

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN ENGLISH CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Godfrey A. Steele

This article explores the nature, achievement, and implications of teachers' participation in English curriculum development by focusing on teachers' functions, defined as what teachers do. Responses to a questionnaire (n=79) and data from a sub-sample (n=12) collected from classroom observations, interviews, teacher self-ratings, and student ratings of teachers and their teaching were obtained from teachers in 14 secondary schools in North Trinidad. The study found that teachers have a mainly consultative role in curriculum development. The discussion of the data on teacher functions addresses three issues involved in teacher participation in English curriculum development: its nature, teachers' contribution, and the implications of such teacher contribution for individuals and institutions.

Introduction

There is uncertainty about the actual and potential role of teachers in curriculum development. For example, this uncertainty is present in the area of curriculum reform and curriculum decision making (Johnston, 1995; Klein, 1999; Konzal, 1997). The classroom teacher faces the challenge of reflecting on philosophical and curriculum development issues which can shape his practice (Pring, 1975, pp. 178-179). In my view, the philosophical issues are a priori questions such as: What should be my curriculum decision-making role? How do I decide what is most appropriate? The curriculum issues are questions about suitability, coverage, balance, depth of content; and questions about planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Practice can also shape the teacher's curriculum beliefs. It has been shown that there is a tendency in official circles not to prescribe specific syllabuses, but to issue general guidelines (Caribbean Examinations Council [CXC], 1982; Miller, 1984, p. 157). It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that in the absence of specific guidelines, the classroom teacher has a critical role in curriculum philosophizing and decision making. The presence of

Godfrey A. Steele

specific guidelines may not guarantee that teachers will follow them, but their absence can make curriculum supervision more difficult.

In this study, curriculum is treated as "experience and as communication between teacher, learner and environment" (Skilbeck, 1982, p. 4). The curriculum is not merely a static instrument or vehicle for learning. It is a negotiated experience arising out of the interactions emanating from the inputs of the teacher, the learner, and the learning environment. It is not only "what is taught to students" (Sowell, 2000, p. 1). It is also what teachers and students derive from the experience.

The remainder of this paper is presented in four sections: 1) the literature review, which discusses the background issues and the theoretical framework: curriculum concepts, teacher participation, and research questions; 2) a description of the methodology of the study; 3) a presentation of the findings; and 4) a discussion of the implications for individuals such as teachers, students, and administrators; and organizations such as schools, training institutes, and ministries of education.

Literature Review

Historical background

This investigation of teacher participation in English curriculum development took place in the context of the historical background of the English curriculum in Trinidad. The development of English curriculum in the Caribbean and in Trinidad, in particular, was influenced by various approaches to the teaching and learning of English. The learning of English began in nonformal functional settings in 19th century Caribbean slave society (Roberts, 1988), and so the first approach associated with learning English may have been that of fulfilling a practical and functional role. Creole was used in religious education (Devonish, 1983, pp. 58-59), suggesting that it was a means of communication, but this did not mean that Creole had official language status. The official status of English led to the mistaken popular assumption that English was the first language of students in Trinidad (Carrington, Borely, & Knight, 1972, 1974; Robertson, 1996, p. 113). The suggestion here is that English, as a curriculum subject, developed against a background of various societal and historical imperatives.

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

The development of English curriculum was influenced by a number of difficulties relating to the assumptions behind the teaching of English and the role of English as a subject. Carrington and Borely (1978) commented on language problems in Trinidad, such as uncertainty and lack of clarity about the status and methods of teaching English in the primary school. They noted that "neither the teaching service nor the public have been adequately prepared to accept the [1975 primary school] syllabus" (p. 65). They also recommended that "the teaching force must be intimately involved in all phases of the development of new syllabus and curriculum" (p. 66).

Writing about the teaching of English to vernacular speakers in Caribbean schools, Craig (1999, pp. 30-32) referred to constraints on the efficacy of language education and literacy. These constraints included a number of misconceptions. They were the "tacit assumption that English is the mother tongue"; "confusion of objectives in language and literacy education"; "misconceptions about communicative language teaching"; and "misapplied philosophical positions." In addition, there were wider social and economic factors that created some difficulty, such as "the persistence of elitist traditions among secondary schools," for example; "the unhelpful priority interests of educational publishers"; and "the failure of educational authorities to be focused and consistent in the quest for improvement."

