earned a certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), while Shelly trained to teach art, earned the RSA Diploma, and acquired mainstream and EFL training. In regards to Centre Three, Ericka earned her first degree and the RSA Diploma, Nicole completed a Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) methodology course, and Rebecca acquired EFL training and earned the RSA Diploma.

Teacher Development

Regarding staff-development (college-financed), Centre One teachers agreed with Mark: “there was extensive training... weekly inputs... I couldn’t have asked for a better quality.” For self-development (self-financed), most teachers made decisions similar to

those of Mary who obtained a Master's degree in TESOL, or Leslie who "is currently studying for a Master's degree." In Centre Two, Terry pointed out, "we've got staff-development sessions that we follow on specific topics... I'm involved in the dyslexia course now." Shelly said, "we have a staff-development programme... it is interesting." Shelly and Terry did not engage in formal self-development. For Centre Three, Ericka spoke for Rebecca and Nicole, "we have staff-development workshops." Regarding self-development, Ericka received a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics, Nicole is currently working on a Master's degree, and Rebecca is studying to receive a Master's degree in Education.

Curriculum Framework

In Centre One, Linda, Leslie, Mark, and Mary shared Carol's opinion that the textbook was prescribed by their college: "on our timetable, it says course book." However, they agreed with her that "the teachers also have freedom and are expected to supplement the course book." But they "have to cover a certain amount," explained Mary. They agreed with Linda that they taught a broad skills-based curriculum. In Centre Two, Shelly agreed with Terry, "I chose and introduced this textbook." Terry worked in a context encouraging curriculum development: "We are encouraged to use other materials and to make our own materials as well." Shelly noted, "I can do what I want. We're fortunate really in our kind of work." In regard to Centre Three, Ericka and Nicole agreed with Rebecca who explained the curriculum was decided upon "in our own way to suit the students." She added, "we decide what we think the students need... our curriculum is very flexible... we decided... to do a skills-based curriculum." Across the three centres, all students were ability-grouped. For example, Leslie taught intermediate students, while Linda taught advanced students. They also all taught mixed-nationality students.

Results

Data analysis focused on three sets of teachers who were interspersed throughout the study. They do not correspond to any particular college/centre. They will be named as

- Curriculum-transmitters: Terry and Mary.
- Curriculum-developers: Carol, Ericka, Leslie, Mark, and Linda.
- Curriculum-makers: Nicole, Shelly, and Rebecca.

The data will be presented through these four perspectives: teacher perspective (the general interview

data); teacher perspective (pre/post observed lesson interview data); student perspective (the group interview data); and observed lessons perspective (the on-site data). The categories developed from the analysis are used to present the data in this order:

- Learning and content style
- Textbook needs
- Language needs
- Pragmatic needs
- Schematic needs
- Affective needs

Teacher's Perspective: General Interview Data

Learning and Content Style

The teachers developed their curriculum due to factors relating directly to their students. Student content and learning styles led the curriculum-developers and curriculum-makers to pursue curriculum developments.

Learning and content style/curriculum-transmitters. Curriculum-transmitters did not attempt to develop their curriculum, as they claimed their students had predetermined-content styles. Content styles are the different ways students like to approach course materials (Shawer, 2003). Terry said, "They like to learn according to assigned materials, such as textbooks. This is the way this class works... probably it's because of the way they themselves like to learn the language." Content style concerns the personal preference of tackling a whole track of instructional content. It is not a cognitive style which is a psychological make-up that makes individuals prefer to tackle particular tasks and in particular ways, in wholes or parts, or in mental images or words. It is not a cognitive strategy which is the processes learners use to tackle tasks incompatible with their learning style (Riding & Rayner, 1998). Precisely, cognitive or learning strategies are the "steps or mental operations used in learning or problem-solving that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials in order to store, retrieve, and use knowledge" (Wenden, 1986, p. 10). Content-styles also differ from meta-cognitive strategies that constitute the "general skills through which learners manage, direct, regulate, guide their learning, i.e. planning, monitoring and evaluating" (Wenden, 1998, p. 519). However, content and cognitive styles share the aspect that both are habitual and relatively fixed (Klein, 2003; Riding & Rayner, 1998).

Learning and content style/curriculum-developers. Curriculum-developers, for example, developed curriculum to address student learning styles, including analytic, visual, aural, tactile, and field in/dependent.

Ericka indicated, "I have to take notice of different learning styles." She responded to learning-style variation, "I always try to include a variety of different activities on maybe some grammar, some work at skills, some vocabulary and also different types of exercises, a written exercise or a speaking sort of activity." Some of her students were field-dependent, preferring to interact with others when processing information. Other students were field-independent, who could separate important details from a complex context on their own (Meehan, 2006). Ericka asserted, "I realize some people prefer to work alone and some people prefer to work in pairs and some people prefer to work in a bigger group."

Carol also responded to field-independent students. "When I began working... with only Japanese students, they didn't want to work together, so I had to re-focus how I did that." She developed her curriculum because she said, "each class is different, each student is different, so one course book might work well for... the group it was piloted on and may not be appropriate for other groups." She identified the problem: "Textbooks don't really appeal to anyone, because they are trying to appeal to too many learners at one time." The teachers also developed their curriculum to address analytic style students, who preferred to learn grammar and analyze sentences into their component parts (Shawer, 2006a; Tomlinson, 1998). Mark indicated, "Some students are like grammar freaks." Carol agreed, "Some learners like to see how grammar works."

Curriculum-developers also paid attention to student content styles. For instance, some students in Mark's class did not like to learn through predetermined content (unpredictable content style). He explained, "Where possible I don't use it [textbook], because students do not like it... The book is not tolerated. I could do it for one lesson and I'd get away with it. For a second lesson, the students would complain." Other students had combined-content styles, students like to learn both according to assigned materials and also like to learn from non-assigned materials (Shawer, 2003). Mark responded, "Some like a mixture because they also like to feel there is a structure to the course." Carol added, "because... students would just see what is coming next."

Learning and content style/curriculum-maker. Curriculum-makers developed their courses to cater to different learning styles. For instance, Shelly noticed that some students were "tactile" or "kinaesthetic": "The students like holding and moving things around." She created her curriculum because her students do not like to learn through predetermined or combined content styles. They had unpredictable content style, as they agreed, "we do not want course books anymore. We want everyday topics."

Textbook Needs

The teachers also approached curriculum differently to address student textbook, language, pragmatic, schematic and affective needs. Textbook needs included using textbooks for home "reference", "reassuring", "security", "feedback" and for "exam preparation."

