

WHAT HAVE YOU DECIDED ON LATELY, TEACHERS?

Oleh

NORAZILA ABD. AZIZ

Lecturer
Centre for Language Studies
Universiti Malaysia Sarawak
94300 Kota Samarahan
Sarawak, Malaysia
Tel +6 082 679 239
Email: anora@cls.unimas.my

ABSTRACT

Some teachers welcome changes; others don't. As a nation whose system of education has long been based on the "center-periphery" model - where innovations are always initiated at the center, specifically by the government, the responsibility to implement these innovations rest upon the teachers, the periphery. The mixed reactions received from the teaching workforce often become sidelined by more impending pedagogical matters, namely, the decisions regarding planning, execution and reflection of everyday classroom practices. This paper argues that innovations can also take place when teachers are involved in the decision-making process, specifically those concerning impending pedagogical issues. Teachers' ability to make informed pedagogical choices and decisions pertaining to their learning environment are the actual prerequisite for innovation and change. This paper describes an attempt to get pre-service teachers to value and appreciate their decision-making skills by asking them to plan for, carry out and reflect on the decisions they made when organizing and conducting tutorial sessions with their peers. With the rapid socio-economic changes that are taking place worldwide, it is perhaps timely to place teachers as the center for curriculum and instructional decision-making and not merely as peripherals.

A NATIONAL CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK

Teachers are involved in curricular decision making all the time. The official curriculum may put into words the learning outcomes, content, and educational emphases which teachers have to base their pedagogical planning and teaching upon, but the decisions on which outcome, content, and emphasis and how they are to be planned and taught over the period of 40 or 80 minutes are ones which teachers have to make themselves. The fact that teachers decision making affect only their classroom practices has led most to assume that teachers' roles as curriculum decision-makers and agents of change are insignificant and peripheral.

Having a national curriculum has its advantages and disadvantages. The availability of a national curriculum gives the society the assurance that the same amount of information will be accessible to all learners, irrespective of their race, gender, socio-economic status, and

religion. It gives surety that all pupils will have equal chance to excel and no one will be left behind since the number of teaching hours for each subject in the curriculum, the coverage of content and skills to be taught in each subject, as well as the criteria used to evaluate learners' achievement will be the same. A common curriculum also helps communicate, either directly or indirectly, the government's expectations of its future workforce. The process of nation building will be better facilitated when its workforce shares the beliefs and aspirations of the government. In addition, it will be relatively easy for the government, as the central body, to introduce changes or innovations to the curriculum whenever the need and the demand for them arise.

There are, however, some setbacks when a common curriculum is enforced on all. McGee (1997) points out that a national curriculum framework "does not, in itself, guarantee equality of educational opportunity"(p.55). This is because intentions of the curricular documents are subject to various interpretations by teachers depending on their beliefs on what the intentions mean and how they should be operationalised in classrooms. There are also other variables, apart from the teachers' belief that would affect such guarantee, namely, learners' socio-economic background, their level of interests in and motivation towards the subject matter, and the types of educational opportunity given to them. With all these interplay of variables, how would it be possible then for equality of educational opportunity be really guaranteed?

McGee (1997, p.55) also questions the rationale for providing the same common general education to all "when perhaps they should have different experiences to reflect differences in culture, gender and class". In planning for classroom practices, learners' cultural background, gender, and their socio-economic status, are among the factors that teachers normally account for in their curricular decision-making. These are viewed as relevant information as they help inform the teachers about the activities and the materials that they should decide on to promote a conducive learning environment and experience for their learners. With a common general education however, often it is the culture, gender and class of the majority that become the basis for decision making. Although this may be inevitable, the lack of consideration for the minorities may give rise to the assumption that information about them is of no relevance or of very little significance for their own learning experience.

As stated earlier, a national curriculum is meant for all, irrespective of race, gender, socio-economic status, and religion; but these same factors are actually the reasons as to why learners' educational needs, demands, and expectations are so diversified. A curriculum that is prescriptive in nature actually reduces "the autonomy that teachers have to adapt the curriculum to the needs of their students"(p.56). In most circumstances, classroom practices become very examination-based as the needs being addressed is not those of the learners but those of the curriculum.

CURRICULUM CHANGE

The prevailing process of curriculum change in the country seems to be reflective of the center-periphery model. This may be so since a common framework of curriculum is being used and has been used for almost four decades. Curriculum change, also labeled as *reform*, *revision*, *renewal* or *innovation* in curriculum research and literature, is undertaken when changes take place in the three fundamental sources and forces in education, namely, the learners, the society, and the world of knowledge itself (Tanner and Tanner, 1995).