Another feature of the history of the English curriculum in the English-speaking Caribbean is that secondary schools in Trinidad were founded on the tradition of grammar schools in England (Gocking, 1970, p. 104). This means that the British experience in developing English as a subject may have influenced the way English developed as a subject in the curriculum in the Caribbean. In grammar schools, "academic" subjects were emphasized over "technical" subjects. Within this setting, the approach to teaching English teaching would have focused on language as grammar. Shayer (1972) has traced the history of English teaching in England, showing that there was a "strong linguistic grammar bias" in the University of London's first official English paper in 1839. It is not unreasonable to assume that this linguistic bias may have been an influence on the development of a grammar-before-speech emphasis, which deserves more investigation than is possible within the framework of this paper.

Curriculum development

Godfrey A. Steele

Given the difficulties, misconceptions, and academic tradition just described, the pattern in England, to some extent, would have been reflected in the British colony of Trinidad. A likely effect was that those who were responsible for the teaching of English as a subject would have struggled for some time to develop a distinctive subject identity, and to achieve acceptance for English as a subject of study. During this period of change and growth in the subject's identity and status, the teacher's role in curriculum development would have had an opportunity to shape and be shaped by the teacher's relationship to the subject called English. In other words, the curriculum as enacted (Sowell, 2000) would have been shaped by the subjective reality of teachers, and by a view of "curriculum development as a mutual construction of content and meaning by teachers and students" (Paris, 1993 as cited in Sowell, 2000, p. 14). In turn, the experience of a curriculum evolving within a specific context would have had an effect on teachers' and students' enactment of the curriculum.

In addition, a number of social, political, and economic factors, as well as subject identity issues, influenced the development of English curriculum in Trinidad (Steele, 1995, pp. 40-41). The period from 1859 to the mid-1920s in Trinidad was characterized by problems of English subject identity. These related to the study of Latin and the assumption that the mastery of grammar was necessary before reading or writing was possible, and an uncritical acceptance of the utilitarian role of English in preparing an educated elite (James, 1963).

The period of the 1920s to the 1950s was marked by the increasing influence of social, economic, and political forces on the education system, within an increasingly assertive liberal framework. This period was also influenced by an egalitarian mood that witnessed the criticisms of the 1933 Marriott-Mayhew Report. The criticisms of the 1933 report, which echoed responses to previous reports, led to the 1946 primary schools syllabus. This syllabus stressed the "use of every opportunity to correct common errors of speech" as an appropriate strategy for the teacher whose role was to correct "mistakes of speech and writing of the pupils" (Carrington, Borely, & Knight 1972, pp. 13-14).

Other influences on English curriculum development were the expansion of state education in the 1950s to early 1970s (Gocking, 1970, p. 105), and the post-1970 period. This latter period was concerned with the re-evaluation of the role of education in the society, the physical expansion of the school system, the re-evaluation of curricula, and the advent of the

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

CXC English Language (English A) in 1979 and English Literature (English B) syllabuses in 1980. During this phase of social change and reflection, the school curriculum was under review.

During a period of change and innovation, the meaning of change is rarely clear at the beginning (Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991). Furthermore, change is accompanied by ambivalence and uncertainty, and teachers may feel the need to make many decisions (Lieberman, 1992) and may feel pressured, or be unwilling, to participate in "imposed change" (Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 36). I would argue that in such a period it is not unreasonable to expect that the role of the teacher in curriculum development would have been more critical and interpretive.

Curriculum development and English teaching

In the literature on curriculum development and English teaching, a number of observations and findings provide an orientation to the meaning of curriculum as negotiated experience adopted in this paper. Firstly, curriculum development is treated as a process. This process includes decision making and involves planning, implementation, and evaluation (Oliva, 1982, p. 24). In general, views of reality influence the technical and non-technical perspectives taken by persons involved in curriculum processes (Sowell, 2000). For example, the technical approaches assume objective and subjective approaches to curriculum development. From the technical objective perspective, the concern is with checking that the curriculum, as planned, is implemented. However, this approach has been described as ineffective since the implementers are not part of the change process (Fullan with Stiegelbauer, 1991; Leithwood, 1991; Sowell, 2000, p. 13).