Textbook use/curriculum-transmitters. Terry agreed with Mary who used her textbook because "If you never use it, they don't feel secure." Terry added, "the textbook reassures and guides them."

Textbook use/curriculum-developers. Even curriculum-developers agreed that students need a textbook. Leslie still used the textbook because "they need the structure that the course book gives them."

Textbook use/curriculum-makers. Rebecca, who was a curriculum-maker, agreed with the other teachers and conceded that once in a while she used the textbook. She said, "with the lower levels... it [textbook] gives a certain structure and guidance." But she went on to say, "No textbook is written for one particular class. It's written for a general vague level, which is different according to different classes... At the end of the day, it won't necessarily meet the needs of all the students." Shelly declared, "I don't use textbooks, because there isn't one that would be suitable." She added, "a lot of textbooks that are available are written on themes totally alien to them."

There has been controversy over textbook use which reflects the different views in this study. One research perspective stresses the various benefits of school textbooks to the extent that textbooks embody and define the school curriculum (Cody, 1990; Elliot, 1990; Foshay, 1990; Shawer, 2003; Talmage, 1972; Tulley & Farr, 1990; Venezky, 1992; Westbury, 1990). Textbooks determine the topics of teaching, their sequence and the time that should be allocated to each topic (Freeman & Porter, 1989). Westbury (1990) acknowledged the key role of textbooks in schooling: "It is a truism that textbooks are the central tools and the central objects of attention in all modern forms of schooling" (p. 1). Their significance is pervasive to the extent that "educational development and curriculum development... go hand in hand with textbook development and distribution" (p. 1). Woodward and Elliott (1990a) also argued that textbooks represent "national curricula in the basic subjects of the curriculum" (p. 146).

From a different perspective, researchers found textbooks problematic and insufficient to stimulate students' genuine cognitive development or motivation. They are accused of restricting and stifling teachers' thinking and creativity (Bell, 1993; Bell & Gower, 1998; Bhola, 1999; Hawke & Davis, 1990; Shawer, 2003; Squire & Morgan, 1990; Young, 1990).

Researchers criticize textbooks for being inflexible in meeting students' needs or differences. Moreover, they are viewed as substitutes for teachers (Elliot, 1990). Therefore, textbooks create educational and instructional problems (Carus, 1990), since most textbooks lack materials to develop higher order skills of cognitive functioning and many significant topics (Woodward & Elliott, 1990a); they lockstep classroom teaching (Maley, 1990).

For these reasons, teachers need to adapt textbooks and use them as only one of many sources of input (O' Neill, 1990). They need supplementing because "nationally marketed texts cannot anticipate all the contingencies of local use... [and] cannot fully provide for individual differences or capitalise on opportunities in a particular locality" (Woodward & Elliott, 1990b, p. 183). The corollary of reliance on textbooks is that "students are short-changed in learning about important topics and teachers tend to become followers, not initiators of learning plans and strategies" (Elliott & Woodward, 1990, p. 224). Instead of depending on textbooks, teachers should construct learning situations which capture students' interests and engage them in genuine interaction and intellectual processes (Carter, Hughes & McCarthy, 1998; Jolly & Bolitho, 1998; Keiny, 1999; Sheldon, 1988).

Language Needs

Student language needs formed an axis around which many teachers developed their curriculum. This involved teachers' supplementing inadequate content through reading, writing, speaking, listening, and learning strategies. At this point, the curriculum-transmitters, developers and makers diverged into two different routes. Curriculum-transmitters addressed student textbook needs and this was the end of their road to curriculum.

Language needs/curriculum-transmitters. Regarding the issue of language development, even Mary, a curriculum-transmitter, acknowledged her textbook lacked appropriate and sufficient language elements, like writing. She purported, "Textbooks... don't show students enough about the process of writing. For example, they just say write an essay, give the product. They don't say how an essay is written... I don't think they're good quality. Writing is ignored." Again, Mary admitted her textbook lacked enough listening strategies, another language need.

Language needs/curriculum-developers. Curriculum-developers took an entirely different approach. They supplemented inadequate curriculum content to address student language needs in terms of writing, speaking, fluency, and accuracy. Curriculum-developers supported Leslie's statements that "some textbooks provide adequate writing practice, some

don't. Some provide adequate speaking practice, some don't." According to Ericka, the curriculum lacked two basic language needs: reading and listening. She developed her course through supplementing topics and adapting existing topics and materials, "One reason for not adhering to the course book was that this book is not very good on reading and listening skills... so it needs a lot of supplementation." Mark also developed his curriculum, because "books don't really have us do much writing." Carol acted to supplement the speaking element, "I have a class that finds speaking difficult, so I have to supplement that." Linda noticed her students lacked accuracy: "They need to do quite basic grammar work, so I have to respond." Mark supplemented as the textbook listening input was partly inadequate: "The students specifically asked for more listening, so we've done lessons"; and partly because they were poor at this area "they were clearly finding listening difficult... so we've done things like video, which are great really."

Language needs/curriculum-makers. Nicole acted to address students' fluency need: "the class that you've observed... needed a lot of fluency." Nicole added, "The textbook... doesn't cover the topics that they're interested in." She did not use it "because the textbook isn't sufficient... the suggested tasks are quite limited." She was concerned about the imbalance of content elements: "It's mainly structural grammatical knowledge and less to do with the reading, listening, speaking and writing." Shelly did not use textbooks, "because there isn't one that has all the topics that... I need to cover." This way, curriculum-developers and makers addressed key student needs, without which they would never be able use the language (Basanta, 1996; Munby, 1978; Shawer, 2006b; Tomlinson, 1998).

Pragmatic Needs

The curriculum-developers and makers also developed their curriculum to cater to the students' pragmatic needs. These included vocational, academic, exam, and relevance needs.

Pragmatic needs/curriculum-transmitters. Since Terry and Mary followed the textbook to the letter, they did not adapt the content to fit their students' pragmatic needs. They just adopted a policy of textbook transmitting. "I just follow the course book," said Mary with whom Terry agreed.

Pragmatic needs/curriculum-developers. Ericka added topics because the curriculum ignored "vocational" needs, while some students "are looking for a job and English is very important for that job." Nor did it address student "academic" needs, as she explained further, "Some of them... are coming over here to do courses at universities, then of course, the reading and writing are very important to them." In addition, Leslie supplemented and adapted "to cover all

the exam techniques.” Linda supplemented her topics, so that the students could “see that what they’re learning in class is actually relevant to what they’re doing outside the class.” She named “one of the factors [for] moving away from the course book... is... relevance.” Carol further explained, “If you are doing something just because it’s... in the textbook... that has no bearing on their lives... it has no meaning.” In addition, Ericka adapted her course content because “the course does not exactly match the level of the students... their reasons for studying might be different than the reasons envisaged by the writer.”

Pragmatic needs/curriculum-makers. Nicole and Shelly shared Rebecca’s opinion who developed her curriculum “because... it’s pointless giving students meaningless phrases or structures to practice, because they won’t remember... it’s harder to take that language outside of the classroom.” By addressing students’ pragmatic needs, curriculum-developers and makers are responding to one of a curriculum’s main criteria, which is relevance (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998; Eisner, 1990; Hytten, 2000). Pollard and Triggs (1997) asserted that students’ truancy and disruptive behavior are signs that a curriculum does not address the relevance criterion. Dewey (1916) stressed this pragmatic aspect of education: “We do something to the thing and then it does something to us in return” (p. 163).

Schematic Needs

Schematic needs were another driving force behind teachers’ curriculum developments. This required teachers to fill in the gaps of the student’s missing knowledge, to build on student prior knowledge, and to achieve content relevance in terms of difficulty, adequacy, and substantiality.

Schematic needs/curriculum-transmitters. Mary and Terry were very concentrated on following the pattern of the textbook and the teacher’s guide. Consequently, they did not supply the students with extra materials, topics, or pedagogic strategies for building students’ schemas or at least adapting available content to their cognitive structure. Terry made his stance clear: “I have enough time to cover the whole book.” So did Mary: “I most often do the book.”

Schematic needs/ curriculum-developers. Curriculum-developers filled in students’ missing knowledge through supplementing and adapting (Bruner, 1978; Gipps & MacGilchrist, 1999). Linda pointed out, “They hadn’t actually been exposed to that grammar before, so I had to adapt a lot of it. I had to introduce the concepts, before we went on. I felt what the book was trying to introduce was not appropriate.” The curriculum did not match her students’ cognitive structures: “The grammar in that course book, again

was assuming a very high level of understanding of basic grammar, which a lot of them didn’t have.” Leslie also recognized that her students were missing prior knowledge and said there were “many individuals who... needed to do quite basic grammar work.” When the textbook addressed structures which her students knew, she built upon them: “They know this grammar. Now, they need to practice it in a speaking situation.”

Linda built on students’ prior knowledge: “I’ll introduce them to the phonemic chart, if they don’t know it and having done that, I build upon that.” Linda also developed her curriculum because “some of the materials, some of the skills are... too difficult and not appropriate.” Carol overlooked the phonetic alphabet because “they are aware of these symbols.” She provided what was missing and built on existing schema, which reflects the basic constructivist teaching/learning principles (Piaget, 1955; Pollard, 1987, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978). “I see which areas they are getting and which terms, grammatical structures and vocabulary they obviously need at that point.” Her principle was “if you did it that way [content coverage], you’re not really responding to their needs.”

Schematic needs/curriculum-makers. As curriculum-developers did, curriculum-makers addressed several issues around students’ schematic needs. Rebecca built on her students’ prior knowledge and bridged the gaps in their schemas saying, “I might not do the same kind of input. I might have to change my lesson plan, because the students might know a lot more than I anticipated, or a lot less.” So did Shelly: “They have already gone through grammar in a certain degree.” Shelly developed her curriculum “to give individual attention and to focus on individual students’ needs.” Rebecca explained, “At the moment, the class you’ve been observing, we started off with the textbook being too difficult, and that’s why I did a lot of my own materials.”

In line with Siraj-Blatchford (1999), curriculum-developers and curriculum-makers addressed issues of social interaction, conscious construction of knowledge, and student motivation by “organising materials/resources, providing relevant/ interesting and novel experiences, providing opportunities for active exploration ...scaffolding [through] directing attention to a new aspect of a situation [and] helping the child to sequence activities” (p. 40).

Affective Needs

Students’ affective needs constituted another driving force behind teachers’ curriculum developments. These involved addressing student motivation, interests and updating content.

Affective needs/curriculum-transmitters. Since Terry and Mary adhered strictly to the text and teacher

guidelines, it appeared that they were not interested in doing anything special that would motivate the students to learn. They either felt that the students enjoyed the structure of the textbook, or they may have been unaware of the affective part in their students. Mary was quite frank: "It is not fantastic, but it's ok, I guess." To the contrary, Terry was convinced: "The students seem to be quite happy [about sticking to the textbook]." Terry and Mary tended to follow what Richardson (1997) terms the transmissional model of teaching. They just delivered information to passive learners. They also reflect aspects of classical humanism (Kelly, 1999; Skilbeck, 1982) since they were focused on transmitting information and exams. All that they did was linear and predetermined. For them, curriculum knowledge was as if it is timeless, objective, and independent of a particular society or learners. Richardson (1997) maintained that "this transmission model promotes neither the interaction between prior and new knowledge nor the conversations that are necessary for internalisation and deep understanding" (p. 3).

Affective needs/curriculum-developers. Contrary to curriculum-transmitters, curriculum-developers were interactive and constructivist teachers. In addition to fitting curriculum to students' learning zones (Vygotsky, 1978; Wells, 1999), they also considered motivation the key to effective learning (Gross, 1996; Wetton, 1998). Leslie supplemented and adapted partly because "using a textbook solely would be too monotonous... I need to supplement it." Linda agreed, "The students find it boring, so I reject it on the basis of that. Although the level might be fine, motivation is a factor... why I move away from the course book." Carol addressed student interests. "They have to have a real interest... that's the key thing... If they are not interested, they won't have any need to understand it." So did Mark: "I work from things that would interest them."

Affective needs/curriculum-makers. In the case of following the textbook, Nicole indicated, "The students would suffer from that and wouldn't be as engaged. They also wouldn't really get the topics that they are interested in." Shelly provided her topics "of course to motivate the students." She went on, explaining, "It's more about identifying an area of interest... I'm not going to do something on fashion, if I know they're not interested in fashion."

Teacher's Perspective: Pre/Post Observed Lesson Interview Data

Apart from curriculum-transmitters, the teachers developed curriculum to address student "learning" and "content" styles. For curriculum-developers, Mark tended not to use the textbook because his students had

unpredictable content styles: "To be honest... it's not good for them." As for curriculum-makers, Shelly prepared the topics and materials because some of her students had *field-dependent* styles: "As you can see, some are very needy, particularly the lady here. She likes me to sit down with her. She is not very autonomous at all." Some others were *field-independent*: "Kate works very well, if she feels supported. Barbara is very capable."

