An Analysis Of Three Curriculum Approaches In Teaching English At Schools

Rizki Hasanah[1], Siminto[2], Zaitun Qamariah[3]
[1,2,3]Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palangka Raya
*Email: hasanahrizki102@gmail.com [1], simintohs2015@gmail.com [2],
zaitun.qamariah@iain-palangkaraya.co.id [3]*

Abstract. *This research aims to find out the differences and explain the 3 curriculum approaches. This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach with library research methods. The data collection technique is to collect several references, such as books, articles, and other related sources. Then the data analysis techniques used in this study are content analysis, with stages of data display, data reduction, data verification, and conclusion . In this study using qualitative research. The data analysis method used in this research is descriptive qualitative method. The results showed there is no best approach to curriculum design, and that forward design, central design and backward design may each work well but in different circumstances. Each approach has advocates and practitioners who can cite examples of their successful implementation. They may also work simultaneously in some circumstances.*

Keywords: *Curriculum Approaches, Teaching English, Three Curriculum Approaches*

Abstrak. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui perbedaan dan menjelaskan 3 pendekatan kurikulum tersebut. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif dengan metode penelitian kepustakaan. Teknik pengumpulan data yang dilakukan adalah dengan mengumpulkan beberapa referensi, seperti buku, artikel, dan sumber-sumber lain yang terkait. Kemudian teknik analisis data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah analisis isi (content analysis), dengan tahapan display data, reduksi data, verifikasi data, dan kesimpulan. Dalam penelitian ini menggunakan penelitian kualitatif. Metode analisis data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah metode deskriptif kualitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada pendekatan terbaik untuk desain kurikulum, dan bahwa desain ke depan, desain sentral dan desain ke belakang masing-masing dapat bekerja dengan baik tetapi dalam situasi yang berbeda. Setiap pendekatan memiliki pendukung dan praktisi yang dapat mengutip contoh penerapannya yang berhasil. Pendekatan-pendekatan tersebut juga dapat bekerja secara bersamaan dalam beberapa situasi.

Kata kunci: Pendekatan Kurikulum, Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris, Tiga Pendekatan Kurikulum

INTRODUCTION

The curriculum is one of the important components in education which is a reference for educational implementers to determine the direction of educational goals and where students are going to be taken. Therefore, the curriculum is a tool to achieve

goals, so all elements involved must really understand the curriculum that is prepared, so educational goals can be achieved to the fullest excerpted from(ASLAN, 2019) from (Shobirin, 2016). And the teacher is the executor and the key to the success of the curriculum, so that it is the teacher who actually is the planner, executor, assessor, and curriculum developer in schools.

With a curriculum approach, it is expected that the resulting curriculum development can achieve the goals of the National Education System which of course is also based on basic and solid foundations in formulating the curriculum excerpted from (ASLAN, 2019) from (Shobirin, 2016).

To design the curriculum, it is certain that the appropriate and best approaches will be chosen so that a dynamic education can be implemented. This is intended so that the results of curriculum development are in accordance with the interests, talents, needs of students, environment, regional needs, so that they can expedite educational programs in the context of realizing and achieving national education goals.

This review will focus on three approaches to curriculum currently used to teach English

as a second, they are: Forward, Central, and Backwards Design. Richards describes three different approaches to curriculum design for language teaching: forward, central, and backward. He introduces the three designs' claims, practices, and implications to provide a clear understanding of traditional and modern approaches in the field of language learning and teaching. each approach consist input, process, and outcome and defines each design to understand the differences among them. Although all the designs consist of the same components, they differ on how the components are ordered.

Input is the linguistic content that forms the syllabus; process is the methodology and includes activities that the teacher uses in class for teaching; and output is the learning outcomes that learners are expected to achieve because of the teaching process. Even though all three approaches have the same components, albeit indifferent sequences, each may be a successful curriculum approach when implemented to serve the appropriate learners in the appropriate circumstances.

The assumptions and methods underlying three different curriculum design strategies—forward design, central design, and backward design—will be examined in this paper. A 'big picture' understanding of some past and current trends in language

teaching can be attained by comprehending the nature and implications of these design approaches.

THEORITICAL STUDIES

In comparing foreign language curricula, especially the English language theoretically, various frameworks have been proposed by experts in the fields of curriculum development and foreign language learning (Krahnke, 1987; Olsthain, 1987; Brown, 1996; Richards and Rogers, 2001) (Bin-Tahir, S. Z and Suriaman, A., 2019). The frameworks used in theoretical studies of foreign language curricula generally cover two questions The following two questions: (1) What philosophical foundations of education underlie the foreign language curriculum language curriculum: (2) What approaches (referring to language theory and foreign language learning theory) which is used in the development of foreign language curriculum; and (3) How does this approach color the development of the components of the foreign language curriculum? components, i.e. objectives, content, process and evaluation of foreign language learning?

Schematically, the framework proposed by (Khair, U and Misnawati, M., 2022) from (Dubin, F and Olshtain, E, 1986) will be used in this curriculum comparative review used in this curriculum comparative review.

METHOD

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach with library research methods. The data collection technique is to collect several references, such as books, articles, and other related sources. Then the data analysis techniques used in this study are content analysis, with stages of data display, data reduction, data verification, and conclusion. This kind of method is important to do because, without library research, we cannot gain an understanding of the hottest topics, and how a theory is researched. In addition, the method of library research is part of academic development. The flow in conducting this study is (1) to find and uncover the phenomenon/problem that occurs (2) to formulate ideas (3) to conduct theoretical comparisons (4) to make a conclusion.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

It is crucial to further define our understanding of curriculum before we begin the discussion. Some experts believe that the terms curriculum and syllabus are interchangeable. Others, however, make a distinction between the two.

For instance,(Yalden, j, 1987) (Murtiningsih, T and Amelia, R., 2023) stated: The curriculum includes the goals, objectives, content, processes, resources, and means of evaluation of all the learning experiences planned for students through classroom instruction and related program, both in and out of school, and community. In other words, a curriculum is a collection of educational activities made up of a number of crucial components, including purpose, material, methods, supplies, and assessment tool. It goes beyond just organizing extracurricular and school-related activities. According to this definition, curriculum encompasses more than a syllabus and a syllabus is a component of curriculum.

A curriculum is described as "a broad description of general goals by indicating an overall educational-cultural philosophy which applies across subjects" by (Dubin, F and Olshtain, E, 1986) (Khair, U and Misnawati, M., 2022) as opposed to a syllabus, which is described as "a more detailed and operational statement of teaching and learning elements, which translates the philosophy of the curriculum into a series of planned steps leading towards more narrowly defined objectives."

In other words, curriculum plays a role in the paradigm level upon which educational practice is based. While this is happening, syllabus is concentrated on implementing curriculum design. So, it is possible to say that the syllabus is a component of the curriculum.

The aforementioned idea is consistent with Krahnke's (1987) (Murtiningsih, T and Amelia, R., 2023) assertion that the curriculum includes the syllabus but not the other way around. Additionally, a syllabus is "an inventory of things the learner should master," according to (Han, K., 2021) from (Celce-Murcia, M, 1991). When creating courses and teaching materials, this inventory is sometimes presented in a suggested order. The kind of approach and method used is frequently influenced by the kind of syllabus used. Similar to how the syllabus is revised, the approach or method also tends to change (Mumba, C and Mkandawire, S. B., 2019) from (Cahyono, B.Y and Widiati, U, 2011).

When designing a syllabus, content is typically regarded as one of the key considerations (Murtiningsih, T and Amelia, R., 2023) (Krahnke, K, 1987) However, in

reality, some teaching curricula typically include behavioral or learning goals for students, guidelines for how the material will be taught, and methods to assess them. Which definition of language will be used by the instruction and what linguistic content will serve as the foundation and framework for the instruction are the topics of this case's content, according to (Krahnke, K, 1987). This means that content, method, and assessment should all be considered when creating a syllabus.