The use of Bahasa Melayu as the medium of instruction in all government schools after independence, the introduction of the KBSR and KBSM curriculum in the early 1980s, the introduction of the Literature in English component in the early 90s, and the recent directive to teach mathematics and science in English (effective in 2003), are among the examples of changes or innovations which have been initiated and planned by the government through its official curricular representative – the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC). Although changes in the curriculum, such as the above, are often perceived as reflective of the current demands and expectations of the society, the teachers' receptivity towards and willingness to accept the changes, to a great extent, depends on the how the changes are introduced.

Strategies For Introducing Change

Chin and Benne described three models or strategies for introducing change – *power-coercive*, *empirical-rational* and *normative-re-educative* (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2001). Power-coercive strategies refer to the use of 'power' to 'force' individuals to adopt the change. In the context of curriculum change, this can be referred to as using official policy or legislation to 'coerce' teachers into implementing them.

The empirical-rational strategies refer to the use of empirical evidence to make the teachers understand the reasons and rationality for the changes. The assumption here is that "individuals are rational and will follow their rational self-interest" and therefore "if a 'good' change is suggested, people of good intention will adopt the change". Such a strategy also entails carrying out research prior to the change taking effect to show that the change is desirable. However, this strategy "generally ignores the fact that school systems are already crowded with existing passive (though rational) recipients, who may not have the necessary time or expertise to adopt or apply (implement) the new knowledge or program"(Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2001).

Unlike the earlier ones, the normative-re-educative strategies place importance in understanding first and foremost the norms of the people or participants who would be affected by the changes. This is due to the belief that changes are "not just rational responses but occur at the more personal level of values and habits" and "responses from individual participants would be influenced by the social and institutional norms" in which they belong to (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2001). Norms, in the context of curriculum change, can be referred to as the inherent attitudes, values, and belief of the school community. The fundamental principle here is to 're-educate' or change the teachers' attitudes "by involving them in curriculum development in a way that teachers feel that ideas are theirs; that they have some sort of ownership of them" (McGee, 1997). For this to ensue "direct intervention by change agents, who focus on the client system and who work collaboratively with the clients to identify and solve their problems" would be needed, and in the case of curriculum change, the agents could be the trainers or facilitators from the governing body responsible for introducing the change.

The choice of which strategies to be used is not one which teachers have much influence over. As accentuates by Walker and Soltis (1997), "welcome or not, reform is a fact of professional life for educators, who must find ways to deal with it". Nonetheless, teachers should hold in the highest regard the fact that the "real hands on" curriculum development

happens only in their classroom and that is also where curriculum policies and change would have any meanings (McCutcheon, 1995).

Pre-Service Teachers Receptivity To Change And Decision-Making

A tutorial exercise on curriculum change and teacher decision-making was carried out with a class of 46 pre-service teachers enrolled in a course titled Curriculum Design and Materials Development at the Centre for Language Studies, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS). The pre-service teachers or the learners were made up of two different groups – the TESL UNIMAS group and the ESL PKPG group. The TESL UNIMAS group refers to learners who enrolled in UNIMAS' Bachelor of Science (Hons) in TESL program. Entry requirement for this program is a pass at the SPM level or its equivalent with credits in Bahasa Melayu and English language and a pass at the STPM level or its equivalent with at least Grade E or above in the General Paper and at least Grade E in any two (2) subjects. Learners with Certificate or Diploma from the Ministry who already have at least five years of teaching experience may also apply for the program (Centre for Language Studies, 2001). Majority of the TESL UNIMAS group in this course has had very little or no teaching experience at all. Unlike the TESL UNIMAS group, the learners in the ESL PKPG group have already been teaching, mostly in primary schools, for a number of years and the program they enrolled in is the Bachelor of Education in ESL, a teacher education program that falls under the Ministry of Education's Program Khas Pensiswazahan Guru (PKPG). Although the degree awarded is different, both groups generally follow the same structure of courses designed by the Centre for Language Studies, UNIMAS, and for the purpose of this exercise, such distinction was considered irrelevant.

The main objective of this exercise was to provide the learners with the opportunity to demonstrate and collaboratively evaluate their roles as curriculum decision-maker and agent of change. The normative-re-educative model was used to prepare the learners for the exercise, and an online environment was used as the means for preparing them for the tutorial tasks to be undertaken. The rationale for having discussion and deliberation done in such a way was to ensure that everyone would be supplied with the same amount of information and they would be able to learn of the beliefs and attitudes of their peers towards the curriculum issues presented and consequently form an understanding the norms of the group.