In order to identify the reasons behind teachers' curriculum developments, I asked this question: "Did you depart from your lesson plan?" I followed it up with "Why?" Curriculum-transmitters always offered one reply "no." Curriculum-developers often departed to adjust content to student schematic needs. Linda answered in the affirmative and explained, "I was aware that it would probably take quite a while to get through that reading text, because it was difficult." Another lesson, "I didn't get on to what I thought I might, because things came out earlier on, which I then wanted to explore." Ericka answered, "Yeah, I did because I was going to do another listening exercise... but I didn't have time." Of another lesson, "I did because... I expected them to be skilled at using those forms [future perfect]. In fact, they were a lot more hesitant than I expected." Mark replied, "Yes, I added some stuff for the story, but we didn't use any of them. It wasn't really relevant." As for curriculum-makers, Shelly answered, "I always depart from the lesson plan. I didn't think it was going to take so long. What I've planned for the second half I didn't do," while Nicole stated, "I would have gone on listening, had there been time."

To delve deeper into teachers' minds, this question was asked: "Did you make any changes to the textbook content?" As appropriate, it was followed up with "What were the changes? Why?" Again, curriculum-transmitters often answered in the negative. Terry always said "no," apart from adding, "I brought my own ideas." Mary offered one answer: "I followed the textbook." As for curriculum-developers, Linda made changes to address schematic needs: "I used the textbook and developed from it... I missed things out, because I didn't think they might be appropriate." Ericka changed as their prior knowledge mismatched textbook contents: "There was an exercise using the present perfect... We haven't done that yet, because that's quite a big grammar topic and I want to do it later." On another occasion, Ericka supplemented to cater for language needs (listening): "They need as much listening as possible." Regarding curriculum-makers, Rebecca replied, "The whole point of doing these changes was to suit that particular class... so that's why I gave them the other handout."

To identify further reasons behind teachers' curriculum developments, they were asked, "How did

you respond to your students' individual differences and different needs?" Curriculum-transmitters offered different replies. In one lesson, Mary ignored students' needs, but responded to their differences through immediate-feedback questions. "I suppose, so-so. If they made a mistake, I corrected individuals." In another lesson, she again ignored their needs, but addressed their differences, using deferred-feedback of summated corrections: "In the final exercise, I listened and I took some notes and gave corrected feedback." In only one lesson, she supplemented to address student language needs (listening): "The students in the tutorial asked for extra listening, so we did a listening on a topic of music, which was quite interesting for them." Terry said, "I have, as you will have noticed, a policy of going round the class and making sure that everybody in turn answered the questions" and "I did try to take longer with students who were not as quick as the others."

When asked how they responded to student needs and differences, curriculum-developers offered similar statements. Linda considered student pragmatic needs, particularly issues of relevance: "I had the students in mind, when I chose the materials." Ericka responded to students' differences using immediate feedback: "I was always available going round to help." In another, she skipped the content that mismatched students' schema: "Forms like `future continuous` and `future perfect`... are rather difficult for them, I decided... to leave them out completely." In a third, Ericka compensated for content inadequacy "because the students needed more support on vocabulary... so the course needed supplementing in this area." Leslie responded to student schematic needs (content adaptation) and affective needs (motivation): "I select materials, which will effectively allow them to acquire the language that they need to practise. I vary the content of the lesson, so that things remained interesting." Mark also addressed their language needs: "They need... a lot of speaking. They also need writing... and they get a lot of that." In another lesson, Mark acted to address their pragmatic needs: "It's not good for them... so today is good I planned other materials and something proper for them." Carol addressed their textbook and pragmatic needs: "The textbook exercise was to provide them with the techniques they needed... in the exam." In another, she used immediate feedback: "I had to respond to individual students' needs through the questions they had."

When asked how they responded to student needs and differences, curriculum-makers provided replies similar to those of curriculum-developers. Nicole responded to students' differences through immediate feedback: "By going around the class and checking their understanding" and "when there was an individual query, I tried to address that." In another, she addressed

their affective needs. She supplied a topic about "money and the lottery, which is one of the topics the students are interested in." She did not use the textbook, as "it doesn't cover the themes they're interested in." Rebecca modified content to suit student schemas: "Definitely in planning the lesson [I respond to student needs], because that's why the pace was quite slow." Another lesson, she gave the "opportunity for the good ones to move on at their own pace and the slow ones to just do exactly as they were asked." In a third, Rebecca supplemented to address their pragmatic needs: "Because they see it real-life outside. They needed to know the signs." Shelly's preparation was "to plan short visits for a chosen country and present travel arrangements and time scale orally." She was asked, "Why did you prepare this particular lesson?" She wanted to address students' pragmatic needs: "It's related, because this is about local things that they can do for themselves. Some of them will be making arrangements to go home. So what a travel agent is, what they can do for them."

Student's Perspective: Group Interview Data

Learning and Content Style

The students revealed that they had different learning and content styles. This matched teacher interview statements that such differences in style drove their teachers to develop their individual curricula. The students in all three groups were mostly of a field-dependent learning style. From the curriculum-developers' group, Linda's students shared the opinion that "If you study by yourself, then how can you speak in the class? So, it's necessary to speak and to hear the same language from other students." Mark's students agreed: "Working with other students makes us have deeper understanding."

The students ranged across unpredictable-content, predetermined-content, and combined-content styles. Many students had unpredictable-content styles. Carol's students agreed: "I am not suited to the textbook, nor the textbook suit[s] me." So did Mark's students: "I like to have a surprise in learning everyday. If I can prepare the lesson before he teaches it. I think it's not interesting anymore." Even with curriculum-transmitters, most students had unpredictable content style. Mary's students agreed, "We don't like being taught through a textbook." The curriculum-makers' students were no different. Nicole's students noted, "We don't like to use the textbook anymore... now is a time to face the real life... more background knowledge. That's what we want to learn."

Though many students had unpredictable content styles, the majority had combined-content styles. Regarding the curriculum-developers' group, Carol's

students preferred combining other sources with the textbook. One stated, "Other materials can be more interesting than the textbook, but I like both." Even the curriculum-transmitters' group had the same style. Mary's students also "liked both of them." Only one of Terry's students had a predetermined-content style: "I like the teacher to follow the textbook." The curriculum-makers' students shared this statement from Rebecca's class: "I like both of them, I think all of us like both."