The teacher is a key component in the development of curriculum because teachers are the ones who spearhead implementation on the ground in terms of curriculum execution. This is consistent with (Wijaya, M. B. R et al., 2022) from (Murray, P, 1993) assertion that teachers must carry out the curriculum, adapt it to the needs of the school and the community, design it, and conduct curriculum research.

In other words, curriculum development could be thought of as beginning with the class. Therefore, as a crucial step and a component of the overall administrative support, teachers should have a creative idea and examine the curriculum in class.

Forward Design

This method of lesson preparation makes the assumption that there is a linear relationship between the input, process, and output. The teacher should first choose the language material they shall cover in class. The learning tactics they use should be dictated by the topic, and eventually, the teaching activities would establish the learning objectives.

The design forward begins with the input, taking into account the course content. The process, which includes the creation of instructional approaches, including activities, comes after the input. The outcomes of the chosen evaluation, which show how well the prior components affected students, mark the conclusion of the future design. This structure works well for large courses with formalized curricula and assessments, as well as when teachers are in general less skilled, rely heavily on textbooks with limited content and approach options, and are not allowed to participate in professional development. Examples of advanced design include content-based instruction and the teaching of communicative languages.

(Gacs, A et al., 2020), (Wiggins G and McTighe J, 2006) illustrate a typical design-forward lesson plan can help to clarify this procedure:

• The lesson's subject is chosen by the teacher (eg racial prejudice)

• The teacher chooses the materials (eg To Kill a Mocking-bird)

• The teacher selects instructional strategies based on sources and subjects. (eg seminars to discuss books and cooperative groups to analyze stereotyped images in films and television)

• To gauge the students' comprehension of books, the teacher chooses essay questions.

Forward planning is an option in language teaching when learning objectives are conceptualized in very general terms, such as in a course on "general English" or with an introductory tory course at primary or secondary level where objectives can be described in terms like "proficiency in the use of language in a variety of everyday situations" or "communicative ability in the four language skills." In this case, curriculum planning entails integrating ideas of "general English," "intermediate English," or "writing skills" into units that can serve as the foundation for lesson planning, instruction, and assessment. The Council of Europe used this strategy back in the 1970s. John Trim, a significant contributor to the expert group the Council of Europe hired to create the new method of language instruction, explains what they aimed to accomplish: In order to meet the learners' communicative needs, we set out to identify a coherent but constrained number of objectives. The knowledge and abilities that would enable learners to use the language for the specified communicative purposes were then attempted to be outlined in detail. We must then develop a formal language program that will help him master this body of knowledge and skills in light of his characteristics and resources, as well as a method of testing and evaluation to inform everyone involved of the program's success. (Dou, A. Q et al., 2023) from (Trim J., 1987)

In educational settings, the forward design has traditionally been widely used. Here, the emphasis is on content mastery, giving the subject matter central importance. As a result, the syllabus is frequently not designed with the learner's needs in mind. Passive learning occurs because their varying aptitudes and skills are not taken into consideration. Students frequently complain that these instructional approaches are unmotivating and unengaging. As a result, modern educational theories have abandoned this strategy in favor of a teaching strategy that is more dynamic, social, and collaborative.

In some situations, different specialists with expertise in each stage of the curriculum development process, such as those with knowledge of syllabus design, methodology, and assessment, plan and develop each stage of the curriculum. This is known as a "specialist approach," according to (Misnawati, M et al., 2022) from (Graves K, 2008), who also makes the following observation: "In the specialist approach, the

potential for mismatch [i.e. lack of alignment between the different curriculum components] is great because each different group of people performs different curricular functions, uses different discourses, and produces different curricular products."