Setting the Stage – Understanding the Norms

Prior to the exercise, the learners were asked to ponder and respond to the following curricular issues:

- How accountable is a teacher? (McGee, 1997, p.242)
- Can a teacher be entrusted with the tasks of making sound curriculum decisions?

The questions were chosen as they would help elicit the learners' understanding of what being a teacher means and also shed light on their views on how much autonomy and accountability should a teacher have or be given when it comes to decision-making. Although some might argue that it actually makes very little or no difference at all what an activity is done for and how it is perceived by the participants, findings from various case studies (Woods, 1996) have indicated that teachers' interpretations of their roles in the

process of teaching and curricular decision-making “affect in many ways what classroom activities are chosen and how they are carried out” (p.21).

The questions were posted online to the course’s website (<http://athena.calm.unimas.my/pbt3223>) and the learners were given two weeks to deliberate and decide on their answers. The online medium was preferred over the face-to-face one for several reasons. Firstly, it gives opportunity for the learners to recognize and value the importance and significance of their personal views to the class’ learning experience. The online learning environment allows learners to share their personal experiences, thoughts, questions, and comments related to the issue being discussed with the other students. Secondly, a learning environment such as this also helps give learners the autonomy to act and think without being influenced by others. They can make a choice of when and how they will address the issue being raised for discussion. Finally, the online learning experience is believed to be capable of empowering the learners to take charge of their own learning (Schweizer, 1999, p. 6). Instead of depending on the instructor for all the information, as traditionally has been the case, the learners are given more responsibility to decide on what and also how their learning experiences would be shaped.

The Feedback – Finding out the Norms

Three different perspectives on teacher accountability and autonomy in decision making were apparent from the responses received.

1. Accountability and autonomy in curricular decision- making rest upon the Ministry and not the teachers.
2. Being the persons closest to the students, teachers should be entrusted with the tasks of curricular decision- making, thus their accountability acknowledged.
3. Teachers should be directly involved in curricular decision making at all levels – national, state and classroom, and through the teachers’ and the Ministry’s collaborative efforts, curricular intentions would be better translated into the classrooms.

Due to the very nature of our education system, the thoughts of giving teachers the autonomy in decision-making and being made accountable for their decisions were unacceptable to some. According to one student, teachers “have to follow the set of guidelines in the curriculum prepared by the Ministry of Education Malaysia” because their duty as teachers is “to impart knowledge to students”(Eman, December, 2000). This perspective is best described in the following response:

“Our system doesn’t really allow teachers (yet) to be fully accountable in their profession because teachers are still under very strict control and direction from the ministry. So many orders to follow that when teachers don’t put their heart into carrying the program and instructions- and failed in discharging those duties bestowed upon them, teachers can just turned back and blame the system. Teachers are not yet to be held as accountable in the present system”
(Kotien, December, 2000)

It is interesting to note that majority of those who expressed views similar to the ones above are from the PKPG group. This was expected as they have had the experience teaching in

schools for a number of years and would be more familiar with the guidelines and requirements stipulated in curricular documents compared to the other group. Although a lot more would be needed to really understand how they arrived at such reasoning, from the responses they have given, it may be assumed that the likely factors for such line of argument are their beliefs about what their roles as teachers should be and what teaching should entail. This perspective also gave rise to the question - is the system that we have so rigid and strict that it does not allow teachers to be more than 'content deliverer' and 'knowledge transmitter'?

The National Education Policy (NEP), although containing general statements about the nation's educational philosophy – aims, beliefs and values; is in fact, a clear enough guideline to inform teachers in their curricular decision making. This is another perspective gathered from the pre-service teachers' responses, both the TESL and PKPG group alike, to the two questions put forth to them. Differences in the decisions to be made would, of course, be different, and this should be expected since no two groups of learners are the same. Teachers' autonomy and accountability in curricular decision-making should therefore, be duly acknowledged, not just by the teachers themselves but also by the community at large.

With regard to the issue of disparity and the inconsistency of the decisions that may arise due to the differences of opinions and ideas of groups of teachers, I am confident that teachers are well aware of that and it should not become the obstacle because we have the National Education Policy to guide and assist them all the way. Hopefully, with all the expertise, experience and the vast knowledge that they have will assist them in making the correct and wise decisions

(Mroon, December, 2000)

I believe that if teachers can be trusted with the task of educating future leaders of the nation, there is no reason why they can't be trusted with the task of deciding what should be included or excluded from the curriculum.