Language Needs

Apart from curriculum-transmitters, the students generally believed their teachers addressed their language needs. From curriculum-developers, Linda's students agreed, "The teacher improves our listening, but in other topics- economics or politics- so relying on the course book is not enough." Students from the curriculum-transmitter group stated otherwise. Mary's students indicated that she ignored their language needs by adhering to the textbook. One was alarmed: "Reading is not a problem to me. Just... listening, but we practice very little listening." Another complained, "We must have more opportunity to practice listening and speaking." As for curriculum-makers, Nicole's students needed to practice more speaking, but they said, "We had lots of speaking activities."

All the students noted that textbooks were inadequate to address their language needs. But students of curriculum-developers and curriculum-makers noted that their teachers provided the missing elements. Ericka's students praised her supplementations because "This book is basic in reading. I need more and different readings, for example, magazines" (curriculum-developers' group). Nicole's students also noted, "If you study in a grammar book and cover the book, you can't use English properly." One added, "You can't include everything just in one book. Learning is just from all of life" (curriculum-makers' group).

Schematic Needs

Again, apart from curriculum-transmitters, the students indicated that their teachers used various sources to address their schematic needs. Leslie's students indicated that she departed from the textbook to tailor its contents to their schemata: "Our textbook is intermediate. Every student's skills [are] higher than intermediate, so we needed this more difficult knowledge." Carol's students said, "She gave us more materials just to make the textbook more substantial, because the materials in the textbook are not enough for us" (curriculum-developers' group). Nicole's students agreed that she did not use a textbook

"because it's so easy for us" (curriculum-makers' group).

Pragmatic Needs

Apart from curriculum-transmitters, the students noted their teachers tried to develop the course to meet their pragmatic needs. Only the curriculum-developers and makers' students noted that their teachers responded to their vocational needs. Linda's students shared this opinion: "I'm learning English to get a good job. She has taught me something that I wanted." Ericka's students thanked her for addressing their academic needs: "I need all of them [listening, speaking, reading and writing] because I will take a Master's course." Carol's students agreed that she addressed their communicative and exam needs: "She teaches us how to use English. We also learn about exams" (curriculum-developers' group). Nicole's students agreed: "The aim... why we study here... is to use English. We use video films, TV programmes, and newspapers a lot. I like it because it's more related to reality, to our real life" (curriculum-makers' group).

Affective Needs

Yet again, apart from curriculum-transmitters, the students indicated that their teachers addressed their affective needs through addressing their motivation, interests, and updating content. Carol's class agreed, "She chose some very interesting topics." Mark's students stated that he supplemented topics to update content. One agreed and commented, "Everyday new things happen. If only we learn from the textbook, we won't get the new information he brings" (curriculum-developers' group). Nicole's students said that she provided what they were interested in because "The most important thing is the interesting topics, otherwise we don't want to learn." Rebecca's students also agreed: "It's old. We don't like textbooks but Rebecca [is] wonderful" (curriculum-makers' group).

Observed Lessons: On-Site Data

Through matching teacher and student statements and comparing them to observational data, this clarified certain aspects. Curriculum-developers and curriculum-makers were student-directed. They responded to student characteristics, as they skipped and adapted textbook parts and supplemented topics and materials. For example, Carol prepared a lesson about reading skills, like working out meaning from context because, as she also stated, her students were dictionary addicts. She wanted them to improve reading comprehension. Therefore, Carol wanted unconventional text to drive her students to work out meaning. The text included

words, like “bar” meaning “except,” which they would not know, unless they could hear it in context. Leslie’s students asked to learn about slang language, including the use of idioms and expressions. For example, she did lessons on slang language like this: “The fat that rolls around someone’s waist is called a ‘spare tire.’”

Apart from curriculum-transmitters, the teachers took the roles of facilitators, guides, and resource personnel. For example, Nicole asked her students to watch a video film. She joined each group for few minutes to facilitate discussions about the parts they watched and provided help regarding vocabulary. Rebecca’s students discussed their chosen reading texts about which they had to write a summary. At the same time, Rebecca was monitoring them and participating in each group to help those who had difficulties coping with the task. Apart from curriculum transmitters, the teachers also considered student differences in their lesson plans. Carol, for example, asked each student to write a story report, immediately after reading. She handled differences by giving the students who finished early, a separate task of writing sentences using relative pronouns. For those who had trouble finishing their work, she gave them more time to complete the job at hand.

Discussion and Conclusions

This study explored student-directed factors which lead to different teacher curriculum approaches and the possible connection between these motives and the curriculum-transmitter, curriculum-developer, and curriculum-maker’s taught curriculum. In answering the first research question, the study identified several student-related factors leading teachers to transmit, develop, or make curriculum. Teachers equally developed or made curriculum to address student language, pragmatic, schematic, and affective needs. Teachers acted to address students’ language needs whether accuracy, fluency, listening, reading, writing, or speaking. They developed or made curriculum to respond to students’ pragmatic needs, whether academic, vocational, or communicational. Teachers developed or made curriculum to meet student schematic needs by tailoring content and activities to match student schemas and building on their prior knowledge. The teachers equally developed or made curriculum to address student affective needs in terms of motivation, interests, and content updating. They developed or made curriculum to cater to students’ different learning styles. They developed or made curriculum to address student content-styles, whether predetermined, combined, or unpredictable. These conclusions, for example, concur in part with those of (Beck & Kosnik, 2001; Clemente et al., 2000; Eldridge, 1998; Gudmundsdottir, 1990; Heaton, 1993;

Lee, 1995; Remillard, 1999; Shawer, 2003, 2006; Woods, 1991).

These findings clearly put this study’s teachers on Snyder et al.’s (1992) continuum, where curriculum-developers closely approached their curriculum in the same way as the mutual-adaptation approach. Curriculum-makers also approached their curriculum in similar ways to the enactment approach that concurs with Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) who believed teachers no longer need external knowledge and criticize “prevailing concepts of teacher as technician, consumer, receiver, transmitter, and implementer of other people’s knowledge” (p. 16). Concerning curriculum-transmitters, they did not even live up to the fidelity approach implementation or delivery agenda. Indeed, curriculum-developers and makers perceived the dissonance and clash between the prescribed curriculum guidelines and their practical and professional knowledge. They took the risk of developing and making curriculum to address their contexts in similar ways to Craig’s (2006) conclusions from her narrative study; since curriculum-developers and makers “filter[ed] their curriculum... [where] what... they say and do inform[ed] their curriculum making and reveal[ed] their personal practical knowledge in action” (p. 261).