The subjective technical perspective (Patterson, Purkey, & Parker, 1986) recognizes that the curriculum is implemented with students, and that "evaluation includes assessing the degree to which the negotiated curriculum is implemented as well as the degree to which its purpose is attained" (Leithwood, 1991; Sowell, 2000, p. 14). The non-technical approach has a subjective view of reality and is concerned with curriculum development as "mutual construction of content and meaning by teachers and students" (Paris, 1993 as cited in Sowell, 2000, p. 14)). As Sowell (2000) points out, "whether generating a new curriculum or revising an existing one, curriculum development means recreating or modifying what is

Godfrey A. Steele

taught to students. Development includes a number of decisions" (pp. 10-11).

Further, curriculum development is "rooted in personal meaning and in dialogue about what schools should do" (Miller & Seller, 1985, p. 3). Thus, a curriculum is not merely a document or a programme of activities, but it involves "interaction between students and teachers" (Miller & Seller, 1985, p. 3). This view is consistent with the non-technical subjective perspective in which the curriculum is "enacted" rather than implemented (Sowell, 2000, p. 14). The curriculum is enacted since it is created in the same situation in which it is used.

The nature of teacher participation

The concept of teacher functions provides some understanding of the nature of teacher participation in English curriculum development in Trinidad. Functions are defined as teachers' actions, tasks, behaviours, or similar variables that could affect their ability to develop the English curriculum. These functions were characterized in six main ways (Steele, 1995, p. 116):

1. Teaching experience
2. Qualifications and training
3. Curriculum development experience
4. Subjects taught
5. Opportunities for curriculum decision making
6. Factors (professional and personal) influencing curriculum decisions

The present study focused on items 3, 5, and 6.

Research questions

This paper argues that the teacher's role is critical to curriculum development. There are three main dimensions:

- The teacher's conception of curriculum
- The teacher's decision-making
- The nature of power relationships

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

For the sake of economy and practicality, this paper explores the significance of only the first two dimensions in relation to teacher participation in English curriculum development, by addressing three questions:

1. What is the nature of teacher participation?
2. What can teachers contribute?
3. What are the implications of teacher participation for individuals and institutions?

Methodology

The present study: Purpose and design

A combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies was used. The quantitative analysis involved frequency counts of statements made in the questionnaire, interviews, and the comparison of rating scores of students and teachers. The qualitative analysis followed the tradition described as grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). In this approach, theory emerges in the course of data collection arising from the interplay between data collection and analysis.

The present study focused on selected data concerning teachers' curriculum decisions and the basis of these decisions (items 5 and 6 above). All 95 teachers of English in 14 secondary schools spanning six school types (senior secondary, composite, junior secondary, senior comprehensive, traditional government, traditional assisted) in North Trinidad were asked to complete a 29-item questionnaire designed to explore the role of teachers in curriculum development. There were 79 respondents (83%). Questionnaire items 15-17, related to teachers' decision making and participation in English curriculum development in their schools, are used in this study (see Appendix A).

A sub sample (n=12) of the questionnaire respondents was selected (using two teachers from each of the six types of school) for classroom observation and the members of the sample agreed to be interviewed (see Appendix B) about the lesson observed. The classroom observations were analyzed at four levels: school type, school, teacher, and number of events noted in observing teachers. These levels were selected to reflect the researcher's descriptions of the location, context, personnel, and events observed, as patterns in the data emerged. The interviews were analyzed at four levels: the process of teaching, the influence of students, the curriculum content,

Godfrey A. Steele

and the school system. These levels were selected using emergent patterns from the data based on grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In this process, the researcher records the statements of interviewees and codes their statements using categories of what the respondents talk about.

The analysis of the interview data focused on the main ways in which teachers functioned (or operated) in the process of teaching, which revealed something about their role in curriculum development. The interview data were compared to ratings of teachers by the teachers and their students (see Appendices C and D). In this way, triangulation of the data was possible. Complementary use of the quantitative and qualitative analyses reinforced the triangulation procedure.

Findings

Questionnaire data

Teachers' responses (n=79: 9 males and 70 females) showed that teachers' functions related to decisions about content and textbooks for levels of schooling, and involved various degrees of participation in curriculum development. For example, 69.6% and 77.2% of the sample respectively reported that the entire department participated in determining what content should be covered and what texts should be used at various levels in the school. More teachers (87.3%) reported being invited to suggest materials for use than being asked to produce or obtain (53.2%) such materials (Items 15-17).

