This paper set out to examine the motives that drive EFL/ESL teachers to either make, develop, or just deliver curriculum content (teacher curriculum approaches). Recent shifts in curriculum research turn to teacher curriculum approaches (curriculum-transmission, curriculum-development, and curriculum-making) for their significant impact on teachers, student learning outcomes (SLOs) and curriculum (e.g., Craig, 2006; Eisner, 2002; Randolph, Duffy, & Mattingly, 2007; Remillard, 1999; Schultz & Oyler, 2006; Shawer, 2010a). On the one hand, prior research reports numerous positive effects of classroom-level curriculum development (through adopting either the teacher curriculum-making or curriculum-development approach) on SLOs (Eisner, 1990; Erickson & Shultz, 1992; King, 2002; Shawer, Gilmore, & Banks-Joseph, 2008; Wells, 1999), teacher professional development, and curriculum improvement (Craig, 2006; Eisner, 2002; Munby, 1990; Parker, 1997; Shawer, 2010b). SLOs are statements which describe what students are expected to know or be able to do by the end of, for example, a lesson or course. On the other hand, prior research reports negative consequences of teacher curriculum-transmission for teachers, students and curriculum...
1. Teacher curriculum approaches

When teachers implement curriculum, they usually follow a *curriculum fidelity, curriculum adaptation or curriculum enactment* approach (Ben-Peretz, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 1992; Eisner, 1990; Erickson & Shultz, 1992; Jackson, 1992; Munby, 1990; Snyder et al., 1992). The three approaches differ in their treatment of *curriculum conceptualization, curriculum knowledge, curriculum change, and the teachers’ role*. In a *fidelity approach*, curriculum conceptualization is just “a course of study, a coursebook series, a guide, a set of teacher plans” alongside predetermined and standardized evaluation instruments and guidelines (Snyder et al., 1992, p. 447). Since an external curriculum team always defines *curriculum* for teachers, *curriculum change* starts from the center to the periphery in rational, linear and systematic procedures. In a context similar to this, the teachers’ *role* is that of a consumer who just delivers the curriculum message as intact as possible according to specific curriculum implementation instructions (Jackson, 1992; Snyder et al., 1992).

The *mutual-adaptation approach* involves a process “whereby adjustments in a curriculum are made by curriculum developers and those who use it in the school or classroom context” (Snyder et al., 1992, p. 410). The external team discusses with the teachers the necessary adjustments needed to make curriculum relevant to their settings. Despite enfranchising teachers to make adaptations in the received curriculum under curriculum experts’ supervision, *curriculum knowledge* did not differ significantly from the fidelity approach. External developers still define and provide curriculum knowledge. In contrast, improvements have been made to curriculum change and teachers’ role. *Curriculum change* no longer follows linear procedures, whereas the teachers’ role has become active (Ben-Peretz, 1990; Snyder et al., 1992).

The *enactment approach*, on the other hand, involves major differences in curriculum conceptualization, since curriculum is “jointly created and jointly and individually experienced by students and teacher” (Snyder et al., 1992, p. 428). This suggests classroom-level curriculum development may not rely on an external curriculum. Moreover, curriculum *knowledge* changed from an externally defined body into an ongoing process of constructions of experiences that result from teacher and student interactions (Erickson & Shultz, 1992; Munby, 1990; Snyder et al., 1992). As a result, external curriculum knowledge is “viewed as a resource for teachers who create curriculum as they engage in the ongoing process of teaching and learning in the classroom” (p. 429). *Curriculum change* also changed from implementing or even adapting curriculum into “a process of growth for teachers and students, a change in thinking and practice” (p. 429). Such changes in curriculum knowledge and curriculum change engendered further changes in the *teachers’ role* to range from using, adapting and supplementing external curriculum materials to developing curriculum in consultation with learners. “While teachers may use externally designed curriculum and benefit from the stimulation of an ‘outside’, it is they and their students who create the enacted curriculum and give meaning to it.” This means “teachers are creators rather than primarily receivers of curriculum knowledge” (p. 429).

2. Classroom-level curriculum development

Classroom-level curriculum development involves curriculum-development and curriculum-making processes that teachers make in the official curriculum at the classroom level. An official received curriculum includes intended learning outcomes, topics, material (usually coursebooks), pedagogical instructions (teacher’s guides accompanying coursebooks), and guidelines about
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