In answering the second research question, the study concluded that there were positive relationships between the teacher curriculum-developer and teacher curriculum-maker approaches and these learner-related factors. This means that a teacher who takes the above learner-related factors into consideration will either develop or make their own curriculum. By contrast, a negative relationship was established between the teacher curriculum-transmitter approach and the above factors. This means that the teachers who do not respond to student needs, interests, and differences do not develop curriculum and only transmit prescribed materials. These conclusions also concur with the view that constructivist teaching and learning (achieved by this study’s curriculum-developers and makers) has positive outcomes while transmissional pedagogy does not (Bruner, 1978; Craig, 2006; Parker, 1997; Piaget, 1955; Pollard, 1987; Richardson, 1997; Schön, 1983; Shawer, 2003; Terwel, 2005; Vygotsky, 1978; Wells, 1999).

Though curriculum-developers and makers seemed to develop and make curriculum for “student-related” reasons, “teacher-related” factors might have been working behind the scene, which future researchers might wish to investigate. Therefore, teachers’ teaching and content styles might be factors behind curriculum development. Curriculum-developers seemed to be learner-directed as they responded to their students’ needs; and were more facilitators, organizers and guides than teachers. They might have also developed

curriculum because they seemed to have occasional improvising styles, give up some lesson plans at times, and change planned teaching techniques at others. However, it might be because they seemed to have combined-content styles, where they used the curriculum materials, topics, and pedagogic strategies concurrently with theirs.

Eventually, it seems unclear why curriculum-makers adopted to make rather than develop curriculum, though they were very much like curriculum-developers in most respects, including experience, training, and staff-development. This, indeed, might intrigue researchers to study this difference. The only available interpretation is that curriculum-makers seemed to have unpredictable-content and improvising-teaching styles, since they did not use textbooks at all, nor did they follow the teacher's guide instructions.

Curriculum-transmitters might have just delivered materials because curriculum delivery might have been easier and safer for them. The interesting but also intriguing thing about curriculum-transmitters is that, although they had similar education, experience, staff, and self-development, they did not try to address their students' needs. This might be due to their teacher-centered teaching styles. Or might it be because they had textbook content-styles.

It seemed that curriculum-developers and makers developed their curriculum because they were well trained. This concurs with previous research conclusions that teachers cannot achieve curriculum developments without abundant subject-knowledge and pedagogic and curriculum skills (Clemente et al., 2000; Hansen, 1998; John, 2002; Shawer, 2006a; Spillane, 1999). However, teacher education had no bearing on curriculum-transmitters. One explanation could be their training was ineffective. Researchers might study training effectiveness on teachers' curriculum development. Curriculum-developers and makers might have also developed their curriculum because they were experienced, which is a conclusion supported by previous research where it indicated that novice rather than experienced teachers adhere to textbooks (Beck & Kosnik, 2001; Clemente et al., 2000; Doyle & Carter, 2003; Kirk & MacDonald, 2001). Yet again, curriculum-transmitters were experienced but never made curriculum developments. This suggests that though experience is pivotal, it is insufficient. Future researchers may study why experienced teachers just transmit curriculum materials.

Staff and self-development could have influenced curriculum developers and makers to improve curriculum that concurs with conclusions derived from Remillard's (1999) study. Once more, curriculum-transmitters were almost at the same levels of staff and self-development, but achieved quite different

curricula. Management policy in terms of the degree of freedom curriculum developers and makers enjoyed could have driven them to develop curriculum, which previous research also supports (Benavot & Resh, 2003; Craig, 2001; Eisner, 2000; Gess-Newsome & Lederman, 1995). However, this was not the case with curriculum-transmitters (particularly Terry) who enjoyed a great deal of freedom to tackle curriculum but never made an effort to improve it.

Therefore, we had teachers (for example, Leslie and Mark) who were monitored to just transmit curriculum, but they chose to develop curriculum. In contrast, those who had freedom to develop or even make curriculum (for example, Terry) just transmitted textbook content. This might go back to teachers' beliefs, which researchers might wish to examine. All these contradictions about the differences between these teachers, definitely call for a study about *teacher-directed* motives behind their different curriculum approaches.

We should finally point out that the EFL context does not exclusively make curriculum development learner-driven. Rather, we cautiously believe that learner-driven motives could lead teachers to develop curriculum in similar ways in other similar contexts because case studies lead to theoretical rather than statistical generalisation, in which the reader can generalise the techniques and issues to their own contexts (Yin, 1994). Of course, future researchers may study the impact of learner-driven motives on curriculum development in other contexts. We chose to study these motives in relation to the EFL context because it is our area of specialisation. We do not claim any correlation between the EFL context and curriculum development because we did not intend to assess the impact of the EFL context on the curriculum development process.

Implications for Future Practice/Research

In addition to the aforementioned recommendations, the results of this study support that initial teacher-education institutions should equip teachers with curriculum development skills at the classroom level in addition to subject, pedagogic and deep curriculum content knowledge. Policy-makers should adopt broad curriculum development approaches that provide core skills and concepts that teachers address in their own ways and resources. This would drive teachers to plan and develop their own courses. Future researchers may wish to investigate the impact of the different curriculum approaches (curriculum-transmitter/ curriculum-developer/ curriculum-maker) on the following: teachers' professional development (cognitive); teachers' job satisfaction (affective); students' learning (cognitive

development); and students' motivation (affective development).

References

- Basanta, C. (1996). Comment: In the name of the teacher. *ELT Journal*, 50(9), 263-264.
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2001). Reflection-in action: In defence of thoughtful teaching. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 31, 217-227.
- Bell, J., & Gower, R. (1998). Writing materials for the world: A great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 116-128). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, J. S. (1993). Discussion of Kerfoot and Wrigley: The teacher as bridge between program and practice. *Tesol Quarterly*, 27(3), 467-475.
- Benavot, A., & Resh, N. (2003). Educational governance, school autonomy, and curriculum implementation: A comparative study of Arab and Jewish schools in Israel. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(2), 171-196.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (1990). *The teacher-curriculum encounter: Freeing teachers from the tyranny of texts*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Bhola, H. S. (1999). Equivalent curriculum construction as situated discourse: A case in the context of adult education in Namibia. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(4), 459-484.
- Blaikie, N. (2000). *Designing social research*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity Press.
- Bloom, M., Fischer, J., & Orme, J. (1995). *Evaluation practice: Guidelines for the accountable professional*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bruner, J. (1978). *Towards a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Harvard University Press.
- Burns, R. (2000). *Introduction to research methods*. London: Sage.
- Carter, R., Hughes, R., & McCarthy, M. (1998). Telling tails: Grammar, the spoken language and materials development. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 67-86). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Carus, M. (1990). The small publisher in a national market. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 86-96). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 363-401). New York: Macmillan.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1998). Stories to live by: Narrative understandings of school reform. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28(2), 149-164.
- Clarke, A. (1999). *Evaluation research: An introduction to principles, methods and practice*. London: Sage.
- Clemente, M., Ramirez, E., & Dominguez, B. (2000). The selection of contents in school projects in Spain. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 30, 295-317.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher*, 28(7), 15-25.
- Cody, C. (1990). The politics of textbook publishing, adoption, and use. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 127-145). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Cohen, D. K., & Ball, D. L. (1999) Instruction, capacity, and improvement. *CPRE Research Report Series RR-43, Consortium for Policy Research in Education*, University of Pennsylvania.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Craig, C. J. (2001). The relationships between and among teachers' narrative knowledge, communities of knowing, and school reform: A case of the monkey's paw. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 31, 303-331.
- Craig, C.J. (2006). Why is dissemination so difficult? The nature of teacher knowledge and the spread of curriculum reform. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(2), 257-293.
- Davies, C. (1999). *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. New York: Routledge.
- Denscombe, M. (1998). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects* Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education* New York: Macmillan.
- Doyle, W. (1992). Curriculum and pedagogy. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 486-516). New York: Macmillan.

- Doyle, W., & Carter, K. (2003). Narrative and learning to teach: Implications for teacher-education curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(2), 129-137.
- Eisner, E. (1990). A development agenda: Creative curriculum development and practice. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 6(1) 62-73.
- Eisner, E. W. (2000). Those who ignore the past...:12 "easy" lessons for the next millennium. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(2), 343-357.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). From episteme to phronesis to artistry in the study and improvement of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 375-385.
- Eldridge, J. S. (1998). Searching for meaning: Reflections on meaningful professional development. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28, 491-502.
- Elliot, D. (1990). Textbooks and the curriculum in the post-war era: 1950-1980. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.) *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 42-55). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Elliott, D., & Woodward, A. (1990). Textbooks, curriculum, and school improvement. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 56-72). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1992). Students' experience of the curriculum. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 465-485). New York: Macmillan.
- Foshay, A. (1990). Textbooks and the curriculum during the progressive era: 1930-1950. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 222-232). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Freeman, D., J., & Porter, A., C. (1989). Do textbooks dictate the content of mathematics instruction in elementary schools? *American Educational Research Journal*, 26(3), 403-421.
- Gess-Newsome, J., & Lederman, N. G. (1995). Biology teachers' perceptions of subject matter structure and its relationship to classroom practice. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 32(3), 301-325.
- Gipps, C., & MacGilchrist, B. (1999). Primary school learners. In P. Mortimore (Ed.), *Understanding pedagogy and its impact on learning* (pp. 46-67). London: Paul Chapman.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gross, R. (1996). *Psychology: The science of mind and behaviour*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Guba, E. S., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). London: Sage.
- Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990). Values in pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41, 44-52.
- Hansen, S. (1998). Preparing student teachers for curriculum-making. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 30(2), 165-179.
- Hawke, S., & Davis, J. (1990). Small publishers: Filling market niches. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 86-96). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Heaton, R. M. (1993). Who is minding the mathematics content? A case study of a fifth-grade teacher. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93, 153-162.
- Hyttén, K. (2000). The resurgence of Dewey: Are his educational ideas still relevant? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(3), 453-466.
- Jackson, P. W. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.) *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 3-40). New York: Macmillan.
- John, P. D. (2002). The teacher educator's experience: Case studies of practical professional knowledge. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 323-341.
- Jolly, D., & Bolitho, R. (1998). A framework for materials writing. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 90-115). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Keiny, S. (1999). Response to human rights in history and civics textbooks: The case of Israel. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(4), 513-521.
- Kelly, A. (1999). *Curriculum theory and practice*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Kirk, D., & MacDonald, D. (2001). Teacher voice and ownership of curriculum change. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 33(5), 551-567.
- Klein, P. D. (2003). Rethinking the multiplicity of cognitive resources and curriculum representations: Alternatives to learning styles and multiple intelligences. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(1), 45-81.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lee, O. (1995). Subject matter knowledge, classroom management, and instructional practices in a middle school science classroom. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 32, 423-440.