(Lucilla, December, 2000)

Teachers know their students' needs and interests well, so the trust in making sound curriculum decision should not be questioned. However, teachers should always remember that whatever changes they wish to make, they should always be guided by the National Education Philosophy.

(Leline, December, 2000)

There are a couple of issues that may arise when teachers get absolute decision-making autonomy with regards to what their learners' curriculum should be and the manner in which it should be implemented. First of all, the experience, expertise and exposure teachers have would vary according to the teacher education programs they underwent. How certain are we that the spirits of the NEP are understood or even agreed to by all? Differences in their opinions and beliefs on what knowledge is most worthwhile and should be included in the curriculum may also affect their curricular decision-making. Should decisions as to what needs to be included in or excluded from the curriculum be ones which teachers make by themselves?

Instead of giving absolute power to the Ministry and complete autonomy to teachers, the third perspective views collaboration between both as the most fitting arrangement to have to

ensure that the general statements of the curriculum and the specific instances in the classroom are accounted for in curricular decision-makings.

What can be done is that teacher from different schools, districts, and states can gather and share their views, experiences and opinions. Then, after coming to consensus, they decide what sound curriculum to impart in education system. They are the people who represent the students, and society overall. They know their surroundings and the needs of the society. Even though the place might be too far from the others but their needs might having slightly the same features

(Mary, December,2000)

The problems can be solved by having a board of decision makers which consists of teachers as the panels to decide what is the best for everyone. No doubt, at the moment this is done by the Curriculum Development Centre. Teachers should be involved in the decisions and they must come to a consensus as to what is the best for every student and the nation as a whole. It must take into account that teachers from every state in the country involved have freedom to present their ideas and findings

(Yvonne, December,2000)

It is interesting to learn that there were responses, although very few, that reflect this perspective. This is because numerous collaborative efforts between the Ministry of Education through its various departments and the teaching community have actually been undertaken for decades. Seminars, conferences, or meetings where representatives from both groups are present have been organized in the past and will continue to be organized in the future. The perspective above, however, seems to indicate that the learners were probably uncertain about how much influence teachers actually have in the decision-makings that resulted from such collaborative endeavors. Perhaps they are uncertain as to what their roles are when present at these events – are they the information seeker, information provider or are they the decision-maker?

Re-Educative Attempt – The Tutorial Sessions

The perspectives uncovered from the online discussion were put to challenge via face-to-face class tutorial exercise. The intention of asking them to reflect on their beliefs, or the class 'norms' was to provide them with the opportunity to possibly '*re educate*' their norms themselves. Although in the normative-re-educative model, direct intervention would be required from the trainer or facilitator representing the governing body, due to the limited time available at hand, such intervention was not possible. Nonetheless, the absence of it, in a way allowed the learners to deliberate on the issue and looking at it from their own perspectives, thus giving them the ownership of ideas and decision-making.

To accommodate the class size of 46, two tutorial exercises were conducted, each lasting for an hour. Although the learners had to be divided into two smaller groups, a group of five students, who were already chosen at random among them, prior to the exercise, were put in charge of planning and managing both sessions. This was to ensure the organization of the

tutorials for the two groups would, as much as possible, be similar to one another. The role of these tutors, among others, include:

1. Deciding on activities or strategies to make the tutorial sessions interesting, meaningful, and lively.
2. Ensuring that everyone gets to participate in the discussion (no one should be left out)
3. Ensuring that all the issues are adequately addressed within the time frame allocated.

A class debate activity was chosen as it allowed the learners to present arguments for and against the issue at hand. Two topics for debate were presented a week before the sessions to enable the tutors to prepare for their roles and to decide with the class the points or the views that could be highlighted in the debate. The two debate topics were:

- Teachers should have the freedom to make autonomous curriculum decisions to develop a program for their students
- The Ministry of Education has an obligation on behalf of the public to audit teachers and schools to guarantee high educational standards among people

Upon discussion as a class, the tutors then would have to decide with the class which topic to be debated, who would be in the proponent teams, opponent teams and panel of judges. The panel of judges would be responsible in deciding which team had put forth the most convincing arguments and should be declared winner.

Outcome Of The Tutorial Sessions

The topic chosen by both groups was the first one - *Teachers should have the freedom to make autonomous curriculum decisions to develop a program for their students*. At the end of the sessions, the tutors were asked to reflect on the decisions they made in preparation for the debate and explain why those decisions were made. As described above there were a number of things that the learners would need to plan and decide on by themselves.

