

# What is Curriculum? *Building a Broader Understanding of the Term*

Mohammed El-Astal<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mass Communication and Public Relations Department, College of Communication and Media Technologies, Gulf University, Sand 26489, Kingdom of Bahrain.

\*Correspondence: Mass Communication and Public Relations Department, College of Communication and Media Technologies, Gulf University, Sand 26489, Kingdom of Bahrain

Received: August 28, 2023

Accepted: September 11, 2023

Online Published: November 15, 2023

doi:10.5430/jct.v12n6p188

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v12n6p188>

## Abstract

This paper is an attempt to come to a broader understanding of the term ‘curriculum.’ To that end, tens of curriculum definitions from language teaching and education literature were collected and analyzed using a proposed analytical formula. The ‘theme-rheme’ or ‘trunk-branch’ (as described and explained in the methodology) formula proposed here was utilized from Halliday’s (1985) systemic functional linguistics (SFL). This formula helps identify the part of the definition in which the topic is stated and the part of the definition in which Schwab’s (1973) commonplaces (main ideas) or some of them are discursively represented. This formula is not only helpful for analyzing definitions but also for writing definitions. Based on the analysis of definitions collected, the study defines curriculum as prescriptive content that illustrates what will be taught in a given educational program, who will teach, who will be taught, with what tools and in what context, with what effect, and how learners will be assessed.

**Keywords:** curriculum, commonplaces, meta-analysis, SFL, theme-rheme analysis

## 1. Introduction

A cursory review of the literature on language teaching and education shows that there are “as many definitions of curriculum as there are individuals to define it” (Fox, 2004, p. 1), and it has “as many meanings as there are people using” (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, p. 5) the term. The two statements made by the authors here reflect that it is hard to pinpoint a precise definition for the term ‘curriculum,’ and curriculum makers or developers employ the term differently based on their different experiences, beliefs, and backgrounds. This being the case, this paper seeks to collect tens of curriculum definitions from the literature of language teaching and education and then analyze and discuss these definitions to build a broader understanding of the term.

In what follows, I will explain the theoretical concepts employed to orient analysis, followed by the study’s methodology. Next, I will display, analyze, and discuss the study’s findings, followed by conclusions.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

Based on the type of inquiry required here, a combined theoretical framework will be employed to guide my analysis: a framework that combines Schwab’s (1973) commonplaces and the theme-rheme analysis utilized from Halliday’s (1985) systemic functional linguistics (SFL). The theme-rheme analysis will help me identify the part of the definition in which the topic is stated (theme) and the part of the definition in which Schwab’s commonplaces or some of them are discursively represented (rheme).

The first theoretical concept in the integrated framework employed here is Schwab’s (1973) commonplaces: subject matter, teacher, learner, and milieu. Schwab described a commonplace as “a body of experience [and/or knowledge] which must be represented in the group which undertakes the task of curriculum revision” (p. 502), and Connelly and Clandinin (1988) described it as a determinant that exists in statements about a curriculum’s objectives, methods and content. The rationale behind employing Schwab’s commonplaces is because, for Connelly and Clandinin (1988), they cannot be avoided: they “appear and reappear in [all] curricular statements” (p. 85).

For Graves and Garton (2017), the subject matter, also known as content, relates to what will be taught (scholarly materials); the teacher refers to who is going to deliver the subject matter to learners, and this includes the teacher’s

abilities and skills, knowledge, and beliefs; the learner refers to who is going to be taught (the beneficiary), and this includes the learner's age and background; and finally milieu relates to the context in which teaching and learning take place, and this includes the classroom, the school, and the broader community. Analyzing the definitions collected for this study, using Schwab's four commonplaces and others (if any, i.e., assessment), will help me identify which of these commonplaces is discursively represented and which of them is missing in the definitions that are supposed to depict the "social practices and discursive accounts," as described by Fox (2004, p. 4), of teachers, students, educational programs' managers, and funders.

The second concept employed in this study is the theme-rheme analysis utilized from SFL. Eggins (2004) defined SFL as a "functional-semantic approach to language" (p. 20), and, for her, this approach is concerned with examining how people employ language in different contexts and how language is structured for use. That said, any piece of language says something about the world in which we live and the world that exists in us, and that piece of language should be structured in a way that carries a message (Kavalir, 2016). Eggins (2004) pointed out that language, as a semiotic system, has three strata or levels (meanings or semantics, wordings or lexico-grammar, and sounds/letters or phonology/ graphology); there are three meta-functional meanings of language in SFL (ideational, interpersonal, and textual); and these meanings are realized through wordings (words and structures) and in turn through sounds and letters. In this study, the textual meanings (in focus here) will be realized through the definitions' wordings. For Eggins, clauses within texts have two functional components: theme and rheme. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) defined the theme as the part of the clause that "serves as the starting point of the message (p. 64). In other words, it is the part that tells what the clause is about. Eggins (2004) defined the rheme as "the part of the clause in which the theme is developed" (p. 300).

It is worth mentioning here that the study will not carry out detailed, in-depth SFL-based analyses. It only aims to explore the textual meanings of texts (definitions) by analyzing the theme and the rheme of the clauses within the texts. To elaborate, identifying the theme of the clause will help me classify and organize the definitions into themes or topics, and identifying the rheme will help me explore the basic ideas (commonplaces) in the part of the clause in which the theme was developed. The theme and rheme, both together, create the textual meaning of the texts under analysis (the definitions).

### 3. Methodology

This is a meta-analytical empirical study. It is a meta-analytical study for which curriculum definitions were purposively collected for analysis from the literature on language teaching and education. It is essential to mention here that I selected new and old definitions published in leading books and journals to enable me to draw comparisons (if any) between old and new definitions. All the definitions selected enable theme-rheme analysis (all definitions had both constituents: theme and rheme). In other words, the theme works here as a tree's trunk and rheme as its branches. This theme-rheme or trunk-branch formula (proposed here for analyzing definitions) can also be used in writing definitions and concepts.

As explained above, theme analysis helps in classifying the definitions collected into themes or topics, while rheme analysis helps in breaking the definitions collected into their basic ideas (commonplaces). To elaborate, the part of the clause that serves as the starting point does not include any of the commonplaces defined above (it reflects the theme or topic only), while the part in which the theme is developed includes such commonplaces or some of them as in some definitions. For example, the part in which Tyler (1949) described the curriculum as "a four-step process" is the theme part of the clause, and the rest of the definition (see Table 1, item 1) is the rheme part in which the author developed the theme referring explicitly to the commonplaces in focus at this study; while Schwab's (1973) definition of curriculum in which he referred to it as "the concrete embodiments" (p. 505) reflects only one part of the clause (theme or rheme). That said, this definition and similar ones were excluded because if the quoted statement above (Schwab's definition) is considered as the clause starting point (theme), where is the rheme then to enable identifying the commonplaces; and if the said quoted statement is regarded as the rheme of the clause, where is the theme then to enable classifying the definition into a topic or theme.

#### 3.1 The Study Strategy

The study strategy consisted of the following five stages in which I: (a) collected tens of definitions from language teaching and education literature based on the criteria mentioned above; (b) broke the collected definitions into themes and rhemes; (c) broke the rhemes (the central part of a definition) into their basic ideas (commonplaces); (d) identified patterns; and finally (e) condensed the patterns identified into a final definition of curriculum. It is worth mentioning that it is difficult to extend large-scale conclusions on this important topic due to only collecting

definitions from language teaching and education literature. Developing large-scale and more valid conclusions requires collecting more definitions of curriculum from different fields and experts in those fields—other than language teaching and education.

