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Abstract

The status of English language has increased over the years as a tool for international communication. The Thai government emphasises that English language education has now become part of the full driving force for national development. This research implies that in order to cultivate Thai learners of English to meet social demands, sound theoretical and coherent philosophical bases of curriculum are essential in the curriculum planning process. This research analyses the new official English language curriculum for the Thai school system: “English language learning strands and standards under Basic Education curriculum 2001” (English language standards-based curriculum, ESB Curriculum), which in 2001 was promulgated as the new official English language curriculum. This research reveals both the coherence and incoherence of the theoretical and philosophical bases of the Thai ESB curriculum, identifies strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and makes recommendations for curriculum revision and curriculum development that could result in positive and effective changes in English language teaching and learning in Thailand. This thesis rests on the premise that principles underlying decisions made in curriculum planning will have a major impact on the effectiveness of the curriculum. It follows that difficulties with foreign language education nowadays are a consequence of the incoherence of philosophical, theoretical, and social bases of curriculum design.

This research analyses the English language curriculum by asking questions about who was involved in the curriculum planning process and what were the decision-making mechanism and processes involved in its planning. The research is different from other research in curriculum studies in Thailand that aim only at curriculum implementation and evaluation. Three sources of data have contributed to the analysis of the curriculum: curriculum-related documents, interviews with the curriculum committees, and interviews and questionnaires with school teachers.

The analysis has shown that (1) the curriculum was developed with input from numerous experts and various groups of stakeholders which affected the underlying principles, philosophical and theoretical bases of education and English language
teaching and learning; (2) the theoretical and philosophical bases of the curriculum were found to be incoherent among curriculum elements; (3) the curriculum has problems at the level of meaning and this has led to the difficulty of conveying the philosophy of Thai education to the school level. The study has found that the incoherence of the theoretical underpinnings of the curriculum elements leads to misunderstanding, misinterpretation and misuse of the curriculum.

The implication for future research is to stress a critical literacy approach to English language education and curriculum development. In this way, English language is seen as a language for empowerment, knowledge enhancement, social development and development of learners as a part of Globalisation and Information Age in the 21st Century as also stated in the Thai National Education Act 1999.
Acronyms

BEC 2001 Basic Education Curriculum 2001
EFL English as a Foreign Language
ELT English Language Teaching and Learning
ESB curriculum English Standards-Based Curriculum
ESL English as a Second Language
DCID Department of Curriculum and Instruction Development
DGE Department of General Education
DTLP Description of Teaching and Learning Principles
ICT Information and Communication Technologies
IBE International Bureau of Education
IT Information Technologies
LAM Lists of Approaches and Methods
MOE Ministry of Education
NEA 1999 National Education Act 1999
OEC Office of Education Council
ONEC Office of the National Education Commission
ONES Office of National Education Standards and Quality Assurance
ONESQA Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment
ONPEC Office of the National Primary Education Commission
PLD Proficiency Level Description
SBC Standards-Based Curriculum
SBM School-Based Management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STLM</td>
<td>Suggested Teaching and Learning Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM</td>
<td>Teaching and learning management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO-ACEID</td>
<td>UNESCO- Asian Centre of Educational Innovation for Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The objective of this research is to analyse the English language standards-based curriculum (ESB curriculum) for the Thai school system, which was promulgated as a new official curriculum in 2001. This research examines an array of important concepts used in the process of curriculum planning, and questions the assumption on which these rest. This study asks questions about who was involved in the curriculum planning process and what were the decision-making mechanisms and processes involved in planning the official English language curriculum. These range from choosing the curriculum stakeholders to the planning of suggested classroom assessments. The research highlights foreign language teaching and learning approaches and curriculum theories applied to the development of the new English language curriculum as well as factors that influenced the planning process of the curriculum in the Thai contexts. It proceeds on the assumption that a sound and coherent theoretical and philosophical perspective is crucial to the task of curriculum planning and development (Taba, 1962; M. Johnson, 1974; Goodlad, 1979; White, 1988; K. Johnson, 1989b; Rodgers, 1989; Brady, 1992; Longstreet & Shane, 1993; Steller, 1995; Tanner & Tanner, 1995; Richards, 2001; Nunan, 2003; Sowell, 2005). Therefore, the analysis of the curriculum and its planning process focus particularly on the coherence of choices made and on the philosophies, theories and contextual factors influencing the choices made during that process. This thesis rests on the premise that difficulties with English language education in the Thai school system
may be a consequence of the incoherence of theoretical, philosophical and social bases of curriculum design.

This chapter presents an overview of English language education in Thailand and the movement of educational reform affecting the development of the English language curriculum at school levels (in-depth detail is presented in Chapter 2). Within this chapter, research problems and their significance are identified together with the justification of this research. The aims, objectives and research questions, and a thesis outline are also included.

1.2 Present Situation of English Language Education in Thailand

1.2.1 Educational Reform: Goals and Policies

Globalization has increased the pace of change in the social and economic environment in Thailand. This movement has also changed the Thai education system, which has been in place since the post war period of the 1950s and the 1960s (Office of the National Education Commission, 1998). In the 1960s, the first National Educational Plan was promulgated along with the first National Economic and Social Development Plan. Since then, education has been expected to assume a full functional role as an instrument for economic and social development (Office of the National Education Commission, 1998, p.9).

The report on education in Thailand 1998 explains that such social and economic changes are too overwhelming for both individuals and society to cope with, thus causing imbalances in various aspects of development (Office of the National Education Commission, 1998). Despite these most drastic social changes, the Thai education system was reformed in order to enhance individual development, which will, in turn, contribute to the social and economic development of the country. According to the report, the development of education in Thailand has reached a new era of education, an “educational reform period”. This new era started in 1997, the year of the promulgation of the 1997 Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand. And an educational reform policy was launched to cover the 1997-2006 periods as
stipulated in the 1997 Constitution, in the hope of radically changing education for the better (Office of the National Education Commission, 1997).

The reform objectives emphasized that the education system should facilitate the country's development process toward self-reliance and sustainability as well as enhance global competitiveness (Office of the National Education Commission, 1998). Under this reform, the government commissioned the National Education Act 1999 (NEA 1999), the first national educational law, which has brought about changes in all areas of education, from administrative structures to classroom practices nationally.

The NEA 1999 is the first in the history of Thai education, and has allowed educational improvements in all aspects of quality of education and especially at the level of “Learning Reform” (Office of the National Education Commission, 1998, 1999). Kaewdang (2001), one of the leading Thai scholars and a driving force behind Thai educational reform states that...

"Back in 1997, at the Third UNESCO-ACEID International Conference held in Bangkok, I declared to the participating friends that, as the national education policy-making organization, the Office of National Education Commission (ONEC), would encourage the government of Thailand to revolutionize education for the 21st Century. The elements of the reform should include teaching-learning reform, revitalization of Thai wisdom, empowerment of teachers, and decentralization."(Kaewdang, 2001)

The decentralized approach to administering education in the country is at the core of the educational reform. According to the 1997 Constitution, the decentralization of authority and localization should be introduced into the national education system (Office of the National Education Commission, 1997). The NEA 1999 had put the decentralization policy into practice by promulgating the “Basic Education Curriculum 2001” (BEC 2001) in 2001. This “Basic Education Curriculum 2001” was introduced as a means of decentralizing government responsibility to the local level. The Thai Ministry of Education (MOE) sought through their curriculum and redefining their rationale, long-term goals, and specific learning outcomes that stress the excellence of knowledge, the emphasis on the learning process and the importance of morality among Thai learners in every subject area (Office of the National
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Education Commission, 1997). Thus, BEC 2001 is the curriculum that provides comprehensive standards and substance for all eight subject areas, provided for schools to develop further their own curriculum (including English language) that leads to wide diversity among provincials (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001b). This was the initiation of the school-based management and school-based curriculum in Thailand (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2003; Office of the Education Council, 2004).

1.2.2 The New English Language Curriculum

In the foreign language area, especially English language, in accordance with the promulgation of BEC 2001, the currently used curriculum - the National English language curriculum of 1996 under the curriculum for elementary education of 1978 (revised edition 1990), the curriculum for lower secondary education of 1978 (revised edition 1990) and the curriculum for upper secondary education of 1981 (revised edition 1990) - was replaced by “English language learning strands and standards under Basic Education curriculum 2001” (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001b, 2002a) or, in general, the so-called “English language standards-based curriculum” (ESB curriculum). Regarding the change, in 2001 and since then, the English language curriculum was not seen as a separate curriculum divided between primary and secondary levels, but a series or progression of 12 years language within one curriculum (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001b).

The reason for the change in the English language curriculum came not only from the educational reform movement, but also out of the problems of the previous curriculum, principally its failure to produce competent Thai learners of English language. The monitoring, assessment and research conducted by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Development (DCID) had made apparent some limitations and weaknesses in the English language curriculum of 1996. The report revealed that “the English language curriculum fails to build up competencies in using languages for communication and in seeking knowledge from various and extensive resources centres in the Information Age” (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001b)
Furthermore, the 8th National Educational Development Plan (1992-1996) reports that Thai learners of English were not meeting expected levels of academic achievement and failed to meet even the basic standard of academic achievement. Students, especially secondary graduate students who studied English for 12 years, as well as university graduates with 4 years more English language education, adding up to a total of 16 years of English language education, were barely able to communicate in the English language (Kladsomboon, 1998; Hawiset, 2001; Ratanavipak, 2002; Manager Online, 2005a). Luanganggoon (2001) adds that many students who have had primary, secondary and university exposure to English find it difficult to conduct a conversation with native speakers of English. Limlek (1998) also comments that Thai students of English have problems with the use English language in real situations. Students do not have enough communicative competence for international trade purposes as expected by the Thai government (Kanjanapunupan, 2002). Mr. Abhisit Vejjajiva, the former Minister to the Prime Minister’s office stressed that English language skills in this country were far below acceptable standards (Hawiset, 2001). Other critiques point to a decline in scores on the TOEFL and TOEIC test and the low national ranking of Thai students among the students of other nations such as Laos and Kampuchea, reported by Manager Online (September 16, 2005b). Recently, on the 28th August 2005, Minister of Education, Jaturon Chansang also expressed his concern at a meeting to consider strategies for the development of English language teaching and learning in Thailand, reported by Thairath (September 7, 2005b).

English language teaching and learning dramatically caught the attention of Thai people from the beginnings of the globalisation movement. Sudsawat (1991) adds that Thai people should know English language because Thais have to contact and trade with foreigners. Also there is strong growth in the technology of education, which requires English language to learn such technologies. People with English language competence in Thailand have come into demand to meet the full driving force for economic development in response to the industrialisation movement and a stronger education movement to create “information societies” where the application, selection of information, creation and dissemination of knowledge all play critical roles in both individual and social development (Atagi, 2002, p.15). The influence of the social and economic movements were observed in 2004 when Prime Minister Taksin Chinawat stated that English language skills and competency should be promoted to Thai
citizens particularly to facilitate the tourism business of the country (Baijuen, 2004). The great attention paid to English language education can also be seen in the increase in teacher development projects provided by various institutions as evidenced in the *Bangkok Post* Classifieds section (Fredrickson, 2005) and the report in *Thairath* (August 29, 2005a).

The increase in the perceived need for Thais to learn English can be demonstrated by the emergence of a large number of accredited and non-accredited English language teaching institutions. Each year, the number of students who eagerly attend English language courses in private English language institutions in Thailand as well as in English speaking countries such as Australia, England and United States tends to increase, even despite the economic downturn of 1997. A survey of Thai language institution agents providing foreign languages courses overseas for Thai students, found that their business growth was 11% in 2000 and up to 30% in 2001 (Language Travel Magazine., 2002). Part of this growth came from the interest of Thai students in attending English language courses in English speaking countries. Surveys in 2000, 2001 and 2004 indicated that “among other languages such as French, Italian, Japanese and Chinese, English was the overwhelming language of choice for Thai students, with six agencies reporting that 100% of their clients asked for English courses.” (Language Travel Magazine., 2002, 2005). White (1988) commented that in some contexts, the private language school system’s provision of English language courses evolved because of the failures of the state system to provide an adequate language education for its clients.

In addition, one of the main goals of English language provision in Thai schools is for further education overseas. An Australian university, for example, requires students to have an average of 6.5 band IELTS score for academic level studies in higher education. However, from a report in 2003, the average IELTS band scores of Thai university graduates were 4.52 which, according to the acting director of studies at IDP (International Development Programs) in Bangkok are surprisingly low.

\footnote{A person at band four has frequent difficulties in understanding and expressing himself/herself and is unable to use complex language. Band five is in the intermediate range, a person is considered to be a “modest user” of English. Such a person “is likely to make many mistakes,” but “should be able to handle basic communication” in their own field (Fredrickson, 2003).}
Fredrickson (2003a) comments that “This is clearly not a very good payoff for the ten or twelve years of English-language study most graduates have put in.”

The survey also shows that English for Academic Purposes is the course which is most in demand (Language Travel Magazine., 2005). Potip and Sharma’s (1998) research on the movement of Thai interest in higher education in Australia, reveals that the number of Thai students who came to Australia for higher education increased rapidly from 1,470 to over 3,500 between 1991 and 1995 and the trend is increasing according to the National and Economic Social Development plan that demands higher education among Thais. Potip and Sharma (1998) also add, from their survey of Thai students attending higher education institutions in Melbourne, that nearly 83% of Thai students had to attend an ELICOS (English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students) program for English remediation prior to commencing postgraduate programs.

Thai criticism of the earlier curriculum of 1996 noted that the failure to promote communicative competence, the low levels of pupil interest and the high rate of students taking up language courses in private institutions both in and outside the country, were partly the result of the English language curriculum of 1996 (Kladsomboon, 1998; Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001b; Hawiset, 2001; Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2002a; Manager Online, 2005a). Accordingly, solutions were thus sought in administration and in the development of the new English language curriculum, ESB curriculum (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001b).

1.2.3 The Process of Implementation

In 2002, the BEC 2001 with its eight subject areas, including English, was tried out through a pilot program. Primary years 1 and 4 and the secondary years 1 and 4 or grades 1, 4, 7 and grade 10 of those schools that participated in the Basic Education Curriculum 2001 pilot program were the first to experience the BEC 2001 (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2002a). The MOE enacted the implementation of the BEC 2001 throughout the country in April 2002, marking the
The beginning of the major dissemination program. Schools started to implement the curriculum in the first semester of the academic year countrywide according to grade level. The curriculum was implemented in grades 1, 4, 7, and 10 in 2003 and in grades 2, 5, 8, and 11 in 2004 with 3, 6 and 12 following suit in 2005. By 2005, every grade (primary and secondary), in every school nationwide, had implemented the “Basic Education Curriculum 2001” (Office of the Education Council, 2004).

1.3 Research Problems and Their Significance

The national English language curriculum always suffered criticism for its failure to promote English language education among Thai schools, even allowing for the problems of human resources, funding and material shortages. The new English language policy, ESB curriculum, had been developed in the hope that it would better solve problems and help greater numbers of Thai learners attain English proficiency than the previous one. In fact, a preliminary analysis of the English language curriculum of 1996 found similarities in the curriculum objectives and approach to language learning to those of the ESB curriculum. Both shared relatively the same underlying principles and purposes: for example, the greater use of English in the globalisation era, the need for English in the information age, the introduction of a learner-centred approach, a communicative approach to language teaching and learning, an emphasis on learning process and creative language users (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 1996, 2002a). Thus, several questions are raised about the ESB curriculum. Apart from the introduction of standards-based curriculum that allows flexibility in learning content, what makes this policy a better solution? What part of this policy could best serve the need of language learners? What parts of this curriculum and policy could solve the enduring problems that the previous curriculum could not?

Furthermore, even though a great change in curriculum development can be seen from the introduction of school-based management which means that Thai schools can now freely write their own curricula, the main objectives and the evaluation are still decided at government level. Because the decision on policy was made at government level, political judgment will reflect a particular set of choices about curriculum
options in schools (Eisner, 1994). Eisner (1994) comments that the underpinning policy reflects what the participants in the process of curriculum innovation should believe to be worthwhile goals to attain and what changes they feel the curriculum should bring about. This implies that a study of the policy is essential because it reveals the real meaning of what is a worthwhile goal and how the curriculum implementers may proceed.

As pointed out by Lian (2003), the crux of the issue of policy-making revolves around the question of meaning-making. He further asks questions related to the curriculum development process and policy-making process concerning how the government makes sense of the situation, how it makes sense of the processes required to fix the problem, how it selects its people to make change, and how those people in turn make sense of the problem. He questions further how these people make sense of the theories of learning, how valuable they are, whether all these meaning-making events are of real value and, if not, what can be done to make them valuable. What needs to be done so that more interesting meanings are generated? The aim of this research is to identify the meaning-making process of the ESB curriculum development and to reveal any hidden meaning underlying the curriculum that is intended to be conveyed.

Dr. Prawase Wasi, one of Thailand’s well-known educators, has commented on the general social practice of Thais - “Our home [Thai people] use more of their opinion than research-based knowledge, and this has caused severe results” (Jornburee, 2004). Furthermore, curriculum policy reform associated with the work of Western intellectual approaches is found to be dominant in Thailand (Yooktanan, 2001; Prutiprapa, 2004). Associate Professor Prapas Prutiprapa, a former lecturer in the Department of English Language Education, University of Srinakarinwirot, claims that “Thai educators have tended to import approaches on English language curriculum development as well as foreigners from overseas” reported by Manager Online (August 4, 2005a). Kongpetch (2003) strongly agrees with the claim and further adds that Thai educators implemented the imported curriculum and approaches without adequately researching the practicality and suitability of them to the development of Thai English language learners. The Western approaches are deified, and simply accepted as good in respect to the reform movement (Yooktanan, 2001). A study of Western approaches (if they exist in the ESB curriculum) in a Thai context
could be seen as essential to English language education in Thailand. One aspect of this research was to examine whether the policy meaning-making process principally relied on the meaning made by the curriculum developers or on the policy makers' own opinion, on research based-meaning, on Western trends and/or on a combination of all of these.

In addition, discovery of the philosophies and understandings underpinning the curriculum and of those who carried out this job is central to this research. Whose task it is to set out the policy is an important question in curriculum design (Stenhouse, 1975; Skilbeck, 1984; Auerbach, 1992; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Print, 1993; Eisner, 1994; Apple, 1995; Posner, 1995; Fullan, 2001; Richards, 2001; Burns, 2003; A-P. Lian, 2003; Freire, 2004; Giroux, 2004). As Rodgers (1989) adds further, what happens in the curriculum planning stage and who is involved in the process more often contribute to successes and failures than inadequacies in the curriculum implementation stage per se.

This study will investigate the philosophies underpinning the ESB curriculum and the planning process that supports and underlies the practice. Because this philosophy is based on judgments and values often not stated explicitly, the process of identifying them, making them explicit and reflecting the unstated values and assumptions driving the curriculum will help us to understand the nature of the curriculum and allow implementers/educators to further develop the curriculum for better congruence with the social and knowledge needs of the citizens of the nation (Richards, 1990). Stern (1989) strongly expresses his contention that most of the language classroom phenomena may hardly be interpreted if the theoretical or philosophical underpinnings of the language program are not studied and understood.

In the next three to five years, English language will become of even greater importance as a means of communication (Avasadanond, 2002) and as the language of international communication. The convergence of a number of factors such as the failure of students to use English language for communication and the traditional way of teaching and learning English language in Thai schools indicates that an analysis of the type proposed is needed. A sound systematic analysis is needed in order to develop an effective foreign language curriculum. This type of analysis could
facilitate a thorough understanding of the underlying assumptions of the second language curriculum and its planning. Studying these assumptions will help planners and implementers understand the nature of problems associated with the failure of English language teaching and learning and how to cope with these problems as well as the approaching changes brought about by the Thai English Language curriculum.

Discovering and analysing the principles of the curriculum and understanding the ideologies and philosophies of planning within Thai contexts will help curriculum planners to understand clearly the problems facing foreign language curriculum development in Thai schools and help them to improve the curriculum development process in future. Hence, the discovery of principles underlying the EFL curriculum could help unravel the complex problems of the Thai foreign language curricula. The results of this analysis could assist curriculum developers to see the strengths and weaknesses of this curriculum for further development. The results could also assist curriculum implementers to understand clearly the ESB curriculum to be implemented as their own school-based curriculum, and also improve the implementation of the ESB curriculum.

Furthermore, as they experience similar processes to those in Thailand, Asian countries must accept that the English language is the tool for preparing citizens to meet the pressures of globalisation and socio-economic rationalism on national development plans (Nunan, 2003; Kanasawad, 2004). Recommendations relating to the policy making process as well as EFL education in Thailand will contribute to both the Thai school system and the school systems of countries in the Asia-Pacific region that have experienced similar problems.

1.4 Justification of the Research

Several previous studies on English language curriculum development in Thailand have been carried out in different periods in order to find ways to help develop Thai learners of English language in the Thai school system. The most prominent type is the curriculum evaluation and curriculum implementation. However, research on the curriculum planning process and curriculum analysis has not been conducted on the
Thai English language curriculum before this. The present research proposes an in-depth analysis of the curriculum that does not place emphasis on judgment of the curriculum achievement, but is focused on the nature of the curriculum, an understanding of the curriculum principles and philosophies, and its constituents in the Thai contexts. This section reviews research carried out in EFL curriculum development and indications the gaps in the research that this present research tries to fill in.

Research on the evaluation of curriculum implementation by schools was prominent. For example, the evaluation of how school teachers implemented the curriculum, and how the curriculum was perceived among school administrators was carried out by Desamut (1985). This research was done on an evaluation of the upper secondary English curriculum 1981 under the Department of General Education in the Bangkok Metropolis. Similar research was done by Ketbhichai (1981), who evaluated the implementation of the 1978 lower secondary school curriculum among teachers of English in the 6th educational region. This research focused on how teachers implemented the curriculum. Ganmanee (1981) evaluated the trial of the elementary school English curriculum of 1978 at primary level 5. A study entitled “A meta-analysis and research synthesis study of the teaching and learning research works done during 1972-1987”, was undertaken by Sumolsun (1992). This research focused on the synthesis of 335 researches in the area of language teaching and learning done at three leading universities (Chulalongkorn University, Srinakarinwirot University and Krasetsart University) and Chulalongkorn University Institutes of Languages from 1972-1987. Most of the research in the curriculum area was also of a curriculum evaluation nature that focused on the achievement of the curriculum in terms of implementation similar to that stated previously.

Other research on curriculum implementation has been continuously carried out over a considerable period. There is work done by Tivawong (1994), who studied the preparation for the implementation of the English curriculum in lower secondary school in the fifth educational region. Inchaloen (1995) studied nationally the indicators for successful implementation of an elementary school curriculum in 1978 (revised edition 1990). Another piece of research was carried out by Srisunt (1996). This focused on how the curriculum of the English subject was organised in primary
level 1 in elementary schools and was carried out under the jurisdiction of the Office of Pra Joub Khirikhan, Provincial Primary Education. In 1998, Limlek (1998) studied the implementation of the 1996 English curriculum by lower primary level 1 English teachers, under the Office of Ratchaburi Provincial Primary Education.

Those pieces of research contributed to the development of the English language curriculum in Thailand in many ways such as by providing recommendations to school administrators and teachers on ways to improve English language provision at school level, and providing recommendations to policy makers, curriculum developers and school district areas on teacher training and the development plan (Ganmanee, 1981; Churteerasathien, 1983; Sudsawat, 1991; Sumolsun, 1992; Tivawong, 1994; Inchaloen, 1995; Srisunt, 1996; Yongkamol, 2000). Most of the research findings from these pieces of research hold common recommendations such as calling for the development of school teachers' English proficiency, an increase in funding and the provision of teaching materials and an English language learning environment. These problems are issues that continue to be discussed at the present time. These studies mostly focused on the classroom implementation level, at a certain grade level (primary or secondary), and at the provincial level. They were different from this proposed study, where the focus is on the coherence of decision making in the planning process for each curriculum element carried out systematically at both the primary level and secondary level and hence to a large scale analysis of the curriculum. Research like this takes into account the development of curriculum content from primary to secondary grades and the whole function of the curriculum, not the separate entities of primary and secondary curricula as done previously. This present research will add a different perspective on the development of the English language curriculum, and hence to English language education development in Thailand. It will provide recommendations relating to both matters.

Another type of research related to the Thai English language curriculum is research considering trends and the historical development of the English language curriculum. There is, for example, the research by Numpeth (1987), who historically explored the development of the English language curriculum in elementary education from 1982 to 1985. Similar research to Numpeth's (1978) was done by Tuthawon (1985, as cited in Aungvattanakul, 1992). This research studied the development of the secondary
education curriculum from 1895 (the first English language curriculum in secondary education) until the curriculum of 1981 (Aungvattanakul, 1992). These two pieces of research described the historical development of the Thai English language curriculum. The four main elements of the curriculum (the details of curriculum objectives, content, implementation and evaluation) were described. They were similar to the proposed study that focuses on these four main issues. However, an in-depth analysis of the theoretical basis underlying the curriculum details was not part of their research aims. They did not explore the planning process, nor the coherences of the choices made on curriculum details.

Another research project related to the study of the Thai English language curriculum was carried out by Sudsawat (1991). This research aimed to predict the trends of English language curriculum development and instructions relating to elementary education toward the year 2000. The prediction was based on the analysis of the elementary curriculum of 1987 (revised edition 1990), and the objectives of the elementary education curriculum of 1996 and included interviews with Thai scholars in EFL areas and general education areas about the possibility of changes in English language teaching in 2000.

Further, other research was carried out by the MOE, such as “The report of the evaluation of English language curriculum of 1996 the national English language curriculum of 1996 under the curriculum for elementary education of 1978 (revised edition 1990), the curriculum for lower secondary education of 1978 (revised edition 1990) and the curriculum for upper secondary education of 1981 (revised edition 1990)”. The report had three focuses: the curriculum, the implementation and teaching and learning. The findings came from questionnaires as well as interviews with school teachers and school administrators regarding their opinions about the curriculum, such as opinions about the clarification of the objectives and the appropriateness of time allocation for learners. The comments received from schools teachers and school administrators relating to curriculum details were that “the objectives scope was too large and was lacking in clarification, the content did not provide details conducive to the school implementation” (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2000). The rest of the report focused on the problems of provision of teaching and learning in schools. The research made the recommendation that the development of teachers’ seminars
and teacher development should be the main focus. As pointed out above, recommendations like this can also be found in much of the research done in this area. In addition, recommendations made about the need for more clarification of objectives were not specific for curriculum development and a clear-cut conclusion and details about ways the curriculum objectives should be developed were all lacking.

The most recent research related to the Thai English language curriculum was carried out by Iamsa-ard (2002). This research focused on the development of a standard-based education model for the English language course at the elementary level. This was a case study carried out on the implementation of the ESB curriculum in one of private schools and was aimed at classroom level change.

It is quite clear that the proposed study has brought a new perspective to the history of curriculum development in the Thai school system. The study of the English language curriculum by analysing the planning process, questioning the level of government policy-making and policy makers could be another step towards attacking the problems of EFL teaching and learning in Thailand. However, as Klausner (1997) comments, “In reality, the Thai academic community does exist in a vacuum and this reflects the behaviour and mind-set associated with a traditionally duty-based, hierarchical social system. There is a premium on knowing one’s place in, not questioning, the system” (p.55). Questioning the policy planning and policy makers’ work is a courageous step to take, which is possibly why this type of research in the area of Thai English language policy and curriculum development has not existed before.

Problems of language policy rhetoric and the principles underlying the curriculum content are not restricted to Thailand. One of the major findings of Nunan (2003) from his research on English language curriculum development in countries in the Asian-Pacific region - Japan, Vietnam, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Korea and Malaysia - is that mismatches exist between the language policy rhetoric and the principles underlying the curriculum content. He reveals that the theories and principles underlying the English language curricula of those countries were found to be problematic and that change needed to be done to bring about more effective
curriculum implementation. His research supports this study's assertion of the need to conduct an in-depth analysis of theories and philosophies underpinning EFL policy details in the Thai contexts.

1.5 Aims and Objectives of the Study

After taking into account the level of English language education in Thailand, the current stage of English language curriculum development and the gaps in research in this area in Thailand, as well as the need for new perspectives toward the development of English language education in the new world of globalization, this study proposes the following research aims, objectives and research questions. These act as guidelines to this research in the analysis of the Thai national English language curriculum planning and curriculum.

Aims

1. Explore the curriculum planning and design processes of the national English Language Standards-Based Curriculum in Thailand.
2. Critically analyse philosophies and theories underpinning the national English Language Standards-Based Curriculum in Thailand.

Objectives

1. Describe processes involved in the national English Language Standards-Based Curriculum planning.
2. Draw conclusions regarding theoretical and philosophical bases of the ESB curriculum planning process and the curriculum.
3. Analyse the intellectual coherences in the planning processes of the national English Language Standards-Based Curriculum in the Thai context.

With these goals in mind, the curriculum will be examined as objectively, comprehensively, and systematically as possible. Past and current pedagogical literature and other relevant documentation, such as policy statements, reports, teaching materials and other support documents will be reviewed. This research will
apply historical, philosophical, and socio-cultural perspectives for the purpose of interpreting the foreign language standards-based curriculum.

1.6 Research Questions

1. What are the philosophies and theories underpinning the national English Language Standards-Based Curriculum? Are these philosophies and theories coherent with one another and how?

2. What factors are involved and need to be considered in planning the English Language Standards-Based Curriculum in Thai contexts?

3. Based on the answers to questions 1 and 2: Are the design and plan of the curriculum appropriate in terms of the need of the Thai society, knowledge of learners' needs, and in terms of foreign language education and curriculum development contexts?

The answers to these three questions will bring about an understanding of the new English language curriculum and hence, suggest possible ways to develop English language education in Thailand.

1.7 Conclusion

This chapter provides an overview of the present English language education and educational reform in Thailand. The national education reform has impacted dramatically on the English language curriculum in Thailand. School-based management, introduced in line with the 1997 Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, should promote decentralization and localization among Thai schools. School-based curriculum management accentuates the decentralization policy in that school teachers are given the authority to develop their own curriculum, hence allowing more localized learning content. All this is quite different from the previous curriculum where the learning content was controlled by the central government. The
government expects that the changes made to the English language curriculum could bring about positive change in English language education in Thailand.

This research aims to critically analyse this newly developed English language curriculum (ESB curriculum) for all Thai schools as well as its planning process. The research questions on the issues related to the planning process behind this curriculum, ask who the curriculum developers were and what were the philosophies and theories underpinning the curriculum. In contrast with other research found, this type of analysis focuses more on the principles underlying the curriculum rather than the achievement of the curriculum. This research rests on the premise that any incoherence between the philosophies and theories underpinning the curriculum and the principles supporting the curriculum design could bring about failures in curriculum development and implementation. The gap in research prior to settling on the principles and the design of the new curriculum was identified as a mix of research problems, research significance and research justifications. The aims, objectives and research questions are presented to guide an in-depth analysis of the curriculum. The next sections present an outline of this thesis and its presentation.

1.8 Thesis Outline

This thesis is organized into three parts. The first part consists of three chapters: the introduction, the literature review and the research methodology which are chapters 1, 2 and 3 respectively. The second part is the analysis and discussion of the findings, consisting of five chapters - 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. The last chapter (Chapter 9) is the conclusion, recommendations and implications of this research.

Part I. Introduction to Research on the Thai National Foreign Language Curriculum

Chapter 1. Introduction

In this chapter, the English language education curriculum in Thailand is introduced together with the research problems. The problems of research are probed in order to
link with research significance. The research aims and objectives, and research questions are presented after the problems were outlined.

Chapter 2. Critical Review of Relevant Literature
Literature relevant to the English language teaching and learning curriculum includes articles, papers and other documents that are discussed in breadth and depth, and any gaps in the literature are noted in this chapter. Four sections constitute the literature review. The first section focuses on the issue of the development of EFL curriculum and EFL education in Thailand. The second section reviews movements in ESL/EFL curriculum development. The third section presents literature on curriculum analysis and the elements of curriculum. This section aims mainly to present the framework for the analysis of the new Thai EFL curriculum. And the last section is literature on traditional and contemporary concepts of foreign language education and curriculum.

Chapter 3. Research Methodology
This chapter details methods used in data collection, methods used in analysing data and ethical considerations.

Part II. Data Analysis and Discussion
Chapter 4. The delineation and discussion of the ESB curriculum planning process
This chapter presents an analysis of the curriculum at the beginning stage of planning, which is the stage of choosing curriculum developers, the planning of the curriculum goals and aims. This chapter delineates the ESB curriculum planning process and curriculum stakeholders and discusses issues related to coherence of the curriculum.

Chapter 5. The origin of ESB curriculum: International and Western influences
This chapter reveals and discusses the origin of the ESB curriculum philosophies and theories together with their international and Western influences.

Chapter 6. An analysis of philosophies and theories underpinning the curriculum overarching goals and content standards
Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter presents philosophies and ideologies underpinning the ESB overarching goals and aims. It also discusses meaning underlying the ESB curriculum goals and aims and difficulties relating to the translation of its meaning into practice.

Chapter 7. An analysis of the organisation of curriculum content

This chapter discusses the theoretical coherence of the organization of curriculum content. This chapter details the principles underlying the curriculum content, explains its epistemologies and discusses its coherence with the curriculum goals and aims and teaching methodologies and assessments.

Chapter 8. An analysis of teaching methodologies and learning assessment

This chapter centres on issues related to the teaching methodologies suggested in the curriculum documents as well as suggested learning assessments. This chapter focuses mainly on the pedagogy of the curriculum in the view of the policy makers, in what ways the objectives can be realized and in what ways they understand the language teaching methodologies. In addition, data related to the training program and comments on curriculum implementation from school teachers are discussed in order to support a critical analysis of the whole curriculum planning process.

Part III. Conclusions, Recommendation and Implications

Chapter 9. Conclusion and recommendations

This chapter presents the overall findings by answering research questions posed in the introductory chapters. It puts together all major discussions from Part II, discusses the planning process of the curriculum and the coherence and incoherence within the process, and provides curriculum details. Recommendations of this study are made along with the discussion. The implications of this research are divided into two parts: the first is implications for policy and school practices; the second is implications for future research.
Chapter 2
Critical Review of Relevant Literature

Introduction

Chapter 1 presented the research problems, research aims and research questions. It also introduced the newly developed English language curriculum, the English language standards-based curriculum (ESB curriculum) of Thailand. This chapter aims to present a review of relevant literature for a more broadly based analysis of the Thai ESB curriculum. The chapter consists of four parts. The background to the provision of English language education, English language teaching and learning (ELT) and the development of the English as a foreign language (EFL) curriculum in Thailand are all presented in the first part in order to fully introduce the Thai educational system and English language education provision in schools from traditional practice to the present day.

Parts II, III and IV present the intellectual framework of the study. Part II outlines movements in EFL/ESL curriculum development. Part III presents the analytical framework of the Thai ESB curriculum including early studies of English language curriculum development in Thailand. Also reviewed is the development of foreign language curricula in the larger contexts of education that EFL curriculum development encompasses. Included are examinations of the issues of educational
philosophies, curriculum development, and disciplinary knowledge that form the core of applied linguistics and foreign language studies, such as psychology, linguistics, and sociology. This study thus presents a so called 'mixed framework' for the analysis of the Thai EFL curriculum. Part IV focuses on teaching and learning principles in the field of ELT from a traditional approach to modern approaches and reviews shifts in foreign and second language curricula development.
Part I: The Provision of English Language and Curriculum Development in the Thai School System

2.1 Traditional English Language Provision

The provision of English language education in Thai schools is aligned with a national educational movement as well as the national educational school system. The status of English language has changed in line with changes in national circumstances as well as national educational philosophies (Ratanapreedagul, 1981). Foreign language teaching commenced in Thailand from the reign of King Narai the Great (Numpeth, 1987) but the era in which English language increased in status was during the reign of King Rama IV (1861-1869).

The object of English language teaching was both political and diplomatic. English language was taught in a limited sphere to the Royal children and elite groups in order to ensure that they learnt the language to understand Western culture (Sukamolson, 1998, p. 69 as cited in Toh, 2003). In addition, the organisation of ELT was for communication with the imperial troops to maintain independence of the country as well as to allow elite groups to pursue higher education overseas (Sudsawat, 1991; Yongkamol, 2000). The King had hired foreigners - Anna H. Leonowens, a British teacher, and John H. Chandler, an American teacher - to teach English (Prapaisit, 2003). At that time, the traditional approach to language teaching was to focus on correctness, such as developing a correct reading skill. Macro skills (speaking, listening, reading and writing) were separately taught and the memorizing of vocabulary was necessary in this learning process. Methods such as “Direct Method” or “Natural Method” were implemented in the classroom.

English classes were conducted solely by Westerners with English language books (Sudsawat, 1991). Numpeth (1987) explains that during this time, textbooks were the only materials used and were regarded as the English language curriculum.
2.2 A Step toward Modernized Education: Formal Education

The foundation of Formal Education in Thailand was laid in late 1868 the year marking the end of the reign of King Rama IV and the beginning of the reign of King Rama V. That was the beginning of the modernizing of education in Thailand (Office of the National Education Commission, 1999). The move towards modernization and reform was in response to the threat of Western imperialism and the pressure of internal politics (Office of the National Education Commission, 1999, p.5). In 1884, the first public school for commoners was established in metropolitan (Bangkok) and similar schools operated later in other areas (Office of the National Education Commission, 1999). During the reign of King Rama V English continued to hold its status as the language for political and diplomatic purposes. Translation skills, including reading and writing skills, were promoted in schools (Numpeth, 1987).

In the 19th century, the effect of Western missionaries, who were respected as literate and well-educated people, was felt in Thai education particularly in the foundation of public education. During this change, Westerners were most influential in planning the Examination Act and Educational Reform in this period, leading to King Chulalongkorn (Rama V) proclaiming the examination Act 1890 (Numpeth, 1987) and educational reform in 1892 (Prapaisit, 2003). The Examination Act 1890 acted as a guideline for educational management (Numpeth, 1987). Responsibility for education was transferred from the King to the MOE. Therefore, this era also saw the beginning of the development of subject matter in the form of a curriculum and English language was added as one subject in the school curriculum.

In the planning of EFL curriculum, Westerners had a legitimate role in deciding how the EFL curriculum should be planned. In response to Westerners' recommendations the traditional approach to language teaching and learning claimed its place in ELT in this period. The curriculum placed emphasis on the macro skills for the promotion of English language for higher education. The Grammar Translation Approach was first used as the way to deliver knowledge (Numpeth, 1987). Alongside this approach was an Audio-Lingual approach, that was part of a Western trend in ELT (Numpeth, 1987). Translation skills - from English to Thai, and vice versa - were continuously
emphasised, but at the higher level other skills related to ELT, such as essay writing in English and knowledge of English literature, were added.

English language was taught to wider groups, not specifically to an elite group, yet the main purposes were still to enable selected students to undertake further education and higher education overseas as well as for entry to the Thai public service. Specifically, English was part of the examination for the King’s Scholarship in 1897. This scholarship was first introduced in this reign and it was granted to secondary school graduates to further their studies overseas (Numpeth, 1987; Prapaisit, 2003).

In 1898, the first Thai teachers were assigned to teach English language in a number of schools. During this period, English language was taught at only the secondary level. The role of Westerners had changed from fully controlling of EFL curriculum planning to cooperative planning with Thai experts where Westerners were consultants. Under this cooperative planning, English language teaching and testing were changed to accord with the Examination Act 1890 (Numpeth, 1987). A test of English that focused on knowledge of grammar and writing was introduced.

In 1932, the national educational policies and plans were revised and the 1936 National Scheme of Education was promulgated to serve as a long term educational plan to modernize education. Under this plan, Thai education was developed further. In 1950, the secondary education curricula of every subject including English language were revised with reference to American educational standards. Thus, the new secondary education English language curriculum of 1950 came into being (Numpeth, 1987).

### 2.3 English Language in Primary School Education

For Thailand, the curriculum is “the mother of educational provision” (Ketbhichai, 1981, p.1). Ketbhichai (1981) states that for Thai people, the curriculum is the tool for the translation of philosophies and educational aims into practice, thus the curriculum changes according to changes in education and social education. In response to strong moves in international competition in 1960, another National Scheme of Education
was enacted as a long-term policy framework (Office of the National Education Commission, 1999, p.6). Within this year, the First National Education Development Plan was promulgated along with the First National Economic and Social Development Plan. Three to five years of National Education Development Plan were formulated under the 1960 National Scheme of Education. As a result, the main objectives of the policy were directly linked to economic development and focused on providing medium-and high-level manpower needed for the growing economy (Office of the National Education Commission, 1999, p.6). Under these national plans, school curricula were devised and developed. The English language curriculum of 1960 was proclaimed to replace the secondary education English curriculum of 1950 and the first upper primary education curriculum was initiated.

According to Limlek (1998) and Yongkamol (2000), English language seriously entered Thai primary education when the secondary education curriculum of 1960 and upper primary curriculum of 1960 were proclaimed in the school curriculum. English language was a compulsory subject from upper primary level 5-6 through all of the secondary level. The status of English language increased with greater evidence of the language being used for international communication, and so the emphasis fell greatly on listening and speaking skills rather than reading and writing, although all four skills were promoted (Numpeth, 1987). The objectives of the curriculum were to understand that English was an international language, a key to resources, and a communicative tool for international communication. However, the minimum requirement of English language competence was to have sufficient listening, speaking, reading and writing to serve merely in daily conversation (Sudsawat, 1991).

The planning of the 1960 English language curriculum was initiated early in 1959. Foreign experts also had less influence on the design of this curriculum compared with the previous EFL curriculum planning. The role of Westerners changed from that of insiders involved in cooperative planning to assistants taking part in the Southeast Asia Regional English Project (SEAREP), in which role they helped to develop the Thai EFL curriculum (Limlek, 1998). This planning resulted in an EFL curriculum design that was still based on a linguistics approach and focused particularly on the structure of language and grammatical knowledge (Limlek, 1998). The prevailing
view of English language teaching and learning was still the mastery of language forms. Teaching methods were similar to previous practice, that is, the "aural-oral" approach and/or "audio-lingual" method, which emphasised memorising grammar rules through drills or repetitious practice (Sudsawat, 1991).

The curriculum of 1960 was not successful in promoting English language proficiency among Thai learners (Sudsawat, 1991; Limlek, 1998; Yongkamol, 2000). The curriculum was criticized for not helping learners to use English in real life situations (Sudsawat, 1991; Yongkamol, 2000). The objectives of the curriculum were claimed to be too many so that teachers could not achieve them. Worse, in practice the objectives were unclear to teachers. For example, the objectives emphasised behaviour relating to feelings and values, but the teaching and learning content focused on knowledge and drill practice (Ministry of Education, 1978, as cited in Numpeth, 1987). The content of the curriculum contained details that could not help teachers to provide realistic English lessons. Teachers complained that the scope of content was too broad and the sequences were not flexible enough to cater for school activities, especially at schools in rural areas. Hence, teachers could not implement the curriculum and preferred to hold on to textbooks as substitutes for curriculum documents (Ministry of Education, 1978, as cited in Numpeth, 1987; Sudsawat, 1991; Yongkamol, 2000).

It is worth noting that in the past, English language education in Thailand was provided to an elite and smaller group of people. With the introduction of the 1960 curriculum, the extension of English language education to primary level, i.e. to a much wider group of learners, caused a shortage of school teachers who could teach English. The twin problems of a small number of competent teachers and a much larger number of learners caused negative results in English language teaching. Furthermore, most school teachers did not understand how to teach English language for communicative purposes (Sudsawat, 1991). Thus, the provision of English language at upper primary level five and six was not successful. Students' results in English language proficiency were very low as a result of a lack of materials and human resources, especially the lack of proficient teachers (Limlek, 1998;
Yongkamol, 2000). As a result, the MOE, after consultation with local and foreign experts, cancelled primary level English classes.

### 2.4 The Introduction of a “Communicative Approach”

In 1977, the third National Scheme of Education was promulgated to strengthen curricula and learning processes and to review the issue of quality of education (Office of the National Education Commission, 1999). Under this Scheme, the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth National Education Development Plans were formulated. In 1978, again the MOE revised the whole school system curriculum, including the English language curriculum, in order to conform to a change made to the 1977 National Scheme of Education as well as the National Economic and Social Development Plan. As a result, the new “English language curriculum of 1978” along with other subject curricula, were proclaimed in 1978 and were implemented in schools in that year. It is worth noting here that Westerners and foreigners had no direct role in the planning of the English language curriculum. However, it can be assumed that Western educational theory had a strong influence on the development of the new curriculum.

Under the 1978 curriculum, English was to be taught from lower secondary level to the end of secondary education (six years). The cancellation of English language provision at primary level created controversial issues among researchers, school teachers, government and especially parents centring on the appropriate grade level to start teaching English language. Therefore, in 1979, the MOE organized the Curriculum Committee to plan a curriculum English for teaching in the primary schools. As a result, English was again officially taught in primary level 5 and 6, but as a Special Experience\(^3\). In addition, by 1982, schools that were ready to provide English language could provide it under the English language curriculum of 1978 as an extra curriculum activity (Numpeth, 1987; Sudsawat, 1991; Yongkamol, 2000).

The major aim of the English language curriculum of 1978 was to improve learners’ communicative competence in English for the development of the country. The
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\(^3\) Special experience is provided only 5-6 grades. The learning activities in the area of special experiences can be organized by each school according to learner’s needs and interests and may include knowledge and skills selected from the other four groups such as English for everyday life.
objectives of this curriculum were to fully promote communication in line with the
needs of society as well as the learners’ needs and focus on the real life use of
language in the present society (Numpeth, 1987; Sudsawat, 1991). Thus, the 1978
curriculum tried to address the failure of the curriculum of 1960, that is to educate
Thai learners to communicate in real life circumstances. For the first time a
“Communicative Approach and Communicative Language Teaching” (CLT) was
introduced to language teaching and learning (Prapaisit, 2003).

The introduction of CLT brought changes in curriculum objectives, content, methods,
materials and evaluation. The content of the curriculum consisted of promotion of real
life situations and conversation while discrete points of grammar were not welcomed
in the teaching of English (Sudsawat, 1991). In the organisation of teaching and
learning, the Government designed textbooks based on the learners’ interests.
Teachers also had their own teaching textbooks as well as a teachers’ manual written
in Thai and English with details on how to teach English communicatively (Numpeth,
1987).

Methods used in this curriculum were claimed to use the Communicative Approach in
which learners were the centre of learning activities (Suwannachoti, 1982; Numpeth,
1987). According to this claim, learners, it was emphasised, should practice as much
as they could by repeating English sounds, words and phrases until mastery of the
knowledge was achieved. Ratanapreedagul’s research (1981) on teachers’ opinions on
teaching and learning English in the Bangkok metropolis under this curriculum,
showed that “most teachers used many types of drill activities to help their students to
master all the language skills”. The drill activities, such as language games and role
play, were the most implemented activities along with a lecture on grammar rules.
Ketbhichai (1981) adds further that methods such as translation methods, audio-
lingual methods, and a transformational approach were still being used. Thus, the
traditional approach to language teaching, based on the concept of repetition to
achieve mastery of language, was still found in this curriculum and its associated
practices.
The assessment method outlined in this curriculum, was changed from a test of grammar knowledge to a test of the learner's achievement indicated by the learner's work and experiences in using English (Ketbhichai, 1981). Numpeth (1987) explains that various types of testing such as observation, questions, and classroom activity were introduced according to the learning proposed, and the final exam focused both on knowledge and practice of English language.

Despite the introduction of the Communicative Approach, Thai learners of English were still not able to communicate in the target language. One of the most criticised areas was teaching. Churteerasathien (1983) reveals that teachers lacked confidence in teaching; indeed, some of them did not graduate with an English teaching major. Suwannachoti (1982) and Desamut (1985) reached the same conclusion from their research on teachers' experiences in implementing the curriculum at upper secondary level: teachers did not receive enough training and teachers did not have teaching experience that coordinated with language teaching.

The problem, as claimed by Churteerasathien (1983) and Ratanapreedagul (1981), was also connected to the range of backgrounds presented by students which took the form of a mix of different proficiency levels. According to Ratanapreedagul's (1981) research, it was difficult to provide activities according to individual proficiency levels; in addition, school teachers blamed the problem on there being too many students in each class, thus, teachers had not enough time for extra curricular activities. Desamut (1985) adds that teachers were also more familiar with grammar teaching. On top of that, was the need of students, especially secondary level 6 students who aimed to take the University Entrance Examination, to pass an examination which focused on reproducing subject matter and which in turn led to the practice of rote memorization (Atagi, 2002). As a result, the organization of learning was apt focus on the teaching of grammar to serve the Entrance Examination itself (Desamut, 1985, p.8). Thus, activities that were conducive to communicative competence were not promoted in Thai classrooms.

Ketbhichai (1981) added that learners' needs were overlooked and that teaching and learning were not correlated with the local needs either since the textbooks provided
by the government were not up to date. Teachers also complained that in order to teach using the Communicative Approach, they required more materials (Desamut, 1985, p.8). From research undertaken by Churteerasathien (1983) and Ketbhichai (1981), it is known that teachers felt that they did not have enough funding or materials or training to support their teaching in the new approach. In addition, students did not have opportunities to use English in an English environment. Even though they were encouraged to use the language in the classroom, they rarely spoke English outside (Numpeth, 1987).

Suwannakit (1979, as cited in Kladsomboon, 1998, p.38) strongly argued that one of the problems with EFL in Thailand was with the teachers, and he states that “teachers taught without looking at the objectives, taught without any principles”. The claim of teachers’ ignorance of curriculum objectives and/or the curriculum generally is in agreement with research done by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Development (DCID) which showed that teachers did not use the curriculum because a lot of teachers claimed that they did not understand it (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2000).

Furthermore, the DCID, comments that the curriculum detail lacked clarity (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2000). Ketbhicha (1981) concluded in research on the evaluation of the implementation of the 1978 lower secondary school curriculum among the teachers of English in the 6th educational Region that the curriculum objectives were difficult for teachers to implement, but he did not explain what part of the objectives were difficult. In addition, research done by Desamut (1985) on the implementation of the curriculum by school teachers at upper secondary education in Bangkok Metropolis, also revealed that most teachers had problems with the objectives that emphasised enhancing understanding of the culture of the target language. Teachers also had difficulties in providing activities according to the objectives. However, none of the research clarified, in any detail, how difficult and how unclear objectives were.

In 1990, the English language curriculum was revised again, and “the Curriculum of 1978 (revised edition 1990)” was implemented. However, critiques concentrated on a
number of areas in the “the curriculum of 1978 (revised edition 1990)”, for both primary and secondary education, that were not conducive to English language education. The DCID had done the research on the evaluation of the curriculum and the effectiveness of the elementary curriculum 1978 (revised edition 1990) Special Experience Group, the lower secondary curriculum 1978 (revised edition 1990), and the upper secondary curriculum 1981 (revised edition 1990). Three conclusions were reached about these curricula:

1. All three curricula lacked clarification of objectives, the description was too broad, and the curricula were not conducive to practice. As a result, the organization of teaching and learning was based solely on textbooks. The learning of English language was not relevant to reality, to the students or to the community because the textbooks were not changing in line with the changing world.

2. The provision of English language was different among schools. Teachers were not ready for English language teaching.

3. Learners’ English language proficiency was very low, especially in terms of communicative competence and language used in society.

(Centre for Curriculum Development, 2000, pp. 2-4)

It is worth noting that these conclusions illustrate problems that still exist in Thai EFL education at present (Ministry of Education Thailand, 2005). In 1996, the English language curriculum was revised and developed again in order to respond to changes in the socio-economic development of Thailand.

2.5 The Movement toward a Learner-Centred Approach to ELT

With the expansion of the Mass Information Age, the 1992 National Scheme of Education pointed out that foreign languages were languages for communicative purposes for social development. English language was first mentioned in the Eighth National Education Development Plan (1997-2001) as the symbol of internationalism (Office of the National Education Commission, 1998). Students were required to have English language skills in order to communicate with people from other countries for the purpose of economic competition (Office of the National Education Commission, 1998).
The Minister of Education agreed to promote and support the teaching and learning of English at a much earlier grade levels. On 28 February 1996, the MOE proclaimed that schools should provide English education from primary level 1 (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 1996). English should also be the first choice of foreign languages among others such as French and German (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 1996). However, the provision of English language education at primary level again was based on school readiness. Despite the promotion of English language provision at the earliest age by the MOE, some schools provided English only at upper primary level because of a lack of teachers and materials (Yongkamol, 2000).

In this curriculum, English language provision was still graded according to the educational system. In addition to requirements of the educational system, a proficiency level was introduced to demonstrate a learner's phase of development. The proficiency level separated learners into three development phases: Beginner, Intermediate Fundamental and Advanced Fundamental Level (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 1996))

The MOE had taken a more contemporary approach to ELT, entailing the adoption of “a learner-centred approach” and the introduction of language for communication to address communication in the Mass Information Age. The curriculum of 1996 stated its significance as follows:

“In the information age, foreign languages are important and essential as communicative tools. English language is one of the international languages that are used worldwide. The Ministry of Education then realizes that it is necessary and important to improve the English language teaching and learning process in Thai schools. This is to develop the learner’s ability of listening, speaking, reading, writing skills, communicative skill, receiving information and language for further education. This is to help Thai people to communicate internationally, to take advantages from information system that links various information and world information system.” (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 1996, p.1)

According to the document of the 1996, curriculum content entailed firstly language functions which is then followed by grammar rules. Textbooks were not specifically assigned by central government; schools could freely choose textbooks according to their preference. In addition, school teachers were encouraged to use different
resources and to provide learning activities such as communication in real life situations to promote a positive attitude toward the English language subject (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 1996). The report on the evaluation of the curriculum of 1996, by the DCID identifies four main features of the curriculum:

1. The organisation of the curriculum based on “learning outcomes” continuously to the upper secondary level: the content is not the description of the subject matter in detail but is only the concept that emphasises the ability of learners to communicate. (It allows teachers to develop their lesson plan within local contexts.)

2. Students can choose to learn English from primary level 1.

3. Teaching methods should vary and be based on different materials and resources, not relying on one textbook, but providing the language curriculum across the whole curriculum using student-centred learning and teaching from content to language learning (content-based instruction). The content will help learners to learn grammar vocabulary and language functions that have macro skills and thinking skills.

4. Promote the use of authentic assessment.

(Translated from Centre for Curriculum Development (2000, p.4))

One of the major initiatives in this curriculum was the development of the Education Resource Information Centre (ERIC) in some provinces in response to the need to broaden knowledge related to English language teaching to school teachers in provincial areas (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2000). This implies a strong emphasis on English language teaching and learning in Thailand.

An evaluation report of the English language curriculum of 1996, undertaken by the Centre for Curriculum Development, MOE in 1998, revealed both positive and negative feedback (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2000). The evaluation was carried out by interviewing school teachers and distributing questionnaires to them and school administrators in 12 school district areas, 2 provinces in each area, 131 schools per province, a total of 3,073.

The positive feedback was as follows. Of those surveyed, 84.42 percent found that the curriculum objectives were good; the time allocation was appropriate; teachers used “learner-centred approaches”. However, both reports and teachers did not specify the term ‘learner-centred’, only claiming that they use the approach in the language classroom; and teachers implemented authentic assessment by observation, interviews, writing tests, and portfolio methods. However, in contrast to the positive
changes, what was also found to dominate most classroom practices were grammar-translation, test-focused teaching and drilling practices (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2000).

The data from questionnaires revealed that the teachers' complaint about the curriculum was similar to that about the previous curriculum: the curriculum objectives lacked clarity. The objectives lacked details that could help in implementing the curriculum. School teachers requested a curriculum with more details in order to follow the same path of development or the same direction of national English language teaching and learning development (Centre for Curriculum Development, 2000). Other research in ELT also supports this complaint and reveals that teachers had difficulties in planning lesson plans according to the curriculum. Although, the curriculum contained a list of skills, structures and vocabulary for elementary learners, it was not very helpful for teachers who wanted to design courses and teaching materials because the curriculum objectives did not specify these clearly (Prapaisit, 2003). Limlek (1998) found that teachers did not understand the curriculum and further adds that the content contained too many details and was too broad for teaching and learning (but the report did not state what teachers meant by ‘too many’). In addition, as with the previous curriculum, the problem of teachers' poor English language proficiency was noted (Prapaisit, 2003). Furthermore, Prapaisit (2003) states that, in fact, there was not much change in terms of the purpose of teaching English in the English curriculum of 1996 compared with the curriculum of 1978 (revised edition 1990). Prapaisit (2003) claims that there was only a slight revision of the 1978 (revised edition 1990) with the use of the phrase “a learner-centred approach”.

To conclude, the issues relating to teacher education, curriculum content development and the practice of English language teaching and learning were all found to be problematic before and after the CLT became the written goal of teaching English. Two controversies discussed over the past decade were the lack of curriculum clarity and the low proficiency of teachers of English language. The research shows clearly that paradoxical problems had emerged between the curriculum designers and the curriculum implementers. Those who oversaw the problems of ELT as a result of the curriculum itself, state that the curriculum lacked clarity: the curriculum objectives
were especially vague, contained too many details and the curriculum could not communicate its intentions to teachers.

Some saw the problem of ELT as a teacher problem. They claimed that the curriculum made a positive change but in practice, teachers followed traditional ways or could not adapt to change. Most of the conclusions made by researchers were that teachers themselves lacked English language proficiency and lacked knowledge of English in terms of teaching skill. Some researchers commented that teachers did not use the curriculum, did not use any principles, did not look at curriculum objectives, and only used textbooks. Teachers were thus seen as a major cause of the failure of ELT in Thailand.

With the failure of the curriculum of 1996 and developments in the educational reform movement as well, the stage was set for the new English language curriculum which was promulgated in 2001.

2.6 The Quest for Educational Reform and the New EFL Curriculum

Critiques reveal that people felt there should be urgent reform of Thai education. Rote learning and the examination culture, authoritarian teachers and obedient students, transmissive teaching and passive learning were found to be the dominant modes of teaching and learning of English language as well as of other subjects (Kaewdang, 2000). Thai schools, despite movement toward contemporary learning approaches that focus on the learning and learners, still used a transmissive teaching and learning approach that was consonant with the teacher's role as provider of information (Kaewdang, 2000, 2001). It is this attitude that fosters the kind of learning that is not directly related to the learners' purposes and needs; it is central to any discussion about the nature of education. As Klausner (1997, p.55) points out that most often, Thai learning is by rote, and the emphasis is on memorization. This educational process is gratifying for the professor and perhaps, even for the students that it is not conducive to creative thinking and intellectual challenge and response.
In addition, the test system emphasised the mastery of discrete points of grammar rather than supported the practice of language for communication. The Thai university entrance examination is highly objective, uses discrete test items, and promotes rote-learning of linguistic ‘facts’. Given the pressure to pass the university entrance examination, it is not surprising that high school English tuition focused on knowledge of language as a code (Tivawong, 1994; Inchaloen, 1995; Srisunt, 1996; Yongkamol, 2000; Luanganggoon, 2001; Kanjanapunupan, 2002; Prapaisit, 2003).

As a result, Thai students learned English for at least 6 years, and more years in some schools, but students could not apply that knowledge when given the opportunity to participate in interactive learning environments. What they did, in fact, was to wait to be spoon-fed with facts about knowledge of the language (Klausner, 1997). According to the UNESCO report “Synthesis of country reports and general trends and needs” of the Mekong sub-region, by UNESCO, (Miralao & Gregorio, 2001, pp.38-43), Thai students were assessed as lacking the kind of knowledge and abilities necessary to seek further knowledge and future living (Miralao & Gregorio, 2001, p.41). Dr. Rung Kaewdang (2001), Thai prominent educator, added that the traditional approach or old educational system was not entirely bad; however, within the age of rapidly advancing information technology, education must aim to cultivate those skills that students can learn continually at any time and any place throughout their life time.

As outlined in Chapter 1, Thailand was faced with a most drastic social change from within and outside forced on it by the rapidly changing world. Hence the need for educational reform to serve the development of society (Office of the National Education Commission, 1999). As stated in “Education in Thailand 1999”

“Reform of the education system is one of the most important processes to enhance individual development which will contribute to the social and economic development of the country. It will enable Thailand to move through the current crisis.” (Office of the National Education Commission, 1999, p.7)

The attempt to include various provisions relating to education in the 1997 Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand was the first step toward reform. The
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4 The Secretary General of the Office of Education Council (OEC), a driving force behind the NEA 1999 and one of the chief architects of the educational reform effort in Thailand for many years.
National Education Act 1999 (NEA 1999), the first national education law, was first promulgated in 1999 in line with the Constitution. The NEA 1999 was enacted with the aim of accelerating educational reform. At its heart was “learning reform” that stressed strongly a “learner-centred” approach (Kaewdang, 2000; Office of the National Education Commission, 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003; Office of the Education Council, 2004). Since then, the “learner-centred” approach has become a central policy that educators, administrators, community and parents, as well as learners must be aware of in the process of education in Thailand (Office of the National Education Commission, 2000).

The document, “Learning Reform: Learner-centred approach”, describes in depth the meaning of a learner-centred approach, learning process and learning reform. It expands on the NEA of 1999 and contains reasons for the call for learning reform. That explanation is similar to the one stated earlier in this section. The reasons for the call for “Learning Reform” in 1999 are as follows:

1. Learners learn only subject matter and written texts.
2. The teaching-learning method does not recognise the process whereby learners themselves are given opportunities for training in analytical thinking, self-expression and acquiring knowledge.
3. Teachers are known as the most knowledgeable, most correct and most powerful in the teaching-learning process, while learners at the receiving end simply have to attune themselves to the subject matter and the teacher’s methods.
4. The learning process brings about unhappiness.
5. Schools do not create an atmosphere and environment conducive to learning.
6. The teaching-learning process is still a routinised and repetitious method of transferring knowledge.
7. The school system provides children, youth and adults with minimal opportunity to be instilled with perseverance, dedication to work and honesty in body, words and mind. The inculcation of moral and aesthetic values is not developed to the extent of yielding benefit to learners. (Office of the National Education Commission, 2000, p.4)

In response to this perceived undesirable learning process, according to the NEA 1999 specialists on learning and educators have developed desirable characteristics of the learning process which need to take into account by stakeholders, communities, society, parents and learners. Both teachers and learners are encouraged to change their roles. Teachers must change themselves from “tellers” to “facilitators”, while
learners are encouraged to learn by themselves with the help of teachers (Office of the National Education Commission, 2001/2002). Dr. Rung Kaewdang, states that

"It is fully appreciated that, in the present world, especially in a knowledge-based economy, competitiveness is attained through knowledge and ability of the people. Thailand therefore is in urgent need of learning reform to encourage and support the potential of youth to be able to thinking and do, to have managerial skills, integrity as well as desirable values for a continuous search for knowledge. The Office of the National Education Commission (ONEC) has devoted untiring efforts to the knowledge-building project in its conviction that this important task will lead to the revolution of the learning culture of the Thai people. It will enable our children to learn happily and eventually become the citizens of quality." (2000, p.VI)

In the “Learning Reform: Learner-centred approach”, the desirable characteristic of learning process that Thais should pursue is summarised as follows:

“Learning is an intellectual process of personal development on a continuous life-long basis. It can take place at all times and in all places. It is a process which brings happiness. It integrates subject matter, depending on the appropriateness of each level of education, so that the learners will learn about themselves and their relationship with society. The content is in line with learner’s interests and is up-to-date. Emphasis is given to the thinking process and to practical work, enabling learners to have authentic experience. The benefits thus obtained can be extensive. It is an interesting process whereby learners and teachers learn together. Learners, teachers and all parties concerned joined efforts in creating an ambiance, conducive to learning, with learner’s interests as the ultimate objectives, so as to attain virtue, competence and happiness” (Office of the National Education Commission, 2000, p.15).

In 2001, following the enactment of NEA 1999, the new national curriculum - “Basic Education Curriculum 2001” - was proclaimed with the aim of ensuring effective educational reform (Office of the National Education Commission, 2001/2002). Thus, the new English language curriculum was born (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2002a).

2.7 “Basic Education Curriculum 2001” - the Revolutionary Process of EFL Education

In 2001 the national education curriculum for all subjects in schools was developed and changed by “Basic Education Curriculum 2001”, a standards-based curriculum that encompasses strands and standards for each subject (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001b; Office of the Education Council, 2004). The MOE

Under the NEA 1999, the education system was divided into three types: formal, non-formal and informal education. Formal education was divided into basic education and higher education. Basic education comprises pre-primary education (grade 1-3), primary education (grade 4-6) and secondary education (grade 7-12), a total of 12 years (Office of the National Education Commission, 1998). The NEA 1999 proclaimed the extension of compulsory education from a 6-year to a 9-year long basic education (primary and lower secondary education (grades 1-9), to be of the highest quality and to be provided free of charge. Primary education was made compulsory for 6-11 year olds and organized by the MOE through the Office of the National Primary Education Commission (ONPEC). Another three years of compulsory lower secondary education and 3 years of upper secondary were to be provided by the Department of General Education (DGE) (Office of the National Education Commission, 2000/2001, 2001/2002; Office of the Education Council, 2004). In 2003, there was a change in the administrative structure, which resulted in the amalgamation of the ONPEC and DGE. Since then, English language education and other subject areas have been administered and provided for by one department, the “Office of Basic Education Commission (OBEC)”. It should be noted that this research studies the planning process of the ESB curriculum carried before the administrative change in 2003; the DCID was then responsible for the curriculum development project along with ONPEC and DGE who were especially responsible for school curriculum implementation. Thus, this research discusses the work done by the DCID, not the new administrative structure.

Dr. Rung Kaewdang states that the previous curriculum development in Thailand was rigid, lacked flexibility and failed to make the curriculum appropriate to local conditions, and the introduction of Basic Education curriculum that is standards-based would allow flexibility of learning content at a local level (Fredrickson, 2003b). In addition, the document, “Synthesis of country reports and general trends and needs”
of the Mekong sub-region by (Miralao & Gregorio, 2001, pp. 38-43), supports Dr. Rung that Thai curriculum previously offered little flexibility in content to meet the varying needs and conditions of localities. It goes on to state that because of dramatic changes in Thai demographic, socio-cultural, economic, environmental and political characteristics, Thailand requires new adjustments in the national curriculum and educational system. Thus, the Office of the National Education Commission (ONEC) took the revolutionary step in the learning culture of the Thai people to propose a curriculum that provides only a framework for schools to further develop their own school-based curriculum. This was also the beginning of school-based management (SBM) and school-based curricula (Office of the National Education Commission, 2001/2002, 2002/2003).

The Basic Education Commission is in charge of prescribing what they call the “core curriculum” (curriculum framework) for basic education while basic education institutions (i.e. primary and secondary schools) are responsible for prescribing “curricular substance” or a “local curriculum”. This Basic Education Curriculum has, therefore, been prepared at two levels: national and institutional (Office of the Education Council, 2004, p. 70). The curriculum framework of Basic Education (or Basic Education Curriculum 2001) is in many ways a radical departure from the old. What students learn will no longer be strictly controlled by the central authorities. Instead, it will be largely up to individual schools. Schools have to write their own school-based curriculum.

According to the report “Education in Thailand 2004”, “the approximate proportions of the core curriculum and curricular substance (benchmarks) developed by educational institutions should be 70:30” (Office of the Education Council, 2004, p. 70). The 70% of content is strongly recommended in order to meet the national educational standards provided by the BEC 2001. Selection of the remaining 30% of the content is left entirely to the school, which has the power to choose learning content in detail relevant to local conditions and wisdom (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2002a).

---

5 Basic Education Institutions is the institutions that provide basic education
According to the Basic Education Curriculum 2001, the English language curriculum was officially named "Foreign learning strands and standards under Basic Education 2001" or the so called "English language standards-based Curriculum" (ESB Curriculum). The educational reform movement gave more value to English language education. Therefore, the NEA 1999, promulgated English language as a compulsory subject from primary level 1 to lower secondary level 6, (or grade 1-9) for 9 years in every school nationwide (Office of the National Education Commission, 2000/2001). Thai schools, in fact, provide several foreign languages such as French, German, Chinese etc. as elective subjects. Unlike other languages, English has become a compulsory subject. Thus, the standards-based curriculum for foreign language was devised specifically for the development of English as a foreign language, not for other languages.

"Core Curriculum for foreign language learning is specifically provided for English language teaching and learning... As for other foreign languages e.g. French, German, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Pali or neighbouring countries’ language groups, educational institutions may formulate subjects and learning procedure management as appropriate." (Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 2001a, p.26)

Table 2.1 illustrates the change from traditional practice of English language classes to the new standards-based educational system. This table was developed from the analysis of the report on Thai education, Basic Education Curriculum 2001 and the new ESB curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional practice</th>
<th>Standards-based educational system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Start with textbooks recommended by government</td>
<td>1. Select and analyse the standard(s) to be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design instructional activities according to exercises or lessons in the textbooks</td>
<td>2. Design or select an assessment through which students can demonstrate mastery of standards; determine the required performance level, if not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and give an assessment according to the textbook’s content.</td>
<td>3. Identify what students must know or be able to do to perform well on the assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Move on to new exercises and lessons</td>
<td>4. Plan and deliver lesson. Provide all students with adequate opportunities to learn and practice the necessary skills or knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Try to keep up with all the lessons and exercises in the textbooks within one semester period.</td>
<td>5. Assess students and examine results to plan further instruction or individual support, if needed, and grade their work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the table, teaching and learning management has turned towards more learner-centred approaches. Previously, teaching and learning was centred on textbooks and teachers' decision-making in the classroom. The standards-based system allows negotiation in classrooms as well as learners' needs and decision on what, when, where and how to learn together with teachers.

The arrangement of the new English language education is slightly different from that of the previous curriculum of 1996. The curriculum is divided into four key stages and each stage comprises three years according to the new learning stages, stated in the Basic Education Curriculum 2001 (Office of the National Education Commission, 2000/2001, 2001/2002; Office of the Education Council, 2004). The emphasis on the learner's proficiency development is on the "4 Key Stages":

1. Key Stage 1: consists of lower primary level Grades 1 to 3
2. Key Stage 2: consists of upper primary level Grades 4 to 6
3. Key Stage 3: consists of lower secondary level Grades 7 to 9
4. Key Stage 4: consists of upper secondary level Grades 10 to 12

The phase of the learner's development was identified by proficiency levels according to 4 key stages:

1. Key Stage 1 = Preparatory-Level
2. Key Stage 2 = Beginner Level
3. Key Stage 3 = Developing Level
4. Key Stage 4 = Expanding Level

(Translated from the ESB curriculum, Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction Development, (2002a, p.2))

2.7.1 The Main Elements of the ESB Curriculum

The Thai ESB curriculum consists of five major elements:

1. Curriculum goals, learning strands and standards: this is the statement of the ESB Curriculum goals which constitute the significance of the teaching and learning of foreign language in Thai schools.

2. Phases of development: This element describes conditions involved in English language learning and teaching at four overlapping phases of development. It includes information on how children learn a language and the environment in which this learning can best take place in each phase of development.
3. **Curriculum content:** the curriculum content is so called “Benchmarks”. This is the place where an English language teaching and learning framework is provided. It provides language teaching and learning expected outcomes in sequences of language learning development. Benchmarks are designed for teachers to use as a guideline for school-based curriculum writing.

4. **Learning and Teaching management:** this section describes the learning and teaching strategies and methods that are capable of helping students to achieve the learning outcomes and helping teachers and learners to organize learning opportunities. Further, it details an assessment and evaluation process that can best fit with assessing learner’s outcomes in the classroom, school and at the national level. This element provides choices and more freely developed teaching and learning methods for teachers to choose according to their preferences. Details of each element will be discussed in Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

### 2.8 Conclusion: English Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand

As can be seen from developments in English language education at different periods of time, the English language policy and curriculum in Thailand follows national, social and political circumstances (Sudsawat, 1991, p.19). Since the reign of King Rama IV, the purpose of English language learning was for communicating with Westerners for political purposes, in order to prepare for missionary and Western influences. In the reign of King Rama V, English language education was provided to wider groups of people but the status of English remained as the language to be used for diplomatic purposes, by an elite group such as public servants to understand Western trends, and by a chosen few for further education overseas for the development of the nation.

When Thai education stepped into the arena of formal education where the MOE had the responsibility to provide education for all Thais, English language was provided to a wider group of commoners. English language teaching and learning in the curriculum of 1960 aimed to develop Thai English language learners’ communicative
competence. Teaching and learning focused on macro skills because Thailand made more contact with international counterparts and diplomats, and discovered trends in the modernization of Education. In 1978, the communicative approach was introduced as a result of the full driving force of education along with the social and economic development of Thailand. English language teaching and learning focused fully on language for communication in line with the needs of society.

English language in schools was provided at primary and secondary levels and there was much discussion about the appropriate commencing level for students to best learn English language. The MOE had to make a decision based on the readiness of schools, the needs of society, teachers' proficiency, learners' foreign language learning development and the national movement. It is clear that the development of an EFL curriculum involved not only the applied linguistics field, but also issues of the national education plan and philosophies as well as curriculum management, human resources management, and the needs of both society and learners.

Thai education has been influenced greatly by Westerners since the 1880s. Their influence brought about innovative approaches in the educational system and English language education. However, it is also clear that even though the curriculum was devised with help from the owners of the target language, both in their role as initiators and consultants, the problems of the English language learner's proficiency was still a matter of discussion right up until the present. The role of Westerners in different educational periods has changed from solely English language education organizers in the reign of the King Rama IV to the compilers of the English language curriculum in the reign of the King Rama V. Westerners took a much more reduced place in cooperative teaching with Thai teachers and, until the curriculum of 1978, the role of Westerners was as government consultants or trend initiators. Western influence on the new ESB curriculum will be discussed in the next chapters.

The movement of English language teaching and learning went further with the National Schemes of Education, National Education Development Plans and National Social and Economic Plans at different periods. Educational reform in Thailand has brought about dramatic changes in the educational system. The policy of
decentralization initiated "Basic Education Curriculum 2001" and as a result the standards-based curriculum was introduced in Thailand for the first time. In addition, globalization moved Thai education forward into the development of technologies, thus English become the tool for accessing information which in turn changed the aims of the language to an even broader use of English.

The communicative approach to language teaching and learning was introduced into the Thai curriculum from 1978; however the persistence of the grammar translation approach continues to attract criticism even up to the present. The introduction of the communicative approach to language learning in the 1978 and 1996 curricula changed the perception among teachers of English language as a form to a communicative tool. Nevertheless, some limitations such as national tests, and teachers' proficiency were the centre of discussion as they remain today. The conservative approach to EFL underlined the practice of the curriculum as well as assessments and materials. Even now, the search continues for the best methods and a better curriculum to guide English language teachers in Thailand. In addition, as with the previous curricula, the problems of curriculum clarity and teachers' difficulties in implementing the curriculum remain, indicating that there is possibly a lack of real communication between the planners and the implementers of the curriculum, or a failure to attempt to bridge the gap between curriculum and practice. There could also be the possibility of a lack of clarity of objectives if teachers' complaints as well as governmental reports are to be believed. For long time a source of debate has been how the new curriculum bridges the gap and solves the controversies.
2.9 Distinction between Syllabus and Curriculum

Distinguishing between the terms syllabus and curriculum is necessary in language curriculum studies. Yalden (1987) states that the overlap between syllabus and curriculum has caused a great deal of confusion and he distinguishes clearly between the two by considering “curriculum” as a very general concept which involves consideration of the whole complex of philosophical, social and administrative factors which contribute to planning an educational program. In comparison, “syllabus” refers to that subpart of a curriculum which is concerned with a specification of what units will be taught. In other words, syllabus contains details of ends - a characterisation of the target outcomes or objectives and means - and the method by which the target outcomes will be achieved (K. Johnson, 1989a, p.4). A syllabus is subsumed in the curriculum (Allen, 1984; Print, 1993; Graves, 1996; Breen, 2001).

Thus, accepting that curriculum is a far broader concept than syllabus, it is important to examine just what others consider a curriculum to be. Rodgers (1989, p.26) explains that, at the school level, a curriculum is all those activities in which children engage under the auspices of the school. The curriculum deals with issues in child learning, teaching methodologies, material organisation and methods of assessment as well as the kind of facilities available. On the other hand, a syllabus only prescribes the content to be covered and that forms only a small part of the total school program. Dubin and Olshtain (1986, p.40) explain further that a “curriculum” deals with abstract and general goals while a “syllabus” is an instructional plan that guides teachers and learners in everyday concerns. The language curriculum development process is typically seen as consisting of needs analysis, goal setting, syllabus design, methodology, and evaluation. Syllabus design concerns itself with the selection of scope and sequences and justifying content as well as proficiency levels of language learners and learning objectives (Richards, 2001; Nunan, 2004, p.6). However, social theorists, psychologists and philosophers have been questioning more widely the role of curriculum and syllabus in the school, especially with regard to the issue of power and control which will be discussed in detail in the last part of this chapter.
2.10 Characteristics of EFL Language Curriculum Development

Richards (2001) asserts that originally – that is, prior to the end of the 1950s - foreign language curricula developed out of syllabus design. He points out that since the 1950s, because of the changing role of English in the globalization era (English has been embraced widely as the language of international communication and this development has expanded rapidly in the past four decades), English as a second or foreign language course should be developed in terms of curriculum rather than syllabus design. Richards (2001) explains that syllabus design covers only the academic mastery of a language like English, which is not sufficient to support language teaching that deals with the need for a practical command of English. Therefore, there is a need for a more efficient language program. White (1988) states that the need for a more efficient language program together with the question of effective methodology and the question of ‘more’ in language course development, introduced a movement away from language course development as syllabus design, towards curriculum development that encompasses the broader field of education.

K. Johnson (1989b) comments that we are entering a new era of English language teaching (ELT) when innovations in language curricula are likely to be quite considerable and when the relevance of other educational areas, especially in the field of educational theory in general and curriculum studies in particular, have come to play a major role in language curriculum development (Stern 1983 as cited in K. Johnson, 1989b). White (1988) adds that the concerns of developing and introducing a new language curriculum not only encompass questions of content, but include ideas about education and people and their organizations. Language curriculum development includes aspects of the broad field of educational activities known as curriculum development or curriculum studies, because language teaching is not only the study of applied linguistics but a branch of education (Allen, 1984; White, 1988; Richards, 2001). From a study on the theoretical bases of ELT curriculum and a case study carried out at De La Salle University, Manila, Tomlin (1990) claims that one of the reason for failure of ELT programs in De La Salle University one for example, is the consequence of an inadequate consideration of the philosophy of education and learning, and curriculum theories in EFL curriculum formulation. Richards (2001)
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asserts that ELT curriculum development needs to encompass the field of education and curriculum studies because,

"Curriculum development focuses on determining what knowledge, skills, and values students learn in schools, what experience should be provided to bring about intended learning outcomes, and how teaching and learning in schools or educational systems can be planned, measured, and evaluated" (2001,p.2).

Thus, language curriculum development is an essentially practical activity since it seeks to improve the quality of language teaching through the use of planning and the review of practice in all aspects of a language program (Graves, 1996; Richards, 2001). The review of practice employed in developing and renewing a language curriculum is the review of theories and developments in language teaching pedagogy, second language acquisition theory, education theory and related fields such as the management and implementation of innovation in language teaching, as well as educational management (Nunan, 1988; White, 1988; Nunan, 2004).

2.11 Practical Characteristics of the EFL Curriculum

Even though the quest for a more effective language program and the movement of curriculum studies in foreign language curriculum development is very strong, in fact, this movement, embracing the broader field of education, was not popular among language educators (K. Johnson, 1989b).

Rodgers (1989, p.26) explained why the field of broad educational curriculum development was not conventional in ELT. First, there has been a tendency to regard language learning, even formal school-based language learning, as different in kind from learning in all other disciplinary areas. Second, ELT is categorised as belonging mainly in the field of Applied Linguistics (Nunan, 1988), while curriculum development and dissemination issues are discussed in the larger area of education. Curriculum development has tended to be ignored or overlooked by applied linguists. Furthermore, Krasnick (1990, p.44) found that in fact, general curriculum and instruction issues themselves are seldom included in ELT training courses. Worse, most language courses were generally set outside the school. White (1988) explains that the actual practice of ELT tended to take place in contexts which were themselves
isolated from mainstream education, namely private language schools. Thus, thinking about ELT in a curriculum development context is still unformed (Rodgers, 1989, p.26). These are the fundamental problems of foreign language curriculum development.

Bolitho and Rossner (1990) note that many schools now have to ‘make room’ for ELT as the result of the changing status of ELT as the language of international relations. Bolitho and Rossner (1990) further assert that “one welcome effect has been an upgrading of English as a school subject in many countries and thus has brought English teaching into much closer contact with the teaching of other subjects in the curriculum” (1990, p. 239). This has increased the demand for a more effective curriculum. Therefore, in order to open up ELT practically into the curriculum development area in a quest for more effective classroom approaches, language educators must be fully aware of some major discussions current in professional education circles about educational programs and the nature of educational change processes (Rodgers, 1989; Bolitho & Rossner, 1990).

2.12 “Standards Movement” and the Standards-Based Curriculum

According to Richards (2001, p. 132), the ‘standards movement’ and standards-based curriculum (SBC) originate in the United States. In the United States, the national professional organizations generate “standards” for States’ education agencies to refer to and to prepare their own curriculum guidelines, with the result that each subject will have at least one set of standards of its own (Sowell, 2005, p. 78). Standards focus on what students should know and be able to do to live in the 21st century. They encompass a broad range of attitudes, values and skills, rather than the specification of the knowledge students have to master (ERIC Development Team, 1993).

Second and foreign language teaching in the United States has embraced the “standards” movement (Richards, 2001, p. 132). The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) with another eight organizations embraced this movement and developed content standards that define – “what students should know and be able to do in foreign language education”. That is the basic principle of

According to “the Executive Summary of Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century”,

“The standards are not a curriculum guide. While they suggest the types of curricular experiences needed to enable students to achieve the standards, and support the ideal of extended sequences of study that begin in the elementary grades and continue through high school and beyond, they do not describe specific course content, nor recommend a sequence of study. They must be used in conjunction with state and local standards and curriculum frameworks to determine the best approaches and reasonable expectations for the students in individual districts and schools” (para 5, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1996)

The standard does not tie to any particular instructional method. Evaluation and assessment are to be defined locally and they focus on performance standards (LeLoup & Ponterio, 1997). As Gutek (2004) explains, “the essential theme of the standards movement is that American education will be improved by creating high academic standards, or benchmarks, to measure student achievement” (2004, p.267).

ACTFL also produces “The ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners”, in order to provide information to teachers and administrators about how well students can be expected to do the ‘what’ from the content standards (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1996).

Within the standards movement, each State develops a foreign language “standards-based curriculum” or “curriculum framework” that contains content standards and benchmarks for K-12 students. A benchmark is “Broad statement of process and/or content that is used as a reference to develop the curriculum and assess student progress” (Louisiana. Dept. of Education., 1997). A benchmark may be developed from the “ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12 learners” proposed by ACTFL,
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or can be developed by the stakeholders of each State in cooperation. Thus, the State's curriculum framework contains the content standards (strands and standards) and benchmarks (or performance standards) for schools to use in their standard teaching and learning at local community level (Delaware. Dept. of Education., 1997; LeLoup & Ponterio, 1997; Louisiana. Dept. of Education., 1997).

The content standards in the United States share similar principles with the 'Curriculum Framework' of Australia that provides a broad statement of principles of teaching and learning, together with a set of goals that are relevant to all language programs (Vale, McKay, & Scarino, 1991, p.10). According to Vale et al. (1991,p.10) - the authors of Australian ALL Guidelines for languages other than English and English as a Second Language (ESL) - the framework contains flexible guidelines for teachers to develop further their own school-based curricula as well as a series of progressive, interlocking, age related stages (1991, p.15). The overarching statement of the Western Australian curriculum framework indicates that

"The Curriculum Framework has two key features which make it different from previous syllabus documents: its focus on outcomes and its Kindergarten to year 12 approach... An outcomes approach means identifying what students should achieve and focusing on ensuring that they do achieve. It means shifting away from an emphasis on what is to be taught and how and when, to an emphasis on what is actually learnt by each student... The agreed outcomes form a common core of achievement. The outcomes-focused approach will provide schools with more flexibility to enable teachers to develop different learning and teaching programs to help their particular students achieve the outcomes."(Curriculum Council Western Australia., 1998)

Some countries in the East, such as Japan and China, have followed this trend. The MOE of China, for example, has initiated its "China English as a Foreign Language Project Standards (CEFLS)" with collaboration from Western organizations (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL) and McGraw-Hill Education) in drafting the content standards. The draft for content standards offer teachers the standards as a guideline for school-based curricula. Thus, teachers have the freedom to pursue the outcomes in their own creative ways and use whatever resources are at their disposal (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Inc., n.d.).
However, Marsh (2004, p.30) argues that some educators are hesitant about using "Standards" and "Curriculum Framework", since curriculum designers have to be very disciplined about writing clear standards and standards must be limited in number (Schmoder and Marzono, 1999, as cited in Marsh, 2004). Many standards are not clearly specified and there is vagueness about content (Glatthorn and Jailall, 2000, as cited in Marsh, 2004).

2.12.1 School-Based Curriculum Development (SBCD)

School-based curriculum development (SBCD) has emerged from the "standards" movement and is part of the broader international trend - such as in Australia, the United States, some countries in Europe as well as in Asia - toward school-based decision making (Brady, 1992). SBCD is the reverse of the bureaucratic, hierarchical, centralist approach to curriculum development. It is supported by the policy of decentralization which emphasises different developments according to local needs (Skilbeck, 1984; Brady, 1992; Print, 1993, p.19). Skilbeck (1984) explains that the rise of the school-based curriculum rests on arguments for the need for educational freedom and responsibility, and the inadequacy of top-down strategies in bringing about change.

Similar to any newly developed approach related to educational practice, there are both advantages and disadvantages in the SBCD approach. Print (1993, p.19) even argues that it creates more problems than advantages. The advantages are mostly found in schools with support, such as appropriate and sufficient funding and human resource, hence the effectiveness of school-based management in such settings comes from teacher accountability, promotion by the parents, as well as community involvement, and a curriculum that meets the needs of specific groups of learners (Skilbeck, 1984; Brady, 1992). However, school-based curriculum development is difficult to manage and administer, and needs more structural support. For example, school-based curriculum and school-based management requires significant changes in the roles of teachers and administrators (Print, 1993). Therefore, the downside of the approach happens in those schools that lack support structures and do not address matters of support and resources (Skilbeck, 1984). Schools with insufficient funding and lacking in intellectual support will find it difficult to be independent of central
bureaucracy. The development of an English language curriculum and the provision of English language in schools with few English language teachers and with low proficiency of teachers will result in frustration and disadvantages instead of advantages. Another concern is that in the implementation of a standards-based curriculum in a school-based curriculum it cannot be assumed that teachers will interpret them in the same way (Willis and Kissane, 1997, as cited in Marsh, 2004, pp.30-31)

Nevertheless, decentralisation often operates simultaneously with centralisation when the determination of aims or even curriculum prescriptions in terms of standards and curriculum framework are provided by the centralized system (Brady, 1992; Print, 1993). Under these circumstances, decision making at the school level is restricted to how those standards are met and achieved. In other words, the ‘Standards’ is a political document while the movement toward greater schools decision making, which can give greater autonomy to teachers in making decisions about the curriculum, may also be accompanied by tighter national control of the curriculum. Thus, the determination of what is worthwhile education originates at the national level (LeLoup & Ponterio, 1997). In the meantime, at the grassroots level, the school must seek new ways of understanding and relating to profound changes in national educational policies and structures, in the culture of modern society and in educational research and theory (Skilbeck, 1984, p.19).

Thus, within the school-based curriculum development movement, the freedom to manage schools really means that the curriculum is not only centred on issues of school administrative capacity but also issues of political intervention and intellectual development. Nevertheless, one needs to be aware that the shift from ‘standards education’ to standardized education is small; similarly the shift from education designed to cultivate individual growth as a part of society, to one designed to achieve even greater control of the individual is also small. Eisner (1994) strongly criticises standardised education for diluting educational aspirations and converting curricula into training programs. Eisner (1994) states that –

"[standardised education] defines an array of educational goals and a framework through which each segment of the whole can be aligned with its goals: first, goals must be formulated; then assessment tasks related to those goals are to be designed; following the design of assessment tasks, standards
are to be set for the content of each curriculum domain for specific age levels; finally assessment tasks are used to measure student performance. Giving another approach that helps school improvement, something that is management, that highly rationalized managerial approach to the production process... Why, one might ask, would such an approach to school reform be embraced so warmly by educators responsible for shaping the lives of children? Why would school administrators be so eager to become "scientific managers" (Eisner, 1994, p.39)

Standardised education is one of the important aims of reform efforts of 1990s. The aim is to create a system that admits scientific method into education (Eisner, 1994; Luke & van Kraayenoord, 1998). According to Eisner, education should not be viewed in this way.

2.12.2 Issues of Accountability

As can be seen from the emphasis on performance standards inherent in the introduction of standards-based curriculum, a standards-based education implies the centrality of the issue of accountability. Burns (2003) notes that the initiation of a national standards-based curriculum is an example of the inherent tension between externally imposed bureaucratic requirements and pedagogic ideals. Burns (2003) raises the important question of whether it is possible to adhere to the principles of learner-centredness within a standards-based curriculum that is focused on outcomes and accountability. Luke and van Kraayenoord (1998) comment that the problem inherent in standards and benchmarks is not the standards themselves but the way they are written. Luke and van Kraayenoord (1998) assert that in the 1980s, in Australia for example, the economic rationalist approach strongly influenced government and public administration on the matter of accountability and that underpins the design of standards and benchmarks. Luke and van Kraayenoord (1998) advocate that

"benchmarks become reifications of standards, taken not as the artefacts of the various trade-offs and compromises ... but as real phenomena - conglomerations of preferred literate skills, traits, attributes, behaviours, practices that are seen to actually exist and serve some purpose in the world - to be translated into single-shot standardized achievement tests." (p.7)

Burns (2003) suggests that given the current Australian government's political and ideological position on the reductive literacy agenda in the ESL program with, for example, accompanying issues of accountability, in order to reflect principles of equity and fairness in schools in different school sectors teachers need to undertake a
great deal of research and engage in advocacy on this issue. LeLoup and Ponterio (1997) add that if teaching professionals in the Standards Movement in the 21st century adopted the idea of working together and sharing ideas with other colleagues the result would not only empower learners to be life-long language learners and users, but could strengthen the position of foreign language learning in the national educational agenda.

2.13 Language Curriculum in Policy Contexts

Sowell (2005) has defined the curriculum as having four levels: societal, institutional, instructional, and experiential. The levels refer to the closeness of the relationship between the curriculum and the learners: the experiential level is the closest and the societal is the farthest. Curriculum policy, or a national language curriculum, has similar characteristics to the societal level of the curriculum which Sowell (2005) defines as being “...farthest removed from learners and is designed by the public, which includes politicians, representatives of special interest groups, school administrators, and professional specialists” (p.5). Thus the learner's need is determined by the interpretation and conclusion of society's views on what learners should learn and not from the learners themselves.

One of the characteristics of the societal level of the curriculum is the cooperation between specialists and national professional organizations to formulate standards to describe preferred intended learning outcomes in a broad statