The role of artificial intelligence in schoolteachers' EFL curriculum adaptation patterns: Experiences in Türkiye

Fatma Özüdoğru
Uşak University, Türkiye

Despite the increasing interest in teachers' curriculum adaptation, limited interest has been paid to their perceptions and practices regarding the use of artificial intelligence (AI) during this process. Thus, this study aimed to fill in this gap by examining English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns and their perceptions and practices about AI-supported curriculum adaptation. This study utilised an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. A curriculum adaptation scale was administered to 225 teachers and semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 teachers. Both descriptive and predictive statistics were applied to analyse the quantitative data, and the qualitative data were subjected to descriptive and content analysis. The findings indicated that teachers used extending practices more than replacing/ revising and omitting. Also, AI did not fundamentally transform teachers' curriculum adaptation tendencies but was used as a resource to support teachers' existing curriculum adaptation practices.

Introduction

A curriculum is designed to provide clear guidance for teaching and learning, helping ensure that instruction aligns with both national and international standards (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018). Because of this, teachers are often expected to follow the official curriculum closely in order to meet its goals. In practice, however, a range of teacher-, student-, and context-related factors make strict adherence difficult to maintain (Combs et al., 2022; Lovett et al., 2024; Sakallıoğlu & Özüdoğru, 2022). Thus, a gap arises between the "intended curriculum" and "enacted curriculum", which is the relationship between what policymakers envision and what actually occurs in the classroom (Yang, 2023).

In highly centralised education systems, curriculum implementation is expected to be closely aligned with national curriculum goals, placing pressure on teachers to implement the prescribed curriculum as intended (Kim, 2024; Lovett et al., 2024). As a result, any modifications made by teachers can be seen as deviations from the intended curriculum (OECD, 2024). However, adaptation is inevitable due to factors such as students' readiness and motivation, limited resources, time constraints, and national high-stakes tests (Nolt & Leviton (2023; Nalbantoğlu & Bümen, 2019). In fact, these adjustments are part of teacher agency and professional decision-making (González & Calle-Díaz, 2023; Priestley et al., 2015).

In Türkiye a single national curriculum is enforced; however, adhering to the curriculum closely is often not applicable. According to Priestley et al. (2015), teachers interpret the curriculum guidelines based on their classroom realities and make necessary adjustments. This situation is similar in English language teaching (ELT), where teachers frequently deal with students of mixed ability and varying preparedness and motivation levels. In

such a circumstance, curriculum adaptation is inevitable for successful instruction (Çeliker Ercan & Çubukçu, 2023; Miqawati, 2022).

Curriculum adaptation refers to modification of learning objectives, materials, or teaching methods to better address students' needs as well as contextual and resource-related constraints (Fullan, 2025; Oliva, 2022). In the context of ELT, such adaptations may involve reducing or reordering objectives or content, introducing authentic audiovisual materials, or allocating more time on speaking activities to promote meaningful language use (Miqawati, 2022; Tomlinson, 2023). These adaptation patterns are commonly classified as extending (adding new content, activities or materials), omitting (skipping the unnecessary or impractical parts of the curriculum) and replacing/revising (changing the duration, format or order) (Nalbantoğlu et al., 2022).

Studies conducted in curriculum adaptation and implementation of fidelity show that teachers make various changes to the curriculum during the implementation process. Onurkan-Aliusta and Özder (2022) revealed that teachers frequently remove, add, or reorganise curriculum content and activities depending on contextual conditions, such as time constraints, limited resources, and crowded classrooms. Similarly, Gelmez-Burakgazi (2020) stated that teachers adapt their teaching practices according to student characteristics, contextual conditions, and pedagogical beliefs. These findings demonstrate that curriculum adaptation is a natural part of the teaching process and is influenced by various contextual factors.

Research shows that curriculum adaptation plays a key role in balancing adherence to intended curriculum with being responsive to classroom conditions (Burkhauser & Lesaux, 2017; Lovett et al., 2024; McNeill et al., 2026; Nolt & Leviton, 2023; Troyer, 2019). This is especially essential in ELT, where teachers try to tailor their instruction to students' various needs and proficiency levels for successful language acquisition (Hanifa et al., 2024). In light of this, the increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) uncovers new dimensions to curriculum adaptation by offering choices that facilitate or hinder teachers' established curriculum adaptation practices.

In recent years, AI has increasingly reshaped education, especially in areas such as content production, evaluation, lesson planning, and adaptive learning (Holmes et al., 2019; Kasneci et al., 2023; Ma et al., 2024; Zawachi-Richter et al., 2019). For instance, ChatGPT and other generative AI tools give teachers new options to streamline lesson planning and adapt teaching resources to the various needs of their students, thereby supporting more personalised learning (Bai, 2025; Holmes et al., 2019; Kasneci et al., 2023; Zhao, 2025). The transformative potential of AI for curriculum adaptation was highlighted by Karataş et al. (2025), who pointed out that it can improve student engagement, relevance, and personalisation. Personalisation entails AI systems examining performance data and learning patterns to adjust content, enhancing learning outcomes and engagement. Thus, the development of differentiated materials and adaptive learning exercises can be facilitated by AI (Sari et al., 2024).

The use of AI has expanded rapidly in ELT to support personalised learning, enhance learner engagement, generate materials aligned with learners' readiness levels and interests, and provide immediate feedback (Bai, 2025; Bekou et al., 2024; Dou et al., 2025; Kristiawan et al., 2024; Zhao, 2025). These affordances give teachers additional ways to adapt the curriculum more effectively (Al-khresheh, 2024). However, the integration of AI raises important challenges, including concerns about the accuracy of AI-generated content, cultural appropriateness, data privacy issues, and the risk of overreliance on AI (Al-khresheh, 2024; Bekou et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024; Nugroho et al., 2024), which may affect students' critical thinking skills and teachers' professional judgment (UNESCO, 2021).

This study is primarily guided by Priestley et al.'s (2015) ecological framework on teacher agency. According to this perspective, teachers are not those who passively implement the curriculum; they are active decision-makers whose actions are shaped by the interplay of their professional experience, future goals, and contextual circumstances. Curriculum adaptation can therefore be understood as an indicator of teacher agency that occurs through teachers' interpretation, modification, and implementation of the curriculum in response to classroom realities. In this context, AI is conceptualised not as an autonomous actor that determines instructional decisions, but as a contextual resource that can support teachers' adaptation practices. The distinction between the intended curriculum and the enacted curriculum provides the curricular context for this process, while the ecological teacher agency framework explains how teachers make adaptation decisions and use AI in this process (Priestley et al., 2015). While AI can support the adaptation process by generating materials and activities, it can also present some limitations regarding the quality, relevance, and reliability of the content produced.

Previous research has examined the effect of AI on student outcomes, attitude, learning experiences and ethical considerations (Can, 2026; Dai & Liu, 2024; Khoso et al., 2025; Williamson & Eynon, 2020; Zhao, 2025). However, there is limited research about how English language teachers employ AI as part of their curriculum adaptation practices (Dewi, 2025; Karataş et al., 2025). Dewi (2025) showed how AI is being used by English teachers to adapt texts, such as simplifying or integrating multimedia as well as to produce content to better fit students' levels and contexts. Karataş et al. (2025) revealed that teachers utilised ChatGPT to add more pertinent and customised content, change or replace existing content, and remove unnecessary parts. Although previous studies have explored teachers' use of AI for curriculum adaptation, empirical research in this area remains limited. How these practices are related to teachers' existing curriculum adaptation patterns has not been sufficiently examined. The current study, which aims to address this gap, examines both teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns and their perceptions and practices regarding the use of AI to support curriculum adaptation.

Curriculum adaptation gained more attention recently both in Türkiye (Çeliker Ercan & Çubukçu, 2023; Gelmez-Burakgazi, 2020; Taş, 2022; Nalbantoğlu & Bümen, 2019; Nalbantoğlu & Bümen, 2024) and other countries (Debarger et al., 2017; Fogo et al., 2019; Lovett et al., 2024; Maniates, 2017; McNeill et al., 2026; Nolt & Leviton, 2023). Despite the fact that AI is becoming more prevalent in classrooms, little research has been done

on how teachers use it to adapt curriculum (Karataş et al., 2025). Although prior research has investigated teachers' traditional curriculum adaptation patterns and, more recently, their general use of AI, how teachers' traditional curriculum adaptation patterns align with AI-supported practices remains unexplored. In particular, there is a lack of empirical evidence on whether and how AI influences teachers' extending, omitting, and replacing/revising decisions in curriculum adaptation. Thus, my study aimed to fill in this gap by investigating both English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns and their perceptions and practices about the integration of AI into curriculum adaptation. This study contributes to the literature by indicating how AI influences teachers' pedagogical decision-making and can be utilised for curriculum adaptation. Within the scope of this research, first the general curriculum adaptation patterns of English language teachers were determined through a scale, then the role of AI during curriculum adaptation was highlighted through in-depth interviews. The research questions (RQs) were:

1. What are the levels of curriculum adaptation patterns among English language teachers?
2. Do English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns vary in terms of age, seniority, faculty of graduation, school type, possession of a postgraduate degree, and participation in in-service training on curriculum adaptation?
3. What are English language teachers' perceptions and practices regarding the use of AI to support curriculum adaptation?

Method

Research design

An explanatory sequential mixed method design was utilised to identify the curriculum adaptation patterns of English teachers. In this design, quantitative findings provide an overview of teachers' general tendencies, which are then elaborated through interviews to uncover the pedagogical and contextual factors shaping these tendencies (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2026). In the first phase, quantitative data were used to determine teachers' levels and patterns of curriculum adaptation, followed by qualitative data to explore in depth teachers' perceptions and practices regarding AI-supported curriculum adaptation.

Participants

The quantitative phase of the study involved English teachers working in public schools in a western city of Türkiye. Simple random sampling was used in the study (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The local Ministry of National Education (MoNE) branch granted the researcher permission to gather data from 45 randomly selected schools. Ultimately, 225 English teachers took part in the research. The demographics of participants can be seen in Appendix 1.

In the qualitative phase, criterion sampling, which is a purposive sampling method where participants are chosen because they meet a predetermined set of criteria, was employed

(Patton, 2015). The teachers were determined based on their self-reported use of AI during curriculum adaptation. 10 teachers who stated that they used AI and volunteered to participate in the interviews were included in the qualitative data collection. The demographics for these teachers can be seen in Appendix 2.

Data collection

The data were collected in the fall semester of 2025-2026 academic year using the Curriculum Adaptation Patterns Scale developed by Nalbantoğlu et al. (2022), and semi-structured interviews. The scale has three sub-dimensions, which are 'omitting', extending' and 'replacing or revising', with 20 items. The reliability coefficients are 0.87, 0.72 and 0.85 (Nalbantoğlu et al., 2022). Reliability was also checked in this study and found 0.86 for the whole scale, 0.87 for omitting, 0.78 for extending, and 0.86 for replacing or revising. The qualitative data were collected through a semi-structured interview form (Appendix 3). The interview form, developed by the researcher, was prepared by scanning the relevant literature. It includes questions addressing general use of AI by English teachers, general curriculum adaptation practices, use of AI for curriculum adaptation, benefits and challenges of using AI during curriculum adaptation, and future perspectives. The form was revised based on feedback from three experts in curriculum and instruction, and the final version included six core questions with probes. Prior to the interviews, informed consent was obtained from the participants. Each interview was recorded and lasted between 20 and 35 minutes. Ethical approval for the study was also granted.

Data analysis

SPSS statistical software was utilised to analyse quantitative data. In order to respond to the first research question, descriptive statistics were calculated to determine the patterns and levels of curriculum adaptation among English language teachers. To comment on the level of the scale items, the interval width was calculated (highest value-lowest value/number of categories). As a result, values between 1.00-2.33 were determined as low, 2.34-3.67 as moderate and 3.68-5.00 as high.

A normality test was then performed on the data to choose the test types. Analysis of skewness and kurtosis found that the skewness value .767 and kurtosis value 1.141. Since these values were between -1.5 and +1.5, it was determined that the data had normal distribution (Tabacknick & Fidell, 2018). In addition, a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to assess normality, finding that the p value was not significant ($p>.05$), indicating that the data had normal distribution. Thus, parametric tests were applied for data analysis (Field, 2024). Within the scope of RQ2, an independent samples t-test was employed to examine whether teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns varied by faculty of graduation, possession of a postgraduate degree, and participation in in-service training on curriculum adaptation, while one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilised to examine differences based on age, teaching experience, and school type. When statistically significant differences were found, post-hoc analyses were conducted to determine the source of these differences. Since the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated (Levene's test, $p<.05$), Tamhane's T2 post-hoc tests were performed to identify

pairwise group differences (Field, 2024; Tabacknick & Fidell, 2018). A significance level of .05 was adopted for all statistical analyses.

Within the scope of RQ3, the qualitative data were further analysed using descriptive and content analysis to uncover the perceptions and practices of English language teachers toward AI-supported curriculum adaption. After the recordings were transcribed, they were read considering research questions and a framework was created. Then, the data were coded and gathered under certain sub-themes and themes. The findings were explained in detail and supported by direct quotations (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

Findings

RQ1: What are the levels of curriculum adaptation patterns among English language teachers?

Table 1: Descriptive values regarding the curriculum adaptation scale

Patterns	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Level
Omitting	225	1	4.85	1.91	0.75	Low
Extending	225	2.57	5	4.01	0.54	High
Replacing/revising	225	1	4.66	2.61	0.73	Medium
Total	225	1.75	4.60	2.85	0.49	Medium

As can be seen from Table 1, English language teachers' omitting pattern is low, replacing/revising pattern is medium and extending pattern is high. Teachers' general curriculum adaptation level is also medium.

RQ2: Do English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns vary in terms of age, seniority, faculty of graduation, school type, possession of a postgraduate degree, and participation in in-service training on curriculum adaptation?

Table 2: Teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of age

Patterns	Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	*F*	*p*
Omitting	Between groups	40.614	3	13.538	.445	.721
	Within groups	6726.941	221	30.439		
	Total	6767.556	224			
Extending	Between groups	48.767	3	16.256	1.116	.344
	Within groups	3220.495	221	14.572		
	Total	3269.262	224			
Replacing/ revising	Between groups	108.776	3	36.259	1.851	.139
	Within groups	4329.446	221	19.590		
	Total	4438.222	224			
Total	Between groups	233.749	3	77.916	.747	.525
	Within groups	23063.291	221	104.359		
	Total	23297.040	224			

ANOVA results revealed that English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns did not differ significantly in terms of age. As shown in Table 2, there were no statistically significant differences in omitting (F=.445, *p*=.721, *p*>.05), extending (F=1.116, *p*=.344, *p*>.05), and replacing/revising (F=1.851, *p*=.139, *p*>.05) sub-dimensions among four age groups. In addition, no significant differences were found in teachers' general curriculum adaptation scores (F=.747, *p*=.525, p>.05). These findings suggest that teachers with different ages show similar tendencies in curriculum adaptation patterns, indicating that age is not a factor that shapes curriculum adaptation patterns of teachers. Table 3 shows English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of experience.

Table 3: Teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of teaching experience

Patterns	Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	*F*	*p*
Omitting	Between groups	55.690	4	13.923	.456	.768
	Within groups	6711.865	220	30.508		
	Total	6767.556	224			
Extending	Between groups	224.493	4	56.123	4.055	.003*
	Within groups	3044.770	220	13.840		
	Total	3269.262	224			
Replacing/ revising	Between groups	210.212	4	52.553	2.735	.030*
	Within groups	4228.010	220	19.218		
	Total	4438.222	224			
Total	Between groups	915.533	4	228.883	2.250	.040*
	Within groups	22381.507	220	101.734		
	Total	23297.040	224			

ANOVA results indicated that English language teachers' curriculum adaptation pattern did not differ significantly in the omitting (F=.456, *p*=.768, *p*>.05) sub-dimension in terms of teaching experience; however, teachers' extending (F=4.055, *p*=.003, *p*<.05), replacing (F=2.735, *p*=.030, *p*<.05) and overall (F=2.250, *p*=.040, *p*<.05) curriculum adaptation pattern differed significantly in terms of teaching experience. Post-hoc tests revealed that more experienced teachers used extending practices more than less experienced teachers. Specifically, teachers with 16–20 years and 21 years and more experience used significantly higher extending practices than those with 1–5 years of experience. Statistically significant differences were also found in the replacing sub-dimension. It was revealed that teachers with 21 years and more experience reported higher replacing or revising practices than teachers with 6-10 years of experience. Teachers' overall curriculum adaptation scores also showed that more experienced teachers got more actively involved in curriculum adaptation practices compared to less experienced teachers. Post-hoc comparisons indicated that teachers with 21 years and more experience reported higher curriculum adaptation than teachers with 6-10 years and 11-15 years of experience. These findings collectively point to the importance of teaching experience in shaping teachers' curriculum adaptation practices. Table 4 shows English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of faculty of graduation.

Table 4: Teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of faculty graduated

Pattern	Faculty	N	Mean	SD	df	t	*p*
Omitting	Education	144	1.97	0.87	223	1.069	.286
	Certification	81	1.87	0.58			
Extending	Education	144	4.15	0.50	223	2.638	.006*
	Certification	81	3.94	0.58			
Replacing/ revising	Education	144	2.65	0.79	223	.156	.876
	Certification	81	2.63	0.63			
Total	Education	144	2.89	0.44	223	.429	.668
	Certification	81	2.86	0.54			

Independent samples t-test results indicated that teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns differed significantly in terms of faculty graduated only in the extending sub-dimension. As shown in Table 4, there were no significant differences between teachers having graduated from the Faculty of Education and those holding teaching certificates in omitting, replacing and overall curriculum adaptation. However, significant differences were found in extending sub-dimension (t = 2.638, p =.006, p<.05). Teachers having graduated from the Faculty of Education scored higher in extending sub-dimension compared to those holding teaching certificates. Table 5 shows English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of school type.

Table 5. Teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of school type

Patterns	Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	*F*	*p*
Omitting	Between groups	420.771	2	210.385	7.359	.001*
	Within groups	6346.785	222	28.589		
	Total	6767.556	224			
Extending	Between groups	394.653	2	197.326	15.239	.000*
	Within groups	2874.609	222	12.949		
	Total	3269.262	224			
Replacing/ revising	Between groups	51.062	2	25.531	1.292	.277
	Within groups	4387.160	222	19.762		
	Total	4438.222	224			
Total	Between groups	138.783	2	69.392	.665	.515
	Within groups	23158.257	222	104.316		
	Total	23297.040	224			

ANOVA test results indicated significant differences in the omitting and extending sub-dimensions; however, no significant differences were found in the replacing sub-dimension and overall curriculum adaptation score. First, statistically significant differences were identified in the omitting sub-dimension (F=7.359, p=.001, p<.05). The post-hoc comparisons revealed that middle school teachers reported higher levels of omitting practices than primary school teachers, and high school teachers also reported significantly higher omitting practices than primary school teachers. Table 5 also indicated significant differences in the extending sub-dimension (F=15.239, p=.000, p<.05). The

post-hoc analysis showed that teachers working in primary school had significantly higher extending practices than middle and high school teachers. Furthermore, middle school teachers had significantly higher extending practices compared to high school teachers. These results imply that primary school teachers appear more likely to enrich the curriculum. Table 6 shows English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of postgraduate education.

Table 6: Teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of postgraduate education

Pattern	Postgrad.	N	Mean	SD	df	t	*p*
Omitting	Yes	53	1.96	0.88	223	.277	.783
	No	172	1.92	0.75			
Extending	Yes	53	4.06	0.54	223	2.446	.015*
	No	172	3.86	0.51			
Replacing/ revising	Yes	53	2.69	0.73	223	.525	.600
	No	172	2.63	0.74			
Total	Yes	53	2.84	0.55	223	.513	.608
	No	172	2.88	0.49			

Independent samples t-test results showed that teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns did not differ significantly in omitting, replacing and overall curriculum adaptation. However, significant differences were found in extending sub-dimension (t=2.446, p=.015, p<.05). Teachers having postgraduate education reported significantly higher scores in extending practices than teachers without such a degree. Table 7 shows English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of in-service training.

Table 7: Teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns in terms of in-service training

Pattern	In-service training	N	Mean	SD	df	t	*p*
Omitting	Yes	68	2.02	0.89	223	1.116	.266
	No	157	1.89	0.73			
Extending	Yes	68	4.07	0.53	223	.921	.358
	No	157	3.99	0.55			
Replacing/ revising	Yes	68	2.83	0.74	223	2.493	.013*
	No	157	2.56	0.72			
Total	Yes	68	2.98	0.51	223	2.036	.043*
	No	157	2.83	0.50			

Independent samples t-test results indicated no significant differences in omitting and extending sub-dimensions. However, statistically significant differences were identified in replacing/revising (t=2.493, p=.013, p<.05) and overall curriculum adaptation (t=2.036, p=.043, p<.05). Teachers participating in in-service training reported significantly higher levels of replacing/revising practices than those without such training. The results also showed that teachers who participated in in-service training had higher overall adaptation levels compared to those who did not.

RQ3: What are English language teachers' perceptions and practices regarding the use of AI to support curriculum adaptation?

Table 8 shows teachers' perceptions and practices regarding the use of AI to support curriculum adaptation.

Table 8: Teachers' perceptions and practices regarding the use of AI

Themes	Sub-themes	Codes	Teachers
Teachers' perceptions of AI use	Perceived competence	Not feeling fully competent	T1, T3, T4, T5, T6, T9
		Feeling incompetent	T7, T8, T10
		Feeling competent	T2
	Perceived benefits of AI	Saving time	All teachers
		Balancing classroom realities	All teachers
		Gaining new insights	All teachers
		Responding to needs/interests	All teachers
		Making students more engaged	T1, T3, T5, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10
		Offering various activities	T2, T3, T5, T6, T8, T9, T10
		Creating various materials	T2, T4, T6, T7, T8, T9, T10
		Meeting student readiness	T3, T4, T5, T7, T9
		Concretising content	T3, T4, T5, T9
		Diversifying content	T1, T3, T6
	Perceived challenges of using AI	Reliability concerns	T1, T3, T4, T5, T6, T9, T10
		Writing the right prompt	T2, T3, T7, T8, T9
		Lack of technical knowledge	T2, T5
		Finding suitable tools	T5
	Future role of AI	Great improvement in capacity and function	T2, T4, T5, T7, T8, T9, T10
		Supportive	T2, T3, T4, T6, T7
		Mentor	T2, T4, T6
		No change	T1
		More personalised learning	T6
Teacher practices in using AI	Use of AI in instruction	Getting new opinions	All teachers
		Preparing course materials	T2, T3, T4, T8, T9, T10
		Preparing assessment tools	T1, T4, T6, T7, T8, T9
		Designing creative activities	T2, T4, T8, T9, T10
		Designing lesson flow and content	T4, T5, T6
		Elaborating on content	T1, T3, T6
		Preparing projects	T5
	Traditional curriculum adaptation strategies	Enriching the content	T1, T3, T5, T6, T7, T8, T10
		Replacing/revising	T2, T3, T6, T7, T8, T9
		Simplifying content	T1
	AI-supported curriculum adaptation strategies	Enriching curriculum	All teachers
		Replacing/revising activities	T2, T3, T4, T6, T7, T8, T9
		Simplifying content	T2, T3, T4, T8, T9, T10
		Preparing assessment for std.level	T1, T4, T6, T8
		Reducing content	T4, T8
		Omitting content	T8

As shown in Table 8, the qualitative data were gathered under two main themes, which illuminate how English language teachers perceive and implement AI for curriculum adaptation. Regarding teachers' perceptions, it was revealed that although teachers used AI frequently, more than half of the teachers did not feel fully competent in using AI. Teachers' limited competence is illustrated by T1's explanation: "AI is something we've only recently encountered. It's something new entering our lives. I use it from time to time and try to benefit from it. Because we don't fully understand it ourselves, I don't think I feel completely competent."

The views of teachers regarding the benefits of AI for curriculum adaptation were quite positive. Within this sample, all teachers stated that AI saves time, helps balance the official curriculum with classroom realities, provides new insights, and supports responding to students' needs and interests. Moreover, almost all the teachers in the interviews believed that AI helped make students more engaged by offering various activities and materials, which suggests that AI makes the lessons more learner-centred and responsive. For instance, T3 mentioned these advantages "I already mentioned that it saves time, it also offers ideas I wouldn't have thought of. Sometimes when I'm stuck and think, "How can I do an activity for this?", it can come up with very creative suggestions outside of my standard frameworks."

Despite many advantages, teachers also depicted some challenges of using AI for curriculum adaptation. Teachers most frequently mentioned reliability concerns in relation to AI-generated content. For example, T5 expressed this concern by saying "When you say, "Create this for me from the materials of this unit in this book", sometimes irrelevant things come up. For example, it might add words or content from a previous topic. You need to verify each item individually." This was followed by difficulties in writing effective prompts. Teachers stated that if they did not write a suitable prompt, then AI would not generate what they actually asked for. Two teachers also complained about lack of technical skills. Overall, these challenges underscore the importance of analytical thinking skills and technical support for teachers.

Another sub-theme obtained from the findings is the future role of AI in curriculum adaptation. As part of their perceptions of AI use, teachers also reflected on the future role of AI in curriculum adaptation based on their current experiences with AI-assisted practices. Seven teachers anticipated great improvements in the capacity and functions of AI. For instance, T7 explained strong optimism about AI's potential by stating "I believe AI will play a more leading role in adapting the curriculum to the students. Because when you provide AI with the right data – data about the student's level and how you want to guide them – it will create many alternative paths for you and it will improve more every day and year". In addition, several teachers believed that AI, rather than replacing them, will be more supportive and a mentor for teachers in the future as well as provide more individualised learning opportunities. Only one teacher believed that AI would not bring change. These findings suggest that most teachers are optimistic about the future role of AI and recognise its potential in curriculum adaptation.

The second main theme was teachers' practices in using AI for curriculum adaptation. In the interviews it was found that teachers mainly used text-based generative AI, such as ChatGPT and Gemini. All teachers in the sample utilised AI for generating novel ideas. For instance, T10 explained, "I would say that I generally use AI to get ideas when preparing lesson plans". In addition, most of the teachers used AI for creating course materials, assessment tools and creative activities.

Another sub-theme obtained from the interviews is traditional curriculum adaptation strategies. Most of the teachers, prior to or alongside AI use, primarily relied on enriching the content or replacing/revising the activities, while only one teacher reported simplifying content due to lack of student readiness. Teachers most frequently enriched the content by adding supplementary content to support student learning. For instance, T3 explained, "When some students show resistance to learning or sometimes the content is weak and insufficient, then I add stories or other content to be able to teach effectively." Replacing/revising the activities was another common strategy employed by teachers. T8 explained simplifying or pacing activities based on students' readiness levels: "Activities might be too difficult for some students depending on their level, so I try to simplify them. In some classes, a topic is understood very easily, while with students at a slightly lower level, I focus on the topic longer than it should to grasp; this is an example of adjusting the pace." T9 emphasised class dynamics to adapt activities, stating "I also revise activities according to the class dynamics; for example, if it's a lively class, I make them more interactive, and if it's a quiet class, I make them more focused on individual work."

In relation to AI-supported curriculum adaptation strategies, all teachers in the interviews reported utilising AI to enrich the curriculum. For instance, T4 explained "Sometimes the activities in the book are not enough so I ask AI, "What creative activities can I do in the classroom to improve speaking skills?" It brings up many options. I choose from them and adjust to their needs." Furthermore, more than half of the teachers stressed their use of AI for replacing/revising activities and simplifying content. T6 illustrated activity revision by stating "Thanks to AI, I can quickly prepare different formats such as matching, multiple choice, or word search. When they don't constantly receive the same type of paper, their interest and participation in the lesson increase because the material becomes more colorful." Teachers also underscored AI's ability to adjust activities based on learner characteristics. As T2 stated, "When I enter my students' ages and levels, it suggests activities or techniques that they might enjoy." Very few teachers utilised AI for reducing and omitting content, which indicates that teachers avoid making radical changes to the curriculum and use AI within the boundaries of prescribed curriculum.

Discussion and conclusion

This study aimed to explore English language teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns and the role of AI to support curriculum adaptation. The quantitative data obtained from the scale indicated that total curriculum adaptation score of teachers is medium. Moreover, they have a medium replacing/revising pattern, a high extending pattern, and a low omitting pattern. These findings indicate that teachers employ extending practices to

enrich and supplement the curriculum more frequently than omitting. The low use of omitting pattern may be due to the centralised Turkish education system, in which omitting is not viewed professional, and adhering to the prescribed curriculum strictly is seen as an indicator of teaching quality (Nalbantoğlu & Bümen, 2019). Similar to the current study, Karataş et al. (2025) revealed teachers placed less emphasis on omitting in Türkiye.

The qualitative findings obtained from the interviews were in line with the quantitative findings. All teachers reported using AI to enrich the curriculum, and a greater number of teachers engaged in replacing/revising activities, simplifying content and preparing assessments appropriate for students' levels. Notably, reducing and omitting content emerged only in AI-supported adaptation and were mentioned by a very limited number of teachers.

When the quantitative and qualitative findings are considered together, a coherent pattern is seen. When teachers started to use AI during curriculum adaptation, these core strategies remained similar; however, AI appeared to broaden and intensify their application. English language teachers do not implement major changes in the curriculum, instead they employ AI to expand and diversify their traditional curriculum adaptation strategies. Qualitative findings obtained from the interviews where teachers were found to enrich content and replaced/revised activities based on student readiness confirm quantitative findings that indicate frequent extending practices. Overall, these findings can be interpreted in line with the framework of ecological teacher agency (Priestley et al., 2015). AI, rather than replacing teachers' professional judgments, has functioned as an additional resource within their ecological working environments. Teachers have maintained the responsibility of evaluating, adapting, and selecting AI-generated content in line with student needs, curriculum objectives, and classroom conditions. For this reason, AI has emerged as an element that supports teacher activity in the curriculum adaptation process. However, the predominance of extending and replacing/revising strategies may be due not only to teachers' use of AI as a supportive resource, but also to the capacity of existing AI tools and the contextual limitations in which teachers work. In particular, centralised curriculum requirements and high-stakes exams can limit opportunities for more extensive curriculum changes, including omitting. In addition, while teachers are optimistic about the future perspectives of AI, there are also issues regarding how pedagogical judgment and professional accountability will be ensured as AI becomes more autonomous (Yusuf et al., 2025).

The study's intriguing finding is that teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns are significantly influenced by teaching experience. More experienced teachers extended their courses by adding new materials or changed the content's sequence. This suggests that teaching experience may enhance teachers' pedagogical decision-making and confidence in making adaptations. This is supported by Karataş et al.'s (2025) study, which indicated experienced teachers were better able to adapt the curriculum to meet curriculum goals than novice teachers. Karataş et al. (2025) demonstrated that novice teachers mostly focused on urgent classroom needs and relied more on the prescribed curriculum

materials. Overall, these findings suggest that over time teachers may develop a greater understanding of curriculum guidelines and make more purposeful adaptations.

The findings also demonstrated that in contrast to teachers possessing pedagogical formation certificate, those who graduated from the Faculty of Education expanded the curriculum more frequently. This result shows that teachers who get formal training in the Faculties of Education may feel more self-confident in adapting the curriculum. Furthermore, such programs may offer stronger theoretical and practical underpinnings for curriculum development, instructional design and learner-centred instruction.

The findings also showed that the type of school greatly improved teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns. Teachers working at middle or high school levels reported omitting content or activities while primary school teachers tended to enrich the curriculum to meet students' needs. This may result from centralised examinations at the secondary level, which leads teachers to omit content that is not tested to save time. This is supported by prior research by Nalbantoğlu & Bümen (2019) that showed teachers tended to omit curriculum content because it was either not tested in the high-stakes tests or students lacked the previous knowledge. In contrast to the current study, Karataş et al. (2025) revealed that school level did not affect teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns.

The findings also suggested that postgraduate education influenced teachers' only extending practices. This result implies that teachers who pursued advanced academic studies tend to enrich the curriculum instead of just implementing the prescribed curriculum. Postgraduate education may enhance critical reflection and provide teachers to be more open to innovation. It is also considered that advanced academic training may boost teachers' self-efficacy to enrich the content and diversify learning experiences. This finding supports Taş's (2022) study, which found teachers handled adaptation challenges through their postgraduate education experiences. Contrary to the findings of the current study, Karataş et al. (2025) found that teachers' approaches to curriculum adaptation did not change as their education level increased or changed.

In-service training was also an influential factor that shaped teachers' replacing/revising practices and overall curriculum adaptation. Professional development may have facilitated teachers' engagement in curriculum adaptation. In such programs teachers may be provided with strategies and examples of how to adapt curriculum more effectively and purposefully. As also highlighted by Nalbantoğlu & Bümen (2024), professional development serves as a stimulus for active involvement in curriculum adaptation. However, the qualitative findings indicated that more than half of the teachers reported not feeling fully competent in using AI. Teachers also reported challenges in using AI, such as reliability issues, writing effective prompts and lack of technical knowledge, which is also supported by prior research (Dewi, 2025). These results highlight the necessity for structured professional development that emphasises both technical skills and the pedagogically significant and critical application of AI in adapting curriculum. As also suggested by Dewi (2025) and Kristiawan et al. (2024), professional development in AI-literacy is necessary to equip teachers with skills to adapt and evaluate AI-generated content critically.

Despite the fact that teachers depicted challenges, the qualitative data also revealed several benefits of using AI for curriculum adaptation. Teachers considered AI as a time-saving tool which reduces the burden of lesson preparation, as also highlighted by previous research (Dewi, 2025; Finley, 2023; Karataş et al., 2025). In addition, AI helped teachers balance the prescribed curriculum with classroom realities by adapting the curriculum to students' readiness levels and interests, making students more engaged. Adapting content and difficulty level through AI can enhance student motivation (Dou et al., 2025; Kok Wah, 2025; Zhao, 2025), suggesting that AI supports learner-centred instruction besides facilitating curriculum adaptation. Hence, teacher training institutions play a significant role in scaffolding prospective teachers to use AI purposefully and responsibly in adapting the curriculum to diverse classroom needs.

This study was conducted with some limitations. Namely, the data were gathered from English language teachers working in a city in western Türkiye. This limitation restricts the generalisability of the findings. Thus, future research may be conducted with teachers working in different regions of Türkiye with various socio-economic and cultural characteristic to understand curriculum adaptation practices and AI use more comprehensively. Furthermore, the qualitative part of the study was limited to 10 teachers. It would have been better if more interviews had been conducted to ensure diversity of experience. Moreover, longitudinal designs or long-terms observations may be conducted to examine how teachers traditional or AI-supported curriculum adaptation strategies evolve over time. Finally, this study did not focus on a specific AI tool, rather teachers mentioned AI in general terms, which made it impossible to derive conclusions about various AI tools. Hence, further research may focus on a specific AI tool and investigate its functions in curriculum adaptation more in detail.

The research findings offer some implications for teacher education and education policies in Türkiye. Considering the centralised curriculum structure, it is important that professional development programs cover not only AI literacy but also the effective and critical use of AI in curriculum adaptation processes. Policymakers may consider integrating AI-supported curriculum adaptation practices into teachers' professional development programs. Additionally, school administrators can create collaborative learning environments where teachers can share their experiences in AI-supported curriculum adaptation.

References

Al-khresheh, M. H. (2024). Bridging technology and pedagogy from a global lens: Teachers' perspectives on integrating ChatGPT in English language teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, article 100218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100218

Bai, Y. (2025). Exploring the role and impact of artificial intelligence in personalized foreign language teaching. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 5, article 318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-025-00546-9

Bekou, A., Mhamed, M. B. & Assissou, K. (2024). Exploring opportunities and challenges of using ChatGPT in English language teaching (ELT) in Morocco. *Focus on ELT Journal*, 6(1), 87-106. https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.6.1.7

Burkhauser, M. A. & Lesaux, N. K. (2017). Exercising a bounded autonomy: Novice and experienced teachers' adaptations to curriculum materials in an age of accountability. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49(3), 291-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2015.1088065

Can, Y. (2026). Artificial intelligence vs. instructor supported AI: Teaching second language writing via "write&improve". *Interactive Learning Environments*, 34(3), 1154-1177. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2025.2519123

Combs, K. M., Buckley, P. R., Lain, M. A., Drewelow, K. M., Urano, G. & Kerns, S. E. U. (2022). Influence of classroom-level factors on implementation fidelity during scale-up of evidence-based interventions. *Prevention Science*, 23, 969-981. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-022-01375-3

Çeliker Ercan, G. & Çubukçu, Z. (2023). Curriculum implementation approaches of secondary school English teachers: A case study. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 31(3), 347-366. https://doi.org/10.24106/KEFDERGI-2021-0006

Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage Publications. https://au.sagepub.com/en-gb/anz/research-design/book270550

Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2026). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage Publications. https://collegepublishing.sagepub.com/products/designing-and-conducting-mixed-methods-research-3-241842

Dai, K. & Liu, Q. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence (AI) in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes: Challenges and opportunities in the spotlight. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 159, article 108354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108354

Debarger, A. H., Penuel, W. R., Moorthy, S., Beauvineau, Y., Kennedy, C. A. & Boscardin, C. K. (2017). Investigating purposeful science curriculum adaptation as a strategy to improve teaching and learning. *Science Education*, 101(1), 66-98. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21249

Dewi, F. (2025). Leveraging generative AI in ELT: Teachers' integration strategies and pedagogical adaptations. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(2), 600-615. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i2.13670

Dou, A., Xu, W., Li, X., Zhang, S. & Zhang, J. (2025). Artificial intelligence in language learning: Bridging gaps, revealing patterns, and charting the future. *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies*, 23(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJDET.385045

Field, A. P. (2024). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (6th ed.). Sage Publications. https://collegepublishing.sagepub.com/products/discovering-statistics-using-ibm-spss-statistics-6-285130

Finley, T. (2023). 6 ways to use ChatGPT to save time. *Edutopia*, 13 March. https://www.edutopia.org/article/6-ways-chatgpt-save-teachers-time/

Fogo, B., Reisman, A. & Breakstone, J. (2019). Teacher adaptation of document-based history curricula: Results of the Reading Like a Historian curriculum-use survey. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 51(1), 62-83. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2018.1550586

Fullan, M. (2025). *The new meaning of educational change* (6th ed.). Teachers College Press. https://www.tcpress.com/products/the-new-meaning-of-educational-change_9780807786727

Gelmez-Burakgazi, S. (2020). Curriculum adaptation and fidelity: A qualitative study on elementary teachers' classroom practices. *Issues in Educational Research*, 30(3), 920-942. https://www.iier.org.au/iier30/gelmez-burakgazi.pdf

González, C. V. & Calle-Díaz, L. (2023). Teachers' agency development when adapting the Colombian English suggested curriculum for high school. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 25(2), 201-216. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v25n2.104627

Hanifa, R., Yusuf, F. N., Yusra, S. R. & Suherdi, D. (2024). Adapting EFL materials and its influences on Indonesia secondary school students' language learning. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9, article 69. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00297-7

Holmes, W., Bialic, M. & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. The Center for Curriculum Redesign. https://curriculumredesign.org/our-work/artificial-intelligence-in-education/

Karataş, F., Eriçok, B. & Tanrıkulu, L. (2025). Reshaping curriculum adaptation in the age of intelligence: Mapping teachers' AI-driven curriculum adaptation patterns. *British Educational Research Journal*, 51(1), 154-180. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4068

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., Weller, J., Kuhn, J. & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Khoso, A. K., Honggang, W. & Darazi, M. A. (2025). Empowering creativity and engagement: The impact of generative artificial intelligence usage on Chines EFL students' language learning experience. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 18, article 100627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2025.100627

Kim, J. (2024). Why do teachers not change while the national curriculum repeatedly changes?: The 'hidden' resistance of teachers in the centralized system of education in South Korea. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 109, article 103105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2024.103105

Kok Wah, J. N. (2025). Artificial intelligence in language learning: A systematic review of personalization and learner engagement. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(9), 327-341. https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i9.10336

Kristiawan, D., Y., Bashar, K. & Pradana, D. A. (2024). Artificial intelligence in English language learning: A systematic review of AI tools, applications, and pedagogical outcomes. *The Art of Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, 5(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.36663/tatefl.v5i2.912

Lovett, J. M., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Zinsser, K. M. & Lawlor, M. S. (2024). Beyond fidelity: Unveiling the landscape of teacher adaptation in social and emotional learning programs. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, article 1444588. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1444588

Ma, H., Ismail, L. & Han, W. (2024). A bibliometric analysis of artificial intelligence in language teaching and learning (1990–2023): Evolution, trends and future directions. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(18), 25211-25235. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12848-z

Maniates, H. (2017). Teacher adaptations to a core reading program: Increasing access to curriculum for elementary students in urban classrooms. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 56(1), 68-84. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2016.1210706

McNeill, K. L., Fine, C. G., Lowell, B. R. & Affolter, R. (2026). Teachers' customizations of storyline science curriculum: Adapting for their students and instructional contexts. *Science Education*, 110(3), 739-755. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.70035

Miqawati, A. H. (2022). Curriculum adaptation in English language classroom. *Journal of English in Academic and Professional Communication*, 8(1), 35-43. https://doi.org/10.25047/jeapco.v8i1.3880 [also https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369841373

Nalbantoğlu, Ü. Y., Bümen, N. T. & Uslu, Ö. (2022). Teachers' curriculum adaptation patterns: A scale development study. *Teacher Development*, 26(1), 94-116. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2021.1996452

Nalbantoğlu, Ü. Y. & Bümen, N. T. (2024). Changes in the curriculum adaptation skills of teachers as a result of professional development support: A Turkish case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 137, article 104386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104386

Nolt, K. L. & Leviton, L. C. (2023). Fidelity and adaptation of programs: Does adaptation thwart effectiveness? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 44(3), 322-334. https://doi.org/10.1177/10982140221138604

Nugroho, A., Putro, N. H. P. S., Syamsi, K., Mutiaraningrum, I. & Wulandari, F. D. (2024). Teacher's experience using ChatGPT in language teaching: An exploratory study. *Computers in the Schools*, online first. https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2024.2441161

OECD (2024). *Curriculum flexibility and autonomy: Promoting a thriving learning environment*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/eccbbac2-en

Oliva, P. F. (2022). *Developing the curriculum* (9th ed.). Pearson Education. https://www.pearson.com/en-us/subject-catalog/p/developing-the-curriculum/P200000001584/9780137525294

Onurkan-Aliusta, G. & Ozder, H. (2022). What teachers teach and how they teach it: A case study on fidelity of implementation in Turkish Cypriot schools. *Issues in Educational Research,* 32(1), 333-351. https://www.iier.org.au/iier32/onurkan-aliusta.pdf

Ornstein, A. C. & Hunkins, F. P. (2018). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues.* Pearson. https://www.pearson.com/en-nz/subject-catalog/p/curriculum-foundations-principles-and-issues-global-edition/P200000005157/9781292162089

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice.* Sage Publications. https://study.sagepub.com/patton4e

Priestley, M., Biesta, G. & Robinson, S. (2015). *Teacher agency: An ecological approach.* Bloomsbury Academic. https://www.bloomsbury.com/au/teacher-agency-9781472534668/

Sakallıoğlu, G. & Özüdoğru, F. (2022). Analysis of curriculum fidelity levels of teachers. *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences*, 41, 70-107. [in Turkish; extended abstract in English] https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/issue-full-file/72352

Sari, H. E., Tumanggor, B. & Efron, D. (2024). Improving educational outcomes through adaptive learning systems using AI. *International Transactions on Artificial Intelligence,* 3(1), 21-31. https://doi.org/10.33050/italic.v3i1.647

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2018). *Using multivariate statistics* (7th ed.). Pearson. https://www.pearson.com/en-us/subject-catalog/p/using-multivariate-statistics/P200000003097/9780137526543

Taş, M. A. (2022). An investigation of curriculum adaptation efforts of teachers working in disadvantaged secondary schools. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 12(1), 10-24. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.02

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) (2023). *Developing materials for language teaching*. Bloomsbury Academic. https://www.bloomsbury.com/au/developing-materials-for-language-teaching-9781350199675/

Troyer, M. (2019). Teachers' adaptations to and orientations towards an adolescent literacy curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 51(2), 202-228. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2017.1407458

UNESCO (2021). *AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://doi.org/10.54675/PCSP7350

Williamson, B. & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(3), 223-235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995

Yang, Y. (2023). Assessing alignment between curriculum standards and teachers' instructional practices in China's school music education. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 45(1), 56-76. https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X221099852

Yazıcılar, Ü. & Bümen, N. T. (2019). Crossing over the brick wall: Adapting the curriculum as a way out. *Issues in Educational Research*, 29(2), 583-609. http://www.iier.org.au/iier29/yazicilar.pdf

Yusuf, H., Money, A. & Daylamani-Zad, D. (2025). Towards reducing teacher burden in performance-based assessments using aivaluate: An emotionally intelligent LLM-augmented pedagogical AI conversational agent. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(17), 24649-24693. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13755-7

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M. & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

Zhao, J. (2025). Advancing English language education: A mixed-methods analysis of AI-driven tools' impact on engagement, personalization, and learning outcomes. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30, 21773-21813. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13560-2

Appendix 1: Participant demographics

Variable	Sub-groups	n	%
Age	21-29 years	61	27
	30-39 years	64	29
	40-49 years	82	37
	50 and above	18	7
Experience	1-5 years	54	24
	6-10 years	36	16
	11-15 years	32	14
	16-20 years	56	25
	21 and above	47	21
Faculty graduated	Faculty of Education	149	66
	Certification	76	34
Postgraduate education	Yes	52	23
	No	173	77
In-service training	Yes	63	28
	No	162	72
Type of school	Primary	68	30
	Middle	87	39
	High	70	31
Total		225	100

Appendix 2: Demographics of interview participants

Teacher	Gender	Age	Faculty	Postgrad. education	In-service training	School type
T1	Female	29	Education	Yes	No	Primary
T2	Male	31	Certification	No	Yes	Middle
T3	Male	36	Education	Yes	No	Middle
T4	Female	40	Certification	No	No	Primary
T5	Female	38	Education	No	Yes	Middle
T6	Female	42	Certification	No	No	Middle
T7	Male	27	Education	No	No	High
T8	Female	45	Education	No	No	Middle
T9	Female	39	Education	Yes	No	High
T10	Male	35	Education	No	No	High

Appendix 3: Interview form

1. Can you tell us about the ways in which you integrate AI into your instruction?
   To what extent do you feel comfortable with using AI for lesson planning?
2. How do you adapt the curriculum to meet the diverse needs of your students?
3. How do you use AI to adapt the curriculum?
   Do you adapt your lesson plans using AI to tailor to the preparedness levels of your students?
   For which purposes do you utilise AI to adapt the curriculum?

In your opinion, how does AI influence the balance between the intended curriculum and the enacted curriculum?

4. What benefits of AI do you experience for curriculum adaptation?
   Do you save time using AI or gain new insights you could have not considered?
   How can you tailor your students' needs through use of AI?
5. Have you encountered any challenges when using AI for curriculum adaptation?
   If yes, can you explain?
6 How do you consider the role of AI in curriculum adaptation in the future?

Dr Fatma Özüdoğru received her PhD in Educational Sciences majoring in Curriculum and Instruction. She is currently working as an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Sciences at Uşak University, Uşak, Türkiye. Teacher education, online learning and teaching, curriculum evaluation and foreign language education are among her research interests.
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5575-7738
Email: fatma.ozudogru@usak.edu.tr

Please cite as: Özüdoğru, F. (2026). The role of artificial intelligence in schoolteachers' EFL curriculum adaptation patterns: Experiences in Türkiye. *Issues in Educational Research,* 36(3), 1121-1141. http://www.iier.org.au/iier36/ozudogru.pdf