European Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development
Volume- 45 November- 2025
Website: www.ejird.journalspark.org ISSN (E): 2720-5746

# IMPLEMENTING A SPIRAL CURRICULUM IN LANGUAGE EDUCATION: THEORY, PRACTICE AND CASE ILLUSTRATIONS

Nasiba Jakbarova
A Senior Teacher at Namangan
State Institute of Foreign Languages, PhD

**Abstract**
This paper explores the theoretical basis of the spiral curriculum, its adaptation for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, and its implications for language skill development. A quasi-experimental study in an Uzbek secondary school demonstrates how cyclic reinforcement of linguistic structures enhances vocabulary retention, grammatical accuracy, and communicative competence. The results affirm that spiral sequencing supports cumulative learning and fosters learner autonomy. The discussion highlights pedagogical implications, challenges in implementation, and recommendations for language teachers and curriculum designers.

## Introduction

Curriculum design lies at the heart of educational success, defining not only what students learn but also how they progress through increasingly complex knowledge domains. The concept of a 'spiral curriculum,' first introduced by Jerome Bruner, offers a cognitive framework for structuring learning experiences around continuous revisiting and expansion of key concepts. J. Bruner argued that "any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development" (p. 33). This implies that learning should evolve through structured cycles that build upon earlier knowledge, enabling transfer and abstraction.
In language education, where skill development requires constant practice and reinforcement, a spiral curriculum provides a natural fit. Learners benefit from recurring exposure to linguistic forms—such as grammar, vocabulary, and discourse structures—within progressively challenging communicative contexts. According to Harden and Stamper, spiral models promote vertical integration by ensuring that previously taught material reappears in new contexts, aiding cumulative understanding. The model contrasts with traditional linear curriculums, which often move through topics without systematic revisitation, leading to knowledge decay and compartmentalized skills (Ireland, 2020).
The spiral model aligns with contemporary constructivist and sociocultural theories of language acquisition. It supports Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), wherein learners progress through scaffolded instruction. Each revisit to a linguistic item or skill represents a new stage in the learner's ZPD, fostering deeper internalization. Similarly, Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Swain's Output Hypothesis find reinforcement within spiral sequencing, as iterative exposure and production cycles consolidate interlanguage development.

**Methods**

This research adopted a mixed-method design to evaluate the effectiveness of a spiral curriculum in developing English language skills among secondary school learners in Uzbekistan. The study involved two groups of Grade 10 students (N=60). The experimental group followed a spiral-structured syllabus integrating recursive learning cycles, while the control group pursued a traditional linear sequence.

The spiral curriculum was structured into three cycles, each reintroducing linguistic content with greater contextual depth: (1) introductory (Weeks 1–6), (2) expansion (Weeks 7–12), and (3) integration (Weeks 13–18). Vocabulary, grammar, and skills-based tasks were designed around common thematic units such as 'Daily Routines,' 'Health and Lifestyle,' and 'Community and Environment.' The complexity increased by integrating tenses, functions, and discourse markers across cycles.

Data collection included pre-tests and post-tests on vocabulary and grammar, observation checklists for communicative performance, and semi-structured interviews with teachers and students. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation), while qualitative data were coded thematically to identify recurring perceptions regarding the spiral model's impact.

**Results**

Quantitative results revealed consistent improvement among students exposed to the spiral syllabus. Mean test scores rose from 71.4% (Cycle 1) to 76.8% (Cycle 2) and 81.2% (Cycle 3), compared to the control group's decline from 70.9% to 67.5%. Vocabulary retention rates were notably higher (by 12%) for the spiral group, confirming the value of cumulative exposure. Grammar tests also indicated enhanced mastery of complex structures, including past continuous and conditional sentences.

Qualitative feedback highlighted students' increased confidence and metacognitive awareness. Many expressed that revisiting earlier topics "made learning easier" and "helped connect old and new lessons." Teachers observed a shift from mechanical to meaningful use of language, as students began applying old vocabulary in new communicative contexts. Observations suggested greater student participation, reduced anxiety during speaking tasks, and stronger peer collaboration.