- Maley, A. (1990). New lamps for old realism and surrealism in foreign language teaching. In R. Rossner & R. Bolitho (Eds.), *Currents of change in English language teaching* (pp. 295-304). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Marker, G., & Mehlinger, H. (1992). Social studies. In P. W. Jackson (ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 830-851). New York: Macmillan.
- Meehan, P. (2006). How an understanding of individual learning styles can pay dividends in class. *TEFL Net*. Retrieved on December 12, 2006, from <http://www.TEFL.net/esl-articles/learning-styles.htm>
- Morgan, D. (1988). *Focus group as qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Neill, R. (1990). Why use textbooks? In R. Rossner & R. Bolitho (Eds.), *Currents of change in English language teaching* (pp. 104-111). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, S. (1997). *Reflective teaching in the postmodern world: A manifesto for education in post modernity*. Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.
- Piaget, J. (1955). *The child's construction of reality*. London: Routledge.
- Pollard, A. (1987). *Children and their primary schools. A new perspective*. London: Falmer Press.
- Pollard, A., & Triggs, P. (1997). *Reflective teaching in secondary education: A handbook for schools and colleges*. London: Cassell.
- Randolph, D., Duffy, E., & Mattingly, K. (2007). The 3 P's of curriculum redesign: principles, personal qualities and process. *Independent School*, 66(3), 86-92.
- Remillard, J. (1999) Curriculum materials in mathematics education reform: A framework for examining teachers' curriculum development. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29, 315-342.
- Richardson, V. (1997). Constructivist teaching and teacher education: Theory and practice. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings* (pp. 23-35). London: Falmer.
- Riding, R., & Rayner, S. (1998). *Cognitive styles and learning strategies: Understanding style differences in learning and behaviour*. London: David Fulton.
- Sapsford, R., & Abbott, P. (1996). Ethics, politics and research. In R. Sapsford & V. Jupp (Eds.), *Data collection and data analysis* (pp. 317-340). London: Sage.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Hants: Aldershot.
- Schultz, B., & Oyler, C. (2006). We make this road as we walk together: Sharing teacher authority in a social action curriculum project, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 36(4), 424-451.
- Shawer, S. (2006a). Communicative-based curriculum innovations between theory and practice: Implications for EFL curriculum development and student learning and motivation. *Ain Shams University Faculty of Education Journal*, 30(4), 30-72.
- Shawer, S. (2006b). *Effective teaching and learning in generic education and foreign language teaching methodology: Learners' cognitive styles, foreign language skills instruction and teachers' professional development*. Cairo, Egypt: Dar El-Fikr El-Arabi.
- Shawer, S. F. (2001). *Teachers' curriculum development: A framework for examining the effects of teachers' conceptualisation of the communicative approach on the development and use of curriculum materials*. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Shawer, S. F. (2003). *Bringing curriculum-in-action to the classroom: a study of teachers' curriculum development approaches and their implications for student and teacher development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Manchester, Manchester, England.
- Sheldon, L. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 237-246.
- Siraj-Blatchford, I. (1999). Early childhood pedagogy: Practice, principles and research. In P. Mortimore (Ed.), *Understanding pedagogy and its impact on learning* (pp. 23-40). London: Paul.
- Skilbeck, M. (1982). Three educational ideologies. In T. Horton & P. Raggat (Eds.), *Challenge and change in the curriculum* (pp. 7-18). Kent, United Kingdom: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Snyder, J., Bolin, F., & Zumwalt, K. (1992). Curriculum implementation. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.) *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 402-435). New York: Macmillan.
- Spillane, J. P. (1999). External reform initiatives and teachers' efforts to construct their practice: The mediating role of teachers' zone of enactment. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(2), 143-175.
- Squire, J., & Morgan, R. (1990). The elementary and high school textbook market today. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 107-126). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Talmage, H. (1972). The textbook as arbiter of curriculum and instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 73, 20-25.
- Terwel, J. (1999). Constructivism and its implications for curriculum theory and practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31, 195-299.
- Terwel, J. (2005). Curriculum differentiation: Multiple perspectives and developments in education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 26(4), 653-670.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Tulley, M., & Farr, R. (1990). Textbook evaluation and selection. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 162-177). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Venezky, R. L. (1992). Textbooks in school and society. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 436-461). New York: Macmillan.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watts, M., & Ebbutt, D. (1987). More than the sum of parts: Research methods in group interviewing. *British Educational Research Journal*, 13, 25-34.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenden, A. (1986). Helping language learners think about learning, *ELT Journal*, 40(1), 3-12.
- Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515-537.
- Westbury, I. (1990). Textbooks, textbook publisher, and the quality of schooling. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 1-22). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Wetton, P. (1998). Physical development in the early years. In I. Siraj-Blatchford (Ed.), *A curriculum development handbook for early childhood educators* (pp. 93-107). Oakhill, United Kingdom: Trentham.
- Woods, D. (1991). Teachers' interpretations of second language teaching curricula. *RELC Journal*, 22, 18.
- Woodward, A., & Elliott, D. (1990a). Textbooks consensus and controversy. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 146-161). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Woodward, A., & Elliott, D. (1990b). Textbook use and Teacher Professionalism. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 178-193). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, M. (1990). Writing and editing textbooks. In D. Elliot & A. Woodward (Eds.), *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 71-85). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

SAAD SHAWER is an assistant professor (first author) of Curriculum and Instruction, Al-Azhar University, College of Education, Sixth District, Nasr City, Cairo, Egypt, Tel: 224038339. Fax: 224038956. He was a visiting scholar at Washington State University, College of Education. Email: saadsaad71@yahoo.com (main email)/ saadshawer@wsu.edu. He got his MA from Cardiff University, MPhil from Cambridge University, and Ph.D. from Manchester University. His interests involve curriculum development and teachers' professional development.

DEANNA GILMORE is an assistant professor (second author) of Literacy Education at the University of Idaho, department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Room 506-C, Tel: 208-885-0629, fax 208-885-0560 Email: dgilmore@uidaho.edu. Her work with students in isolated Alaskan Native villages as well as Native American communities has fostered her interest in teaching English as a second language to students of all ages.

SUSANRAE BANKS-JOSEPH is an associate professor (third author) Washington State University, College of Education, PO Box 642132, Pullman, WA 99164-2132, Tel: 509-335-7064/ Fax: 509-335-5046. Email: sbanks@wsu.edu. She received her Ph.D. from Penn State. Research interests involve early childhood, special education; educational assessment, and teacher preparation inclusive of curriculum development at both pre-service and in-service levels.

Appendix A

Interview main and follow-up questions with teachers:

NB. Only the main questions were asked. The follow-up questions were not asked as long as the respondents mentioned them in their conversation. The interview was open-ended and the follow-up questions were extended from one interview to another through probing the issues the respondents raised.

How do you approach your Language curriculum?

- Do you adhere to the textbook scope, sequence, pages and lessons?
- Do you skip parts of the textbook? Do you supplement other materials?
- Do you adapt or change parts in the textbook you use?
- Do you substitute the textbook topics with your own topics?
- Do you follow the curriculum objectives, adapt or change them?
- Do you follow the time allocated to topics and lessons in the teacher's guide?
- Do you use the pedagogic strategies and instructions in the teacher's guide?

Why do you approach the course in the way you do?

- students
- course nature
- college policy

Appendix B

Pre- and post-observation interviews with teachers:

N.B. This type of interviews had to be direct, which might seem to be leading. They had to be so, in order to drive teachers to supply answers about certain observed actions.

Interviews before Observations

- What did you plan to teach for today's lesson?
- Why did you prepare it?

Interviews after Observations

- Did you depart from your lesson plan? Why?
- Did you make changes in the textbook content? What were the changes? Why did you make them?
- How did you respond to your students' different needs and differences in today's lesson?
- Which parts of the lesson do you think were successful? Which parts were unsuccessful? Why do you think so?
- What teaching/ learning strategies and techniques did you use?
- Did you follow the pedagogic strategies and instructions in the teacher's guide? Why/ not?

Appendix C

Interview main and follow-up questions with students:

- How does your teacher approach/ teach your course?
- Why do you think your teacher teaches this way?
- How does your teacher use the textbook?
 - - Does the teacher adhere to the textbook sequence, pages and lessons?
 - - Does the teacher skip parts of the textbook? Does s/he supplement other materials or lessons?
 - - Does the teacher make changes in the textbook exercises? Lessons?
- Why do you think your teacher uses it this way?
- Which kind of material do you like your teacher to use? Does s/he already use them? Why do you think s/he uses them rather than others?
- Do you think your teacher has responded to your needs/differences? Why do you think so?
- What kind of teaching activities does your teacher use in your classroom? Are you happy with them? Why?
- Do you think that your classroom teaching/ learning is effective? Why?