Central Design

The 'process' is assumed to be the starting point of any learning design in Central Design. As a result, educational activities take center stage. The learning objectives are not stated, nor is a comprehensive language syllabus provided. The first step is to select the teaching activities, and then they can choose the potential inputs and outputs. 'Progressivism' or 'progressive ideology' are frequently linked to this specific design. According to research, teachers most frequently employ the central design when deciding which activities to include in a lesson before defining objectives or choosing the linguistic material.

Making a decision about the teaching strategy first, then the content and assessment, forms the foundation of central design. The most crucial component of this strategy is the teaching methodology. The teaching strategy and the supplementary activities are predicated on producing successful learning outcomes or evidence of mastery, according to the teachers who employ this strategy.

Due to its emphasis on active learning, this design is frequently referred to as learner-centered. Critical thinking, discussion, and the other examples from the previous paragraph are all examples of active learning. The students' personal growth is influenced by these experiences.

The learning process is a major focus of central design. There is a focus on things like discussion, decision-making, critical thinking, etc. It's difficult to evaluate any of these examples specifically. We can identify them when they occur, but because these are individualized skills, it is difficult to rate them.

Instead, central design begins with the methodology of selecting techniques, activities, and methods before moving on to manipulating inputs and outputs during the teaching process. It is primarily a learner-centered approach and calls for qualified instructors who should be familiar with the relevant teaching theories and methodologies. Current course curricula that employ the center design approach include those that are task-based, dogmatic, post-method, and ecological.

This makes central design a "learner-focused and learning-oriented perspective.(Ruzhekova-Rogozherova, B. T., 2022) (Leung C, 2012)

According to (Challenor, J and Ma, M, 2019) from (Brunner J, 1966) and (Stenhouse L, 1975), curriculum development in general education should begin by identifying the inquiry and deliberation-driven teaching and learning processes, such as investigation, decision-making reflection, discussion, interpretation, critical thinking, making choices, and cooperating with others. The promotion of the use of these processes is taken into consideration when choosing content, and the outcomes need not, or rarely need not, be specified in any detail.

Despite the benefits of central design, some issues exist. It implies that the teacher is a master of one or more methodologies in order to emphasize the importance of teaching methods. Because of this, it can be challenging for new teachers to implement central design.

Lack of objectives can also make it very simple for instructors, even those with extensive experience, to wonder about their lesson plans. Because of the focus on teaching activities, teachers can use central design whenever they choose activities that seem enjoyable or entertaining. Students are succeeding in explaining what they are learning, despite the absence of clear objectives.

The problem with the objectives may also affect the evaluation. Without specific objectives, it is difficult to assess what the students learned or whether they met the lesson's objectives. It is challenging to defend such a design when there is so much testing going on.

he essence of central design is best encapsulated in Clark's description of the characteristics of "progressivism": More emphasis on methodological principles and practices and less on syllabus specifications, more focused on the learning process than pre-established objectives, Stresses the importance of methodology and the need for guiding principles in the teaching and learning process, Learner-centered and aims to offer learning opportunities that let students learn through their own initiatives, It sees students as active agents in directing their own education, It supports the learner's growth as an individual, It sees education as an exercise in original problem-solving, It recognizes the distinction between each teaching-learning context.

It places emphasis on the teacher's responsibility to design his or her own curriculum for the classroom.(Clark, 1987) (Fan, L., 2022)

In general, central design is a great option if the main objective is developing subjective skills. However, forward or backward design is a much more suitable option if what you are trying to teach can clearly be measured and evaluated.

The central design appears to be learner-focused, and the teacher's function in the teaching and learning activity is reduced to that of a facilitator. Progressive pedagogy's benefits explain why this design is rising in popularity across a wide range of educational contexts.

Central design can only result in effective learning if the teacher is qualified to give the students an authentic learning environment. They must be knowledgeable and skilled in order for activities to promote real learning rather than just being done for fun.