Classroom observations

Observations of the sub-sample of 12 teachers teaching their students revealed four categories of functions and two categories of related functions (see Table 1). The frequency counts showed the main types of functions and factors across four levels of analysis: the numbers of the school type, the school, the teacher, and the events noted. Table 1 shows the four significant kinds of functions and two sets of factors. "Functions" are the observed classroom behaviours of teachers as they engaged in curriculum-related activities. "Factors" are the reported influences on teachers' decision making. Teacher factors include teachers' personal knowledge and experiences, as well as their personal values. Student factors include students' input such as comments, their responses, and motivation.

Interviews

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

The interview data (see Appendix B) provided four sets of coded functions associated with the teachers' role in English curriculum development: TEACHING, STUDENT, CONTENT, and SYSTEM. These four functions were associated, respectively, with the process of teaching, the influence of students, curriculum content, and the school system. The findings showed that there were six main ways in which the teachers functioned in the process of teaching. The dominant citations by teachers during the interview occurred in relation to English teaching decisions, planning, evaluation, philosophy and methods. The functions associated with the process of teaching addressed traditionally recognized aspects of curriculum development.

Table 1. Categories of Observed Teacher Functions

Category	No. of School Types	No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Events Noted
Teacher Functions:				
1. Guiding	6	9	11	23
2. Task Giving	6	10	12	38
3. Content/ Knowledge Use	6	10	12	24
4. Managing	6	10	12	19
Teacher Factors	3*	3*	3*	3*
Student Factors	7*	7*	7*	9*

*This number is an aggregate of various factors.

Table 2 illustrates the areas that appeared to occur most frequently in the interviewer's discussions with teachers. Similarly, the other sets of data (Tables 3-5) illustrate the outstanding citations made by teachers in relation to their students, the curriculum content, and the school system aspects of their English teaching.

Ratings

Godfrey A. Steele

Both teachers and their students were asked to independently rate the teachers' behaviour. Data on ratings by teachers and students were compared. Teachers and students tended to agree on the extent to which teachers:

- select work outside the text
- clarify objectives
- clarify what is expected of students
- try to adhere to objectives
- emphasize aspects of content
- consider the suitability of work
- match content with students' interests

Teachers, however, gave themselves higher ratings than their students in sequencing textbook content and in lesson planning but students' ratings were higher for the provision of adequate time for learning, and for the issue of teachers really testing what they taught.

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

Table 2. Categories of Interviewed Teachers' TEACHING Functions

Category	No. of School Types	No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Events Noted
Personal	6	8	10	18
English Teaching	6	9	10	26
Job				
1. Duties	6	9	9	18
2. Planning	6	10	12	31
Planning	6	9	9	33
Evaluation	6	9	10	33
Implementation	4	4	5	5
Design				
1. Philosophy	5	7	9	29
2. Syllabus Use	6	10	11	6
3. Methods	6	10	11	26
4. Time Use	6	9	9	3

Table 3. Categories of Interviewed Teachers' STUDENT Functions

Category	No. of School Types	No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Events Noted
Psychological				
1. Motivation	5	6	8	16
2. Ability	6	6	1	18
3. Needs	5	9	9	27
Philosophical	4	5	5	14
Sociological	6	7	8	16

Table 4. Categories of Interviewed Teachers' CONTENT Functions

Category	No. of School Types	No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No of Events Noted
Syllabus/ Programme	5	6	6	11
Texts/ Materials	5	8	11	16

Table 5. Categories of Interviewed Teachers' SYSTEM Functions

Category	No. of School Types	No. of Schools	No. of Teachers	No. of Events Noted
Education				
1. School Performance	6	9	9	12
2. Curriculum Development	6	10	12	67
3. School System	5	7	11	14
Economy	5*	7*	8*	11*
Wider Society	3	3*	3	4

* This number is an aggregate of various factors.

Discussion

This study addressed the nature of teacher participation, the potential contributions of teachers, and the implications of teacher contribution. What exactly do teachers do that relates to their actual and potential participation in English curriculum development?