First, deciding on the topic. This was a decision made by the class and not the tutors. When asked why this was so, the tutors described that they felt the choice of topic should be left for the class to decide as they would be the ones debating and weighing the arguments. They further commented that the above topic was chosen, as the focus was on the teachers and the degree of freedom they should be given, hence, the class would like the arguments for and against this topic be heard from the teachers' perspectives. Indeed familiarity and a sense of ownership towards an issue are prerequisite for effective discussion. Without these, any discussion would lose its significance and relevance to the participants.

The debate entitled 'Teachers should have the freedom to make autonomous curriculum decisions to develop a program for their student,' was thought provoking and (an) interesting topic

(Gerald, December, 2000)

The next decision to be made was who should be in the debate teams and who as the panel of judges. Not surprisingly, the initial decision was to ask the learners who were considered 'experts' in the issue and have been participating actively in class in other discussions. This

decision, however, was strongly protested by a few 'experts' as they felt that it was not fair to the others, and furthermore, the idea of being coerced into doing something was considered unacceptable. In the end it was decided that they would let the 'vote' decide on who would play what role. Fairness here was seen as a key factor in decision-making. It is, no doubt, a fundamental criterion that one expects in a decision that would affect everyone's involved.

We gathered at BS 5 to discuss how to choose the opponents, proponents, judges, audience and the score sheets. Finally it was agreed that we draw lots to determine who would carry out the debate and who were to be the judges

(Gerald, December, 2000)

The criteria for evaluation was another decision which the tutors would have to make. Without any given guidelines on how the debate should be evaluated, the tutors had to reflect on their previous experiences as teachers and learners in deciding on this. This proved to be a demanding task as each criterion proposed must be justified and so must the percentage of marks allocated for each of them. These criteria also had to be clarified to the appointed panel of judges so that the points raised and the style and manner in which they were raised during the debate would be awarded accordingly. Again, the tutors found this to be challenging because they could not claim for sure that what they have agreed on paper would be adhered to in practice. Ensuring that everyone would have the same understanding and interpretation of an issue was, without a doubt, a difficult thing to do. This applies not just to the guidelines for this debate but also to other guidelines, which learners have to adhere to for their classroom practice.

After weeks of thorough planning and brainstorming for ideas we finally drafted out the plan to conduct the debate. It was suggested that the debate was to be conducted in a formal and orderly manner complete with rules and regulations

(Gerald, December, 2000)

The debate format and procedure had to be decided on too, to ensure that the exercise could be carried out within the time frame given, which was an hour for each tutorial group. Unlike the earlier decisions, this one involved only the assigned tutors and they found it easier and less time consuming to decide on the format and procedure because of the small number of decision makers. It is, however, argued that it is not the number of decision makers available that should matter, but the breadth and depth of discussion and the number of decisions that are to be made. Some decisions, especially the ones that involve format and procedure probably do not really require a lot of people to deliberate on, unlike the one on content as described earlier.

There were decisions which the tutors had no influence on and these were the decisions on who should win the debate and who to be declared the best speaker. Based on the criteria of evaluation decided on earlier, the panel of judges had to decide which arguments deserved to be awarded, which ones dismissed, and who, amongst them to be declared the best speaker. For the first tutorial session, the proponent team was announced as the winner. All members of the judges seemed to favour the arguments put forth by the speakers for the proponent team. For the best debater award, surprisingly, it went to a speaker from the opponent side. When later asked to clarify why the outcome of the first debate was as such, the member of the panel justified that the proponent's arguments for the notion of giving teachers the autonomy to make their own curricular decisions were unchallenged by the opponent side.

Rebuttal for the notion came only from one speaker who, in the end, they chose as the best debater.

In the first session among group 1, the proponent had a strong argument when they backed theirs with the fact that in the US has a state based curriculum. The proponent also said that the teacher being trained and in the front line of the profession is better at making decision then those in the high position. Though the opposition emphasis the importance of a standard criterion for all school in a country and importance of a single culture and education they failed to rebuke the proponent argument (except for the best speaker)

(Gerald, December, 2000)

This outcome gave rise to the issue as to whether it was the speakers' eloquence that influenced the panel of judges' decision or was it the merit of arguments against teachers having the autonomy to make curricular decisions.

The result for the second tutorial session was the opposite of the first one. It was the opponent team who was victorious and like in the first session, the chosen best speaker was also from the opponent side. These results suggests that the panel of judges were probably not convinced of arguments for the notion of teachers being given the autonomy to make curriculum decisions for their learners. Interestingly, instead of refuting the arguments, the proponent side appeared to agree with the point of view of their opponents. This could probably be due to the fact that selection of members for the proponent team was a vote decision. For them to propose for a motion, which they perhaps have little or no confidence at all, would probably be a daunting task.

In the second session the opponent came strong with their argument that teachers are bias in their decisions according to their area and their background. They said that there would be problem in standardization should there be difference in curriculum design. Furthermore they argued that it is a time consuming and a burdening task for teachers to involve themselves in the design. In the second session however the proponent did not have a strong argument and had the tendency to agree with the opponent

(Gerald, December, 2000)

After the debate sessions were completed, the class was asked to reflect on the role of teachers in curriculum decision-making. They were also asked to reflect on the responses, which they had given earlier to the online discussion, and state whether they still believed in views they have expressed or have been swayed by the arguments they had heard during the debates. Most felt that the idea of teachers being given the autonomy to make curricular decisions would be desirable but they agreed that teachers most of the time trivialized their pedagogical planning and decision-making skills as they believe that they do not affect anyone but their pupils. Although this may seem to be the case, it is also imperative for teachers to realise that any changes to the curriculum are indeed with the intention of affecting the pupils and no one else. The fact that they are the most influential decision makers to the pupils should be of some significant value. As accentuated by McGee (1997, p.290), "any planned change is only as good as the teachers working in a school, for it is the teachers who finally shape what happens with students in classrooms and how classroom plans are interpreted". Teachers' ability to make informed pedagogical choices and decisions

pertaining to their learning environment, as what the tutors of this exercise have shown, are the actual prerequisite for innovation and change.

CONCLUSION

What perhaps has caused most teachers to assume that they have no role in curricular decision-makings is the belief that curricular decisions can be made only by the Ministry and not the teachers. Even when they are deciding on their everyday classroom practices, selecting and developing instructional materials for their lessons, reflecting on which methods would work best to evaluate their learners' achievement, teachers do not regards these as curricular decisions. Often the successful or otherwise 40 or 80 minutes experiences were left only in the pages of the planning, rarely brought up, until there is a need to teach the same lesson again to different group of pupils.

The tutorial exercises carried out with the TESL UNIMAS and ESL PKPG groups illustrated that decision-making is a not a simple task which could be taken lightly. However, they are also not ones which teachers are not able to make. Learners' reflections as described earlier indicate that they are aware that a certain degree of reasoning and justification need to be made for their decisions. Decisions made would either bring positive or negative consequences depending on the amount of and the receptivity of the people who would be affected by the decisions.

The exercises also illustrated that beliefs and experience of the decision-makers, with regards to the issue at hand, their perceived role in the curriculum and the education system itself are the factors that influence curricular decision-making. Indeed, what teachers believe, what teachers know and what teachers believe they know actually have influence over the decisions that they make in their planning and teaching (Woods, 1996). Efforts to empower teachers, to make them see themselves more than just content deliverer or knowledge transmitter are underway in most teacher education programmes. It is hoped that many others would also recognize the importance for teachers to get their ideas and views heard and to share with the others their curricular decision-makings and classroom experiences.

Decision-making skill is fundamental for all teachers to have. Educational policy, curricular documents, and public opinions stipulating as to what knowledge and competency learners should be equipped with after they leave schools are nothing but frameworks and guidelines for teachers to base their decisions on. With the limited classroom time they have coupled with the number of learners they are responsible for, it is of utmost importance for them to ensure that their classroom decisions would result in effective learning. Perhaps, it is timely that these classroom vignettes be made known to others in the profession to inform them of their own curricular decision- making.

REFERENCES

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2001). Approaches to Changes. Retrieved, 1 August 2002 at <http://www.sedl.org/change/facilitate/approaches.html#early>

Eisner, E.W. (1994). The educational imagination. Singapore: Macmillan

- McCutcheon, G. (1995). Developing the curriculum: solo and group deliberation. New York: Longman.
- McGee, C. (1997). Teachers and curriculum decision-making. The Dunmore Press: Palmerston North
- Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (1995). Curriculum development: Theory into practice_(3rd. ed). Merrill Prentice Hall: New Jersey
- Walker, D. F & Soltis, J.F. (1997). Curriculum and Aims. Teachers College Press: Columbia University.
- Woods, D. (1996). Teacher cognition in language teaching: beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.