Teachers' initial concerns are typically with what they want their students to do, regardless of the strategy that has been advised to use in their initial teacher education. throughout the lesson. Later, they focus on the type of assistance and input that students will require to complete the learning activities (Pennington MC and Richards JC, 1997) (Hassan, K. I and Gao, X., 20221). The linear forward-design model that teachers are typically prepared to use contrasts with this.

(Zaky, H., 2018) from (Freeman D, 1996), summarizing research on teachers' planning, noted:

In the structured formats that they had been instructed to use in their professional training, [teachers] did not naturally think about planning. Furthermore, they frequently did not teach the lessons as planned even when they did plan them using these formats.

It can be helpful to think of lessons as groups or series of activities because they combine content with activity and typically have a specific student in mind. In other words, rather than creating lessons to achieve specific goals, teachers typically plan lessons as ways of doing things for specific student groups.

Backward Design

backward design as an assertive and exceptional approach to curriculum design. (Su, J et al., 2022) from (Taba H., 1962) organized backward design is a method that starts with identifying needs, then moves on to writing objectives to address those needs, choosing and preparing content, choosing and preparing learning activities, and selecting and preparing evaluation techniques. As a result, in backward design, it's crucial to use the best teaching strategies in order to accomplish goals and gauge student performance through assessments. Additionally, ongoing needs analyses are crucial for establishing

the foundation for learning objectives and curriculum goals.(Van Slyke, R. D and Armstrong, N. J, 2020) from (Stufflebeam D et al., 1985)

Teachers support learners with activities that support scaffolding and also expose them to real-life situations to connect them to meaningful practices relevant to daily life. I think that students can play a significant part in improving their outcomes through targeted action and a commitment to developing accurate language and learning habits. Consequently, the specified standards, which are continually evaluated and assessed, result in high-quality teaching and learning.(Nkemleke, D and Belibi, E. P, 2019) from (Docking R, 1994)

There are numerous examples of backward design, such as task-based teaching in another version, which creates target tasks for language learners to master through the use of needs analysis. Furthermore, competency-based learning is concerned with students' mastery of competencies, which translate into results that constitute the subjects of daily life that are covered in units made up of activities and skills. Different examples of backward design that uses benchmarks as learner targets include standards and the Common European Framework of Reference. Generally speaking, backward design is a cutting-edge method of curriculum development.(Millimouno, T. M et al., 2021) from (Korotchenko, T. V. et al., 2015).

The backward design was the most appealing because it seemed to be very logical and provided all the answers the teacher was seeking. Create a path for the teacher and the students by stating the goals at the very beginning of the plan. The teacher and the students are both aware of the objectives, even though this pathway may lead to a number of different directions.

Additionally, if those objectives have been met or not, the evidence of learning would reveal it, allowing for the revision of teaching techniques.(Asrial, A et al., 2019) from (Richards, J. C., 2013)

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

When given a choice between various solutions to a problem, teachers and planners frequently ask, "Which approach is best?" This paper is based on the premise that there is no single best approach to curriculum design and that forward design, central design, and backward design can all be successful under certain conditions. Each strategy has proponents and practitioners who can provide instances of its effective application.

Additionally, they might function concurrently in some situations. Design actually moves forward and backwards regardless of the starting point, says David Crabbe. It's not that curriculum designers don't consider objectives when creating the syllabus, as you point out. Just that the content items' objectives are not stated. Similar to how a central design considers a variety of outcomes, even though they might not be fully specified. A backward design frequently incorporates content and considers the method of instruction when determining the outcome. As opposed to being sequential, all three can be thought of simultaneously. However, each strategy has unique presumptions about the current curriculum context, such as: whether it is meant for implementation on a large or small scale, the function of textbooks and exams, the degree of teacher preparation, the function of instructors and students, the English language proficiency of teachers, the demands placed on teachers, the amount of support given to teachers; the degree of autonomy assumed for teachers.

forward design works well for large courses with formalized curricula and assessments, as well as when teachers are in general less skilled, rely heavily on textbooks with limited content and approach options, and are not allowed to participate in professional development. Examples of advanced design include content-based instruction and the teaching of communicative languages. In educational settings, the forward design has traditionally been widely used. Here, the emphasis is on content mastery, giving the subject matter central importance. As a result, the syllabus is frequently not designed with the learner's needs in mind. Passive learning occurs because their varying aptitudes and skills are not taken into consideration. Students frequently complain that these instructional approaches are unmotivating and unengaging. As a result, modern educational theories have abandoned this strategy in favor of a teaching strategy that is more dynamic, social, and collaborative.

Teachers most frequently employ the central design when deciding which activities to include in a lesson before defining objectives or choosing the linguistic material. this design is frequently referred to as learner-centered.
Instead, central design begins with the methodology of selecting techniques, activities, and methods before moving on to manipulating inputs and outputs during the teaching process. It is primarily a learner-centered approach and calls for qualified instructors who should be familiar with the relevant teaching theories and methodologies. Current course curricula that employ the center design approach include those that are task-based,

dogmatic, post-method, and ecological. This makes central design a "learner-focused and learning-oriented perspective.

The backward design was the most appealing because it seemed to be very logical and provided all the answers the teacher was seeking. Create a path for the teacher and the students by stating the goals at the very beginning of the plan. The teacher and the students are both aware of the objectives, even though this pathway may lead to a number of different directions.

Additionally, if those objectives have been met or not, the evidence of learning would reveal it, allowing for the revision of teaching techniques

REFERENCES

ASLAN, 2019. Hidden Curriculum. Cv. Pena Indis.

Asrial, A, Syahrial, S, Kurniawan, D. A, Subandiyo, M, Amalina, N, 2019. Exploring Obstacles in Language Learning among Prospective Primary School Teacher. Int. J. Eval. Res. Educ.

Bin-Tahir, S. Z, Suriaman, A., 2019. Designing English syllabus for multilingual students at pesantren schools.

Brunner J, 1966. The Process of Education. Camb. MA Harv. Educ. Press.

Cahyono, B.Y, Widiati, U, 2011. The Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia.

Celce-Murcia, M, 1991. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language.

Challenor, J, Ma, M, 2019. A review of augmented reality applications for history education and heritage visualisation.

Clark, J., 1987. Curriculum Renewal in School Foreign Language Learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 49–90.

Docking R, 1994. Competency-based curricula – the big picture.

Dou, A. Q, Chan, S. H, Win, M. T., 2023. Changing visions in ESP development and teaching: Past, present, and future vistas. Front. Psychol.

Dubin, F, Olshtain, E, 1986. Course Design: Developing Programs and Materials for Language Learning.

Fan, L., 2022. Action Research in Foreign Language Teaching in China.

Freeman D, 1996. Redefining research and what teachers know. In: Bailey K, Nunan D (eds) Voices from the Language Classroom. N. Y. Camb. Univ. Press.

Gacs, A, Goertler, S, Spasova, S, 2020. Planned online language education versus crisis-prompted online language teaching: Lessons for the future. Foreign Lang. Ann.

Graves K, 2008. The language curriculum: a social contextual perspective. Language Teaching.

Han, K., 2021. Fostering students' autonomy and engagement in EFL classroom through proximal classroom factors: autonomy-supportive behaviors and student-teacher relationships. Front. Psychol.

Hassan, K. I, Gao, X., 20221. Communicative Language Teaching in Malaysian ESL Context: A Qualitative Exploration into In-service Teachers' Beliefs and Practices. Int. J. TESOL Stud.

Khair, U, Misnawati, M., 2022. Indonesian language teaching in elementary school: Cooperative learning model explicit type instructions chronological technique of events on narrative writing skills from interview texts. Linguist. Cult. Rev.

Korotchenko, T. V., Matveenko, I. A, Strelnikova, A. B, Phillips, C, 2015. Backward design method in foreign language curriculumdevelopment. Procedia-Soc. Behav. Sci.

Krahnke, K, 1987. Approaches to Syllabus Design in Foreign Language Teaching.