The nature of teacher participation

Teacher participation, in most instances, involved school-based decisions about content and texts. Teachers were more likely to be asked to suggest materials rather than to produce them. This type of teacher participation is consistent with Klein's (1991) six categories of decisions made in the course of developing and using curricula in classrooms: 1) content; 2) goals,

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

objectives and purposes; 3) materials and resources; 4) activities and teaching strategies; 5) evaluation; and 6) grouping, time and space. In the process of making decisions, people's underlying values and beliefs are influential (Goodlad & Su, 1992). An important area of influence for teachers is in the realm of pedagogical content knowledge, a combination of content and pedagogy that is part of the professional understanding that teachers have (Shulman 1987, p. 7). This study confirms the nature of teacher participation in English curriculum development in classroom decision making about content, and the best way of influencing the curriculum, in the sense of not only "what is taught to students" (Sowell, 2000, p. 1), but also what they derive from the experience.

Teacher contribution

The foregoing discussion of the data presented earlier suggests a number of ways in which teachers participate in curriculum development. The nature of their contribution involves the interplay of functions related to TEACHING, STUDENTS, CONTENT, and SYSTEM. How then can teachers contribute to the overall process of curriculum development? It seems that teachers have a consultative, less involved role than they are capable of having.

Teachers already undertake functions not normally associated with their role as teachers but which, traditionally, in a top-down approach to curriculum development, are associated with curriculum specialists. Teachers are actively involved in traditional activities such as planning, implementation, and evaluation. However, in one study it was recommended that if teachers are to do more than simply assume the role of administrators in curriculum decision making, their expertise should be fully recognized (Johnston, 1995). A better understanding of teachers' expertise can be achieved by exploring the types of teacher activities outlined above.

As far as other functions are concerned, teachers are interested in giving tasks, using content or knowledge, understanding the nature of English teaching and decision making, and exploring the methodological and philosophical aspects of curriculum design. Teachers are also concerned about a variety of functions or activities associated with inputs from students, curriculum content, and system issues (educational, economic, and wider social concerns).

The main point, however, is that since teachers are involved in

Godfrey A. Steele

implementing the curriculum, their conception of the curriculum and their associated functions in delivering the curriculum should be considered as a critical part of the entire process of curriculum development. There are various ways of recognizing the critical role of teachers mentioned in previous research. For example, it has been recommended that teachers and students should make decisions about the curriculum under the guidance of interested parties (Klein, 1999). A study of physics teachers found that teachers' classroom goals may sometimes be in conflict with covering a list of topics agreed upon by colleagues for inclusion in the curriculum (Feldman & Kropf, 1999). Another way to recognize the teacher's critical role is to explore collaboration between teachers and parents (Konzal, 1997). However, it should be noted that while it may be desirable for teachers and parents to collaborate on curriculum reform, Konzal's study found that it is difficult for parents and teachers to agree on what goes on in "good" classrooms, and suggested that redefining teachers and parents as part of a community could address tensions between both groups. The present study concludes that recognition and acceptance of the teacher's role can have implications for teachers, their students, parents, and the institutions that are interested in what schools do.

Implications of teacher participation

Three sets of implications arise from the foregoing discussion for teachers, students, and training and examining institutions. If there is recognition and acceptance of the present and potential role of teachers in curriculum development, then one can consider the impact on teachers first of all.

Teachers themselves need to be aware of their present and potential roles. Such awareness would have two possible effects. The first effect is that teachers would become more sensitive to the ways in which they affect the curriculum. Some research shows that teachers are interested in participating in curriculum development in the secondary school (Diphofa, 1995; Jennings, 1990; Osborne, 1997; Steele, 1995). There has been interest in broad participation in curriculum development in the primary and secondary schools, but teachers have expressed reservations about working with parents (Ashton, 1979). There is some evidence of successful teacher participation in curriculum development in primary science (Fraser-Abder, 1989). Nevertheless, it is a sensitive issue requiring an awareness of the impact of teachers on others such as parents, given the new conceptualization of teachers as professionals, which sometimes places teachers in a superior position to parents with respect to knowing what is "good" for the classroom (Konzal, 1997). Curriculum specialists

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

would need to be aware of how teachers influence the curriculum, and could seek to involve teachers as well as produce curricula that are responsive to teacher inputs. The second effect that would need to be considered is the suggestion that different types of school climate can play an important role (Taylor, Thompson, & Bogotch, 1995).

Additionally, a role for students is envisioned. It seems necessary that on the basis of teachers' sensitivity to their students, and on the basis of students' and teachers' agreement on what teachers do, there should be an active and direct role for students in curriculum development. Given the data on teachers' perceptions of students' functions (see Table 3), and given students' ratings of their teachers (Steele, 1995), students appear to be quite aware of what their teachers are doing when the curriculum is being implemented. According to Klein (1999), with the right guidance, teachers and students can work together in a positive fashion in developing a highly desirable personalized curriculum.

Institutions such as the School of Education of The University of the West Indies (UWI), CXC, and teachers' professional associations stand to benefit from recognizing the nature of the teachers' present and potential role. For example, work on teacher training and teacher activities in curriculum units and departments in a Ministry of Education can involve teachers' knowledge and experience. Teacher training programmes and instructional development work at secondary and tertiary levels can take into account what teachers bring to bear upon curriculum conceptualization and decision making. Carlgren (1999, p. 54) has suggested that "in order to develop professionalism as designers of school practice" student teachers "need experience of the practice of reflective curriculum planning". Links between tertiary-level institutions such as UWI and the secondary school system can be strengthened by recognizing the critical role of teachers as participants in curriculum development. Examination bodies such as CXC already make use of teachers in various ways, as evidenced in workshops and assessment exercises (Griffith, 1999). However, there is need to involve teachers even more in the planning and implementation phases in a fashion similar to that described for school geography (Jennings, 1990). Finally, teachers' professional associations need to consider the significant ways in which teacher input in curriculum development can contribute further to the professionalization of teaching in the Caribbean.

References

- Ashton, A. A. (1979). *Trinidad and Tobago. Teacher perceptions of broad participation in curriculum planning and development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Caribbean Examinations Council. Secondary Education Certificate Examinations. (1982). *English syllabus*. St. Michael, Barbados: Author.
- Carlgrén, I. (1999). Professionalism and teachers as designers. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(1), 43-56.
- Carrington, L. D., & Borely, C. B. (1978). *The language arts syllabus 1975: Comment and counter comment* (Rev. ed.). St. Augustine, Trinidad: Faculty of Education, UWI.
- Carrington, L. D., Borely, C. B., & Knight, H. E. (1972). *Away Robin run! A critical description of the teaching of language arts in schools in Trinidad and Tobago*. St. Augustine, Trinidad: School of Education, UWI.
- Carrington, L. D., Borely, C. B., & Knight, H. E. (1974). The linguistic exposure of Trinidadian children. *Caribbean Journal of Education*, 1(1), 12-22.
- Craig, D. R. (1999). *Teaching language and literacy: Policies and procedures for vernacular situations*. Georgetown, Guyana: Education and Development Services.
- Devonish, H. (1983). Creole languages and the process of socio-economic domination in the Caribbean: A historical review. *Carib*, 3, 52-68.
- Diphofa, M. (1995). Teacher participation in curriculum development: Views from the ground. *Multicultural Teaching*, 13(3), 35-40.
- Feldman, A., & Kropf, A. (1999). Teachers as curriculum decision makers: the selection of topics for high school physics. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 14(3), 241-259.
- Fraser-Abder, P. (1989). Participation in a curriculum development model and its effect on teacher attitude toward science teaching. *School Science and Mathematics*, 89(7), 561-570.
- Fullan, M. G., with Steigelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- Gocking, C. V. (1970). Queen's Royal College 1859-1870-1970. In Q. R. C. 100: *Being a record of Queen's Royal College 1870-1970* (pp. 101-105). Port of Spain, Trinidad: QRC.
- Goodlad, J. I., & Su, Z. (1992). Organization of the curriculum. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 327-344). New York: Macmillan.
- Griffith, S. A. (1999). *The Caribbean Examinations Council: Responding to the educational needs of the region*. Kingston: UNESCO. (EFA in the Caribbean: Assessment 2000 Monograph Series; No. 8)
- James, C. L. R. (1963). *Beyond a boundary*. London: Hutchinson.
- Jennings, Z. D. (1990). What role for the geography teacher in curriculum development? In M. Morrissey (Ed.), *Curriculum reform in the Third World*:

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

- The case of school geography*, (pp.129-142). Mona: Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- Johnston, S. (1995). Curriculum decision making at the school level: Is it just a case of teachers learning to act like administrators? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 10(2), 136-154.
- Klein, M. F. (1991). A conceptual framework for decision making. In M. F. Klein (Ed.), *The politics of curriculum decision-making: Issues in centralizing the curriculum* (pp. 24-41). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Klein, M. F. (1999). Whose standards? What curriculum? *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 35(2), 60-62, 74.
- Konzal, J. L. (1997, March). *Teachers and parents working together for curriculum reform: Possibility or pipe dream?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Leithwood, K. A. (1991). Alternative orientations to implementation. In A. Lewy (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of curriculum* (pp. 446-447). New York: Pergamon.
- Lieberman, A. (1992). Introduction: The changing context of education. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *The changing contexts of teaching* (pp. 1-10). Chicago: NSSE, distributed by University of Chicago Press. (The 91st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I.)
- Miller, E. L. (1984). *Educational research: The English-speaking Caribbean*. Ottawa: IDRC.
- Miller, J. P., & Seller, W. (1985). *Curriculum perspectives and practice*. New York: Longman.
- Oliva, P. (1982). *Developing the curriculum*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Osborne, A. (1997). *The development of English language curriculum (secondary level) - Resolving conflicting perceptions through the Delphi technique*. Unpublished master's thesis, The University of the West Indies, St Augustine.
- Patterson, J. L., Purkey, S. C., & Parker J. V. (1986). *Productive school systems for a nonrational world*. Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Pring, R. (1975). Review of P. H. Hirst's *Knowledge and the curriculum* and L. K. Thompson and J. White's *Curriculum development: A dialogue*. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 7(2), 178-181.
- Roberts, P. A. (1988). *West Indians and their language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, I. (1996). Language education policy: Towards a rational approach for Caribbean States. In P. Christie (Ed.), *Caribbean language issues: Old and new* (pp. 112-119). Kingston, The Press UWI.
- Shayer, D. (1972). *The teaching of English in schools, 1900-1970*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review* 57(1), 1-22.
- Skilbeck, M. (1982). School-based curriculum development In V. Lee & D. Zeldin (Eds.), *Planning the curriculum*, (pp. 18-34). London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Sowell, E. J. (2000). *Curriculum: An integrative introduction* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle

Godfrey A. Steele

River, NJ: Merrill.

Steele, G. A. (1995). *The role of teachers in English curriculum development in the secondary school*. Unpublished master's thesis, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taylor, D. L., Thompson, B., & Bogotch, I. E. (1995). A typology of school climate reflecting teacher participation: A Q-technique study. *Research in the Schools* 2(2), 51-57.

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

Appendix A

**Curriculum Development Questionnaire Items 15 to 17
(Excerpt from main questionnaire)**

IV. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT DATA

15. WHO DECIDES WHAT CONTENT IS TO BE COVERED IN ENGLISH AT A GIVEN LEVEL IN YOUR SCHOOL?

- Department Head
- Year Co-ordinator
- Entire Department
- Independent teachers
- Other (Please explain)

.....

16. WHO DECIDES WHAT TEXTS ARE TO BE USED IN ENGLISH AT A GIVEN LEVEL IN YOUR SCHOOL?

- Department Head
- Year Co-ordinator
- Entire Department
- Independent teachers
- Other (Please explain)

.....

17. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN INVITED TO

- | | Yes | No |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| A. Suggest or identify | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Produce or obtain | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

CONTENT MATERIALS (E.G. TOPICS, THEMES, EXERCISES) FOR INCLUSION IN A SYLLABUS OR PROGRAMME OF WORK IN ENGLISH FOR USE IN YOUR SCHOOL?

Appendix B

Interview Schedule

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Classroom Lesson

1. Why was this lesson done today?
2. Did the lesson go as planned?
3. What kind of follow-up work do you have in mind for this class?
4. Do you plan to evaluate this lesson?
- 5A. Can you think of any instances in this lesson when you consciously made a change in your lesson plan?
- 5B. If you had to teach this lesson again, would you do it the same way or make changes?

Students

6. What kind of students are there in this school?
7. What kind of students do you have in this class?
8. To what extent are you influenced by a syllabus/ programme of work when you are planning lessons for this class?
9. Are there any activities or ideas you have in mind which you wish you could do with this class but which are not possible?
10. Is there any aspect of your English teaching which you feel you would like to be able to do in a better way with these students?

School

11. In your view how is the school doing in English?
12. How is the English Department organized?

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

13. Are there specific duties or functions which you are expected to perform as a member of the department?
14. Do you have a view about what content is suitable for this class which is different to what the Head of Department or other teachers think is suitable?
15. Who selects and decides texts/content to be covered by this class?

Curriculum Development

16. Would you prefer if curriculum planning for English were done by a central committee set up by the Ministry of Education or a local in-school/district committee?

Probe: Could you give reasons for your preference?

17. Would you like to be involved in such planning (either local or central)?

Probe: If yes, why?

Probe: If no, why not?

18. Are there any advantages or disadvantages to planning at the level you indicated?
19. Can you speculate as to how other teachers of English in
 - (a) your school
 - (b) other schoolsmight feel about being on a curriculum committee at local or national level?
20. What do you think the tasks of such a committee might be?

Appendix C

SELF RATING AS AN ENGLISH TEACHER

IN RELATION TO

FORM _____

SCHOOL _____

Below are some statements which describe what an English teacher might do in the course of teaching your class. To the right of each statement is a number which indicates how much this statement applies to yourself. Please circle the number which matches the extent to which each statement describes you as an English teacher.

ALL STATEMENTS APPLY TO YOUR TEACHING ENGLISH TO THIS CLASS.

5 = Always; 4 = Often; 3 = Sometimes; 2 = Hardly; 1 = Never

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU

A. Select content materials (e.g. Exercises, activities, topics, themes) that do not follow the textbook order?	5	4	3	2	1
B. Select work that does not come from the text	5	4	3	2	1
C. Consider yourself ultimately responsible for planning work for instructing this class?	5	4	3	2	1
D. Make clear to this class what you are going to try to do in a lesson?	5	4	3	2	1
E. Tell these students what you expect them to be able to achieve by the end of the lesson?	5	4	3	2	1

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

F. Keep to predetermined set of objectives or ideas for a lesson with this class? 5 4 3 2 1

G. Consider yourself responsible for these students' learning? 5 4 3 2 1

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU

H. Believe you are capable of teaching this class? 5 4 3 2 1

I. Emphasize what the more important areas of the course are? 5 4 3 2 1

J. Provide adequate instruction time? 5 4 3 2 1

K. Consider the difficulty level of content in relation to the students' level of understanding? 5 4 3 2 1

L. Match content material to students' interest? 5 4 3 2 1

M. Plan for evaluation at the same time you are deciding what to teach? 5 4 3 2 1

N. Prefer to teach some areas in English more than others? 5 4 3 2 1

(Please list these areas below)

O. Avoid teaching some areas in

Teacher Participation in English Curriculum Development

Appendix D

STUDENT RATING OF TEACHER

WHO TEACHES

FORM _____

SCHOOL _____

Below are some statements which describe what your English teacher might do in the course of teaching your class. To the right of each statement is a number which indicates how much this statement applies to your teacher. Please circle the number which matches the extent to which each statement describes your present English teacher.

ALL STATEMENTS RELATE ONLY TO YOUR PRESENT ENGLISH TEACHER

5 = Always; 4 = Often; 3 = Sometimes; 2 = Hardly; 1 = Never

TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR ENGLISH TEACHER

A. Select work for you (e.g. exercises Activities, topics, themes) that Does not follow the order of the text?	5	4	3	2	1
B. Select work for you that does not come from the text	5	4	3	2	1
C. Plan what is going to be taught?	5	4	3	2	1
D. Make clear to you what he/she is going to try to do in a lesson?	5	4	3	2	1
E. Tell you what he/she expects you to be able to do or understand by the end of the lesson?	5	4	3	2	1
F. Keep to what he/she set out to do at the beginning of a lesson with this class?	5	4	3	2	1

G. Feel personally responsible

Godfrey A. Steele

for your learning?	5	4	3	2	1
H. Seem capable of teaching this class?	5	4	3	2	1
TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR ENGLISH TEACHER					
I. Stress what the more important areas of the course are?	5	4	3	2	1
J. Provide enough time for you to learn what is being taught?	5	4	3	2	1
K. Take into account whether the work is difficult for you to do?	5	4	3	2	1
L. Match what is taught with what you are interested in?	5	4	3	2	1
M. Really test what you were taught	5	4	3	2	1
N. Prefer to teach some areas in English more than others?	5	4	3	2	1

(Please list these areas below)

O. Avoid teaching some areas in English?	5	4	3	2	1
------------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

(Please list these areas below)