#### 4. Findings and Discussion

This part pertains to displaying, analyzing, and discussing the thirty definitions collected for the study. The definitions collected are chronologically displayed (from the oldest to the newest) in three tables in the pages to come. Dividing them into three groups makes embedding them within the body of the paper easier and makes tables shorter. As mentioned above, the theme-rheme analysis (formula/recipe) utilized from SFL will be used to orient the analysis. Both analyses (theme and rheme) will be discussed separately in what follows.

##### 4.1 Theme Analysis

A careful scrutiny of the themes (the underlined part of each definition displayed in the tables to follow) reveals that curriculum was described as follows: (a) a ‘process’ in Tyler’s and Boomer’s definitions (Table 1) and also in Graves’ definition (Table 2); (b) an ‘attempt’ in Stenhouse’s definition (Table 1); (c) an ‘autobiographical text’ in Pinar and Grumet’s definition (Table 1); (d) ‘materials’ in van den Akker’s definition (Table 1); (e) ‘plan(s)’ in Breen and Candlin’s definition (Table 2), Goyes and Uscátegui’s definition and Manrique, Revilla and Lamas’ definition (Table 2), and also in Glatthorn, Boschee, Whitehead and Boschee’s definition (Table 3); (f) ‘issues’ in Hall and Hewings’ definition (Table 2); (g) ‘experiences/activities or both’ in Knight’s definition (Table 2), the Colombian Education Ministry’s definition (Table 2), and the South African National Education Policy Initiative’s definition (Table 2); (h) a ‘medium’ in Hurren’s definition (Table 2); (i) a ‘methodology’ in Russell’s definition (Table 2); (j) a ‘rhetorical accomplishment’ in Fox’s definition (Table 2); (k) a ‘blueprint’ in Wiggins and McTighe’s definition (Table 2); (l) a ‘project’ in Jackson, Oliver, Shaw, and Wisdom’s definition (Table 2); (m) a ‘set of courses and subjects’ in Barriga’s definition (Table 2); (n) a ‘framework’ in Booyse and du Plessis’ definition (Table 2); (o) a ‘set of [elements or things]’ in Christodoulou’s and Fraser’s definitions (Table 2); (p) a ‘content’ in Desha’s definition (Table 2), in Ahrens, Bassus and Zašcerinska’s and also in Siu and Wong’s definitions (Table 3); (q) a ‘practice’ in Lopes and Macedo’s definition (Table 2); (r) a ‘system’ in the Peruvian Education Ministry’s definition (Table 2); (s) a ‘series of objectives’ in Roman and Diez’s definition (Table 2); and finally a ‘series of choices’ in Kumar’s definition (Table 3).

**Table 1.** Definitions Published before 2000

| # | Definition   |
|---|--|
| 1 | A four-step <u>process</u> that involves identifying instructional objectives, choosing learning activities to achieve those objectives, organizing these activities, and assessing the extent to which the specified objectives have been realized (Tyler, 1949).   |
| 2 | An <u>attempt</u> [meant] to communicate the essential principles and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical scrutiny and capable of effective translation into practice (Stenhouse, 1975, p. 4).  |
| 3 | An <u>autobiographical text</u> that posits narrative as a theoretical ground (Pinar & Grumet, 1976).  |
| 4 | Curriculum is a <u>process</u> beginning with the teacher’s or the curriculum writer’s conception, proceeding through planning, and eventually reaching enactment and evaluation (Boomer, 1992, chap. 3, p. 24).   |
| 5 | The <u>materials</u> [that] are most effective when they stimulate teachers to a more elaborate and accurate ‘internal dialogue’ about what, when, how, and why of their own teaching role, and provide them with clear advice about the implications of these matters for classroom practice ([van den Akker’s 1994 definition] as cited in Rogan, 2007, p. 453). |

A cursory look at the starting points (themes) with which the thirty definitions collected for this paper started shows that the most frequent terms used to describe curriculum were the term ‘plan’ and terms synonymous with it (five times); and terms synonymous with the term ‘written content’ stood second (4 times). Interestingly, the word ‘process’ was used thrice: twice in definitions published before 2000 (Table 1) and once in Graves’ (2008) definition (Table 2). This clearly shows that current authors still use words used by authors tens of years ago.