Leung C, 2012. Outcomes-based language teaching. In: Burns A, Richards JC (eds) The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Language Teaching. New York: Cambridge University.

Mackey WF, 1965. Language Teaching Analysis. Lond. Longman.

Millimouno, T. M, Delamou, A, Kourouma, K, Kolié, J. M, Béavogui, A. H, Roegiers, S, Delvaux, T., 2021. Outcomes of blended learning for capacity strengthening of health professionals in Guinea. BMC Med. Educ.

Misnawati, M, Poerwadi, P, Veniaty, S, Nurachmana, A, Cuesdeyeni, P, 2022. The Indonesian Language Learning Based on Personal Design in Improving the Language Skills for Elementary School Students. Multicult. Educ.

Mumba, C, Mkandawire, S. B., 2019. The Text-based Integrated Approach to Language Teaching: Its Meaning and Classroom Application. Multidiscip. J. Lang. Soc. Sci. Educ.

Munby J, 1978. Communicative Syllabus Design. Camb. Camb. Univ. Press.

Murray, P, 1993. Curriculum Development and Design Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Murtiningsih, T, Amelia, R., 2023. Designing an English Syllabus for Architecture Students: Matching Students' English Skills and Future Jobs. SALEE Study Appl. Linguist. Engl. Educ.

Nkemleke, D, Belibi, E. P, 2019. Strategies for enhancing learners' language competence with special reference to Cameroon. Syllabus Rev. Spec. Focus APCCBA.

Pennington MC, Richards JC, 1997. Re-orienting the teaching universe: the experience of five first-year English teachers in Hong Kong. Language Teaching Research.

Richards, J. C., 2013. Curriculum Approaches in Language Teaching: Forward, Central, and Backward Design.

Ruzhekova-Rogozherova, B. T., 2022. BACKWARD EFL AND ESP CURRICULUM DESIGN: THE CASE OF THE NEW EFL AND ESP CURRICULUM FOR PHD STUDENTS AT THE TODOR KABLESHKOV UNIVERSITY OF TRANSPORT. Mech. Transp. Commun.-Acad. J.

Shobirin, M., 2016. Konsep dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 di Sekolah Dasar. Deepublish 19.

Stenhouse L, 1975. An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development. Lond. Heinemann.

Stufflebeam D, McCormick C, Brinkeerhoff R, Nelson C, 1985. Conducting Educational Needs Assessment. Hingham, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Su, J, Zhong, Y, Ng, D. T. K., 2022. A meta-review of literature on educational approaches for teaching AI at the K-12 levels in the Asia-Pacific region. Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.

Taba H., 1962. Curriculum development: Theory and practice. New York:Harcourt Brace and World.

Trim J., 1987. Some Possible Lines of Development of an Overall Structure for a European Unit/Credit Scheme for Foreign Language Learning by Adults. Sytrasbourg: Council of Europe. 9.

Van Slyke, R. D, Armstrong, N. J, 2020. Communities serve: a systematic review of need assessments on US veteran and Military-Connected populations. Armed Forces Soc.

Wiggins G, McTighe J, 2006. Understanding by Design: A Framework for Effecting Curricular Development and Assessment. Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 15.

Wijaya, M. B. R, Suwahyo, S., Kurniawan, A, Kurniawan, M, Nugroho, A. Y, Satyawiguna, T, 2022. Application of Competency Test Materials Standard Motorcycle Business Techniques with SKKNI Level II Scheme Standards for Excellent and Competitive Vocational High Schools Graduates. 4th Vocat. Educ. Int. Conf.

Wilkins DA, 1976. Notional Syllabuses. Oxf. Oxf. Univ. Press.

Willis J, 1996. A Framework for Task-Based Learning. Harlow Longman.

Yalden, j, 1987. The Communicative Syllabus.

Zaky, H., 2018. Phenomenological and humanistic psychology: Formulating adult education instructional system to increase ESL learners' autonomy. J. Psychol.