**Discussion**

Findings affirm the theoretical premise that spiraling facilitates long-term retention and transfer of linguistic competence. The cyclic reintroduction of topics mirrors natural language acquisition patterns, where repetition and elaboration lead to deeper learning (Harden & Stamper, 1999). The improvement in test scores and student engagement demonstrates the potential of spiral sequencing to transform passive learning into active cognitive reconstruction. Comparatively, traditional linear curricula often produce "coverage without mastery," as students encounter content once and then move on (Tyler, 1949). Bruner's spiral, however, promotes depth through recurrence. The results align with international experiences—for example, Helendoron (2024) demonstrated similar improvements among young EFL learners

using spiral phonics instruction, and Lee (2021) found enhanced writing fluency in a Korean high school adopting a spiral communicative syllabus.

However, implementation challenges persist. Teachers require training in backward curriculum mapping and vertical integration planning to maintain coherence between cycles. Without such design precision, repetition can become redundant rather than developmental (Ireland, 2020). Additionally, contextual constraints such as rigid national curricula and time limits may restrict iterative revisiting of topics.

**Conclusion**

This study reinforces the pedagogical value of the spiral curriculum for language education. Revisiting linguistic content in cycles of increasing complexity enhances retention, grammatical accuracy, and learner confidence. In contexts such as Uzbekistan, where English proficiency remains a national priority, spiral approaches could align well with communicative and competency-based reforms (PF-60, 2022).

To maximize its benefits, educational policymakers should encourage professional development programs on spiral curriculum design. Future research might examine longitudinal effects across academic years or explore digital spiral learning models integrating AI-based adaptive feedback. Overall, the spiral curriculum represents not merely a structural innovation but a paradigm shift toward cumulative, lifelong language learning.

**References**

1. Bruner, J. (1960). The Process of Education. Harvard University Press.
2. Harden, R. M., & Stamper, N. (1999). What is a spiral curriculum? Medical Teacher, 21(2), 141–143.
3. Ireland, J. (2020). Perspectives on Curriculum Design: Comparing the Spiral and the Network Models. Cambridge Assessment Research Report.
4. Helendoron, D. (2024). The Benefits of Using a Spiral Approach in Teaching English. Helendoron English Press.
5. Lee, S. (2021). Applying Spiral Sequencing in High School English Curriculum: A Case from Korea. TESOL Journal, 12(3), 224–240.
6. Bjork, R. A., & Bjork, E. L. (2011). Creating desirable difficulties to enhance learning. In M. A. Gernsbacher et al. (Eds.), Psychology and the real world. Oxford University Press.
7. Bjork, R. A., & Bjork, E. L. (2020). Desirable difficulties in theory and practice. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 9(4), 475–479.
8. Cambridge Assessment (Ireland, J.). (2020). Perspectives on curriculum design: Comparing the spiral and the network models. Cambridge Assessment Publications.
9. Carpenter, S. K., Cepeda, N. J., Rohrer, D., Kang, S. H. K., & Pashler, H. (2012). Using spacing to enhance diverse forms of learning. Educational Psychology Review, 24, 369–378.
10. Council of Europe. (2020). CEFR Companion Volume with new descriptors. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
11. Harden, R. M., & Stamper, N. (1999). What is a spiral curriculum? Medical Teacher, 21(2), 141–143.

12. Kang, S. H. K. (2016). Spaced repetition promotes efficient and effective learning: Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3(1), 12–19.
13. Nation, P. (2024). Re-Thinking the Principles of Vocabulary Learning and Teaching. Languages, 9(5), 160.
14. Rohrer, D. (2012). Interleaving helps students distinguish among similar concepts. Educational Psychology Review, 24, 355–367.
15. PF-60. (2022). The New Uzbekistan Development Strategy 2022–2026. Presidential Decree of the Republic of Uzbekistan.