It is worth mentioning that out of the 25 definitions collected from literature since the turn of this century, seven definitions used words like plan, blueprint, project, and planned activities which shows that there is a trend currently towards depicting curriculum as a plan intended to achieve instructional objectives. None of the five definitions selected from the last century used any of these words to describe curriculum.

**Table 2.** Definitions Published between 2001 and 2014

| #  | Definition  |
|----|---|
| 1  | A <u>plan</u> designed to answer the following three interrelated questions: What is to be learned? How is the learning to be undertaken and achieved? To what extent is the former appropriate and the latter effective (Breen & Candlin, 2001, p. 9)?   |
| 2  | All the <u>issues</u> [that are] relating to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of a series of language learning events conceived as a coherent whole with a specified purpose (Hall & Hewings, 2001, p. 1).  |
| 3  | A <u>set of purposeful experiences</u> that may take the form of content, organization, learning and teaching methods, and assessment (Knight, 2001, p. 369).   |
| 4  | The <u>medium</u> that creates the space for telling (Hurren, 2003, p. 120).  |
| 5  | A mindful <u>methodology</u> that would recognize that voices from the past—both our own and others[']—break through our thoughts[,] and inform our current thinking (Russell, 2003, p. 97).  |
| 6  | A kind of <u>retorical accomplishment</u> which is realized in the social practices and discursive accounts of key stakeholders (Fox, 2004, p. 1).  |
| 7  | The specific <u>blueprint</u> for learning that is derived from desired results (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, pp. 5-6).   |
| 8  | A large-scale <u>project</u> designed to help teachers, whatever their teaching area, to foster students' creativity through specific examples of teaching practice ([Jackson, Oliver, Shaw, & Wisdom's definition] as cited in Biggs & Tang, 2007, p. 171).  |
| 9  | A <u>process</u> that involves planning what is to be taught/learned, implementing it and evaluating it (Graves, 2008, p. 149).   |
| 10 | The <u>set of courses and subjects</u> that make up a study program (Barriga, 2014, p. 330).  |
| 11 | As an organized <u>framework</u> that delineates the content that learners are to learn, the processes through which learners achieve the identified curricular goals, what teachers do to help learners achieve the objectives/goals, and the context in which teaching and learning occur (Booyse & du Plessis, 2014, p. 5).          |
| 12 | Curriculum is mainly viewed as a <u>set of [elements such as]</u> technical guidelines, objectives, and strategies for teaching and learning (Christodoulou, 2014, p. 158).   |
| 13 | The planned and structured <u>set of activities</u> in which students, teachers, and [the] community take part in order to achieve the aims and goals of education ([Colombian Education Ministry's definition] as cited in Montoya-Vargas, 2014, p. 137).  |
| 14 | <u>All of the learning [content]</u> that is developed and implemented for a given 'program'. This includes a 'syllabus' (i.e. what is taught) and 'pedagogy' considerations (i.e. how it is taught) (Desha, 2014, p. 230).   |
| 15 | The <u>inter-related totality of [elements such as]</u> aims, learning content, evaluation procedures, and teaching-learning activities, opportunities and experiences that guide and implement didactic activities in a planned and justified manner (Fraser, 2014, pp. 3-4).  |
| 16 | An <u>educational plan</u> that actualizes and makes effective a pedagogical theory and that is oriented towards the development and learning of a group of students in a particular context ([Goyes and Uscátegui's definition] as cited in Montoya-Vargas, 2014, pp. 145-146).  |
| 17 | Curriculum is seen as <u>instituting practice</u> that takes into account the reiteration of traces of supposedly shared meaning, such as strategy of representing authority, without these meanings being taken as transparent or mimetic (Lopes & Macedo, 2014, p. 93)  |
| 18 | <u>Plan of study</u> organized in subjects, globalized or integrated, in which the objectives for the year and of each subject, as well as the actions suggested to orient the teaching practice, are regulated (Manrique, Revilla & Lamas, 2014, p. 381).  |
| 19 | The <u>learning system</u> that progressively generates bodies of knowledge, abilities, and skills to enable learners, at the end of a grade, level and the system, to understand, explain, interpret, and later manage their reality ([Peruvian Education Ministry's definition] as cited in Manrique, Revilla & Lamas, 2014, p. 384). |
| 20 | Structured <u>series of learning objectives</u> intended to be achieved ([Roman & Diez's definition] as cited in Manrique, Revilla & Lamas, 2014, p. 379).  |
| 21 | Curriculum refers to the <u>teaching and learning activities and experiences</u> which are provided by schools ([South African National Education Policy Initiative's definition] as cited in Booyse & du Plessis, 2014, p. 4).   |

#### 4.2 Rheme Analysis

Analyzing the rhemes of the definitions collected (the rheme here is the non-underlined part of each definition) helps me identify the commonplaces or “defining features,” as referred to by Clarke and Erikson (2004, p. 208) embedded within each definition. That said, this part of the paper may include new defining features or commonplaces other than Schwab’s (1973) traditional ones: someone (teacher), teaching someone (learner), something (subject matter), and somewhere (social and cultural contexts). Each of these commonplaces or defining features will be explored and discussed separately in the pages to follow.

**Table 3.** Definitions Published between 2015 and 2019

| # | Definition  |
|---|---|
| 1 | Curriculum [ <u>is a content that</u> ] comprises the following components: aim, objectives, content, process of teaching and learning as well as evaluation (Ahrens, Bassus & Zašcerinska, 2015, p. 470).  |
| 2 | A <u>series of choices</u> made under the demands placed by the social milieu on education and the constraints placed upon pedagogy by children’s psychology and the conditions prevailing at school ([Kumar’s definition] as cited in Chacko, 2015, p. 66).  |
| 3 | The curriculum [ <u>is a content that</u> ] includes the aims, objectives, teaching content, teaching strategies, assessment methods, and other components of learning and teaching in classrooms (Siu & Wong, 2015, p. 390).   |
| 4 | The curriculum is a <u>set of plans</u> made for guiding learning in the schools, usually represented in retrievable documents of several levels of generality, and the actualization of those plans in the classroom, as experienced by the learners and as recorded by an observer; those experiences take place in a learning environment that also influences what is learned (Glatthorn, Boschee, Whitehead & Boschee, 2019, p. 28). |

##### 4.2.1 Subject Matter

The subject matter, for Graves and Garton (2017), relates to the scholarly materials that will be taught in classrooms of a given educational course or courses of study; that is, it could be math, physics, English, etc. A careful scrutiny of the rhemes of all definitions (see the tables displayed on the previous pages) examined here reveals that only Hall and Hewings’ (2001) definition (Table 2) explicitly mentioned language as the subject matter. All other definitions defined curriculum in general without specifying or highlighting a given subject matter; that is, none included words or phrases like language acquisition, language skills, language systems, language usage, math, science, education, etc. To elaborate, Breen and Candlin (2001) indicated in their definition of language teaching curriculum (Table 2) that any teaching curriculum should answer the question about what will be learned. The phrase ‘what will be learned’ here obviously refers to any subject matter: it could be math, science, education, etc.

##### 4.2.2 Teacher

In the education process, the teacher is the one who is supposed to teach the subject matter to learners. Based on the rheme analysis of the 30 definitions examined here, the following two terms were used to refer to this commonplace (teacher): (a) the term ‘teacher(s)’ as in items 4 and 5 (Table 1) and items 8, 11, and 13 (Table 2); and (b) the term ‘stakeholders’ as in item 6 (Table 2). Hall and Hewings (2001) defined a stakeholder as anyone “who might have an interest in what goes on in the language classroom” (p. 1), such as education authorities, programs’ managers, teachers, learners, funders, parents, etc.

With these numbers in mind, six definitions (20%) explicitly referred to the commonplace in focus here, and many definitions implicitly indicated it. For example, item 5 (Table 1) and items 3 and 4 (Table 3) used the word ‘classroom,’ which is an implicit reference to teachers’ roles. Another implicit reference was the word ‘teaching’ used by the authors in items 12, 15, 18, and 21 (Table 2) and item 1 (Table 3).

##### 4.2.3 Learner

In relation to this commonplace, the rheme analysis of the 30 definitions shows that the following four different terms were used to refer to this commonplace (learner): (a) the term ‘students’ as in items 8, 13, and 16 (Table 2); (b) the term ‘stakeholders’ as in item 6 (Table 2); (c) the term ‘learners’ as in items 11 and 19 (Table 2) and item 4 (Table 3); and (d) the term ‘children’ as in item 2 (Table 3).

With these figures in mind, only eight definitions (26.66%) explicitly referred to learners’ roles, and most of the remaining definitions implicitly referred to it. Germane examples of implicit reference to the commonplace in focus here are Knight’s (2001) definition in which he portrays curriculum as “a set of purposeful experiences that may take

the form of “content, organization, learning and teaching methods, and assessment” (p. 369); and Graves’ (2008) definition in which she describes curriculum as “a process that involves planning what is to be taught/learned, implementing it and evaluating it” (p. 149). The word ‘learning,’ which implicitly refers to this commonplace, was mentioned in another 13 definitions (item 1, Table 1; items 1, 2, 3, 7, 12, 14, 15, 20, and 21, Table 2; and items 1, 3, and 4, Table 3).

#### 4.2.4 Milieu

Milieu refers to the emotional, social, and cultural contexts within which the teaching and learning processes occur (i.e., the classroom milieu, the institution milieu, etc.). The milieu is usually examined within classrooms by considering the learning activities enacted; observing the interaction between students and the teacher; and, finally, observing the interaction among the students themselves (Pyle & Luce-Kapler, 2014). That being said, Milieu reflects the educational philosophy of the institution. White (1988) identified three philosophies: classical humanism, progressivism, and reconstructionism. For Cheng and Fox (2017), classical humanism underpins the subject or content-centered view of learning; reconstructionism underpins the ends-means or output view; and progressivism underpins the learner-centered view of learning.

Based on the rheme analysis of the 30 definitions collected for this study, the term ‘milieu’ was explicitly mentioned in one definition only (item 2, Table 3). The term ‘context,’ which is synonymous with the term milieu, was mentioned twice (items 11 and 16, Table 2). This tells us that the term milieu and the terms synonymous with it only appeared in three (10%) definitions. However, several definitions implicitly mentioned the milieu surrounding the teaching and learning environment. Germane examples were the definitions in which the authors used terms like school and classroom to refer to the teaching and learning environment (see item 5, Table 1; item 21, Table 2; and items 3 and 4, Table 3).

#### 4.2.5 Assessment

Black and Wiliam (1998) define assessment as “all those activities undertaken by teachers, and by their students in assessing themselves, which provide information to be used as feedback to modify the teaching and learning activities in which they are engaged” (p. 2). According to Cheng and Fox (2017), assessments involve both teachers and students, and they include tests within classrooms and standardized large-scale tests.

The rheme analysis of the 30 definitions reveals that there was an explicit reference to the term ‘assessment/assessing’ in three definitions (item 1, Table 1; item 3, Table 2; and item 3, Table 3), and there also was an apparent reference to the term ‘evaluation/evaluating,’ which is synonymous with the term assessment, in five definitions (item 4, Table 1; items 2, 9, and 15, Table 2; and item 1, Table 4). Besides the explicit reference to the term assessment in the eight definitions (26.66%), there were implicit mentions of the term in several items. Assessment is another commonplace or ‘defining feature’ (as referred to by Clarke and Erikson, 2004). That is to say; in addition to Schwab’s (1973) four commonplaces, assessment is the fifth commonplace found in the definitions examined here.

#### 4.2.6 Outcomes

Cheng and Fox (2017) define learning outcomes as straightforward statements of expectations that “describe the skills, knowledge, attitudes and capabilities” (p. 36) that learners should attain by the end of a course of study. For Cheng and Fox, learning goals are often “referred to as intended learning outcomes” (p. 19). Based on the rheme analysis of the definitions studied, terms synonymous with the term ‘outcome(s)’ such as ‘goal(s),’ ‘objective(s),’ and ‘aim(s)’ were found in nine (30%) definitions (item 1, Table 1; items 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, and 20, Table 2; and items 1 and 3, Table 3). Again, this is another commonplace (besides Schwab’s four commonplaces) found in the definitions studied here.

## 5. Summary

The results obtained from the theme-rheme analyses can be summarized as follows:

A curriculum can be an attempt, a process, a medium, a methodology, a set of elements/issues/ activities/materials/courses/ or experiences, a series of choices, a rhetorical accomplishment, a document, an autobiographical text, a prescriptive content, a plan, a project, a blueprint, a design, a practice, a system, or a framework that illustrates the following commonplaces:

- (a) What will be taught (input or subject matter as referred to by Schwab, 1973),
- (b) Who will teach (teacher),

- (c) Who will be taught (learner),
- (d) With what tools and in what context (milieu),
- (e) With what effect (output/outcomes), and finally
- (f) How learners will be assessed (assessment).

All these key ideas can be condensed into the following working definition of curriculum: Curriculum is a prescriptive content that illustrates what will be taught in a given educational program (input or subject matter), who will teach (teacher), who will be taught (learner), with what tools and in what context (milieu), with what effect (output/outcomes), and how that will be assessed (assessment). Although the term ‘plan’ and its synonyms were the most frequently used to describe curriculum and the term ‘content,’ was the second most frequently used term, I prefer to use ‘content’ in my proposed definition of curriculum as a plan itself is content.

To conclude, the aim of this study, as stated above, was not to determine which of the thirty definitions of curriculum analyzed here was best but rather to build a broader understanding of curriculum as a term. All the definitions collected were probably used at a given time in a given situation. However, the working definition developed above is expected to deepen policy makers, curriculum designers, instructors, theorists, researchers, and students’ understanding of curriculum.

Finally, it is too early to extend large-scale and more valid conclusions at this stage as that requires sending the above-developed definition of curriculum to several experts in the field to examine it and feed me back with their insights. This may require a series of interviews with experts in a Delphi study until a consensus is reached.

## References

- Ahrens, A., Bassus, O., & Zašcerinska, J. (2015). Enterprise 2.0 in engineering curriculum. In M. Khosrow-Pour, S., Clarke, M., Jennex, E., Becker, A., & Anttiroiko, V. (Eds.), *Curriculum design and classroom management: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications* (pp. 467-486). PA: Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global).
- Barriga, F. D. (2014). Curriculum research in Mexico. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 329-339), (2nd ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for Quality Learning at university* (4th ed.). Berkshire, UK: McGraw Hill.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139-48.
- Boomer, G. (1992). Curriculum composing and evaluating; an invitation to action research. In Boomer, G., Lester, N., Onore, C., & Cook, J. (Eds.), *Negotiating the curriculum: Educating for the 21st century* (chap. 3, pp. 1-39). London: The Falmer Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203975381>
- Booyse, C., & du Plessis, E. (2014). *Curriculum studies: Development, interpretation, plan and practice* (2nd ed.). Pretoria, SA: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. N. (2001). The essentials of communicative curriculum in language teaching. In D. R. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 9-26). London: Routledge.
- Chacko, M. A. (2015). Schooling as counter-socialization: Krishna Kumar’s contributions to curriculum. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum studies in India: Intellectual histories, present circumstances* (pp. 65-82). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cheng, L., & Fox, J. (2017). *Assessment in the language classroom: Teachers supporting student learning*. London: Palgrave.
- Christodoulou, N. (2014). Curriculum studies in Cyprus: Intellectual history and present circumstances. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 151-160), (2nd ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- Clarke, A., & Erickson, G. (2004). Self-study: The fifth commonplace. *Australian Journal of Education*, 48(2), 199-211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000494410404800208>
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. Toronto, ON: OISE.

- Desha, C., & Hargroves, K. (2014). *Higher education and sustainable development: A model for curriculum renewal*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Fox, J. (2004). Curriculum design: Does it make a difference? *Contact*, 30(2), 1-4.
- Glatthorn, A. A., Boschee, F., Whitehead, B. M., & Boschee, B. F. (2019). *Curriculum leadership: Strategies for development implementation* (5th ed.). California: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Graves, K. (2008). The language curriculum: A social contextual perspective. *Lang. Teach.*, 41(2), 147-181. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004867>
- Graves, K., & Garton, S. (2017). An analysis of three curriculum approaches to teaching English in public-sector schools. *Lang. Teach.*, 50(4), 441-482. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000155>
- Hall, D. R., & Hewings, A. (2001). Introduction. In D. R. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 1-8). London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar* (1st ed.). first London: Arnold.
- Hurren, W. (2003). Auto'-geo'-carto'-graphia' (a curricular collage). In W. Hurren & E. Hasebe-Ludt (Eds.), *Curriculum intertext: Place/language/pedagogy* (pp. 111-121). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kavalir, M. (2016). Paralyzed: A systemic functional analysis of James Joyce's "Eveline". *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 13(2), 165-180. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.13.2.165-180>
- Knight, P. T. (2001). Complexity and curriculum: A process approach to curriculum-making. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(3), 369-381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510120061223>
- Lopes, A. C., & Macedo, E. (2014). The curriculum field in Brazil since the 1990s. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 86-100), (2nd ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- Manrique, L., Revilla, D., & Lamas, P. (2014). Theoretical approaches underlying primary education curricula in Peru. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 376-390), (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- Montoya-Vargas, J. (2014). Curriculum studies in Colombia. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 134-150), (2nd ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. F., & Grumet, M. R. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Pyle, A., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2014). Looking beyond the academic and developmental logics in kindergarten education: The role of Schwab's commonplaces in classroom-based research. *Early Child Development and Care*, 184(12), 1960-1977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2014.897945>
- Rogan, J. M. (2007). How much curriculum change is appropriate? Defining a zone of feasible innovation. *Science Education*, 91(3), 439-460. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sce.20192>
- Russell, B. D. (2003). Reaching haiku's pedagogical nature. In W. Hurren & E. Hasebe-Ludt (Eds.), *Curriculum intertext: Place/language/pedagogy* (pp. 93-101). New York: Peter Lang.
- Schwab, J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. *The School Review*, 81(4), 501-522.
- Siu, K. W. M., & Wong, Y. L. (2015). Soft and hard technologies in technology education. In M. Khosrow-Pour, S. Clarke, M. E. Jennex, A. Becker & V. Antiroiko (Eds.), *Curriculum design and classroom management: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications* (pp. 378-391). PA: Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global).
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- White, R. (1988). *The ELT curriculum: Design, innovation, and management*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.



**Acknowledgments**

“Not Applicable”

**Authors contributions**

“Not Applicable”

**Funding**

“Not Applicable”

**Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

**Informed consent**

Obtained.

**Ethics approval**

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal’s policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

**Provenance and peer review**

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

**Data availability statement**

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

**Data sharing statement**

No additional data are available.

**Open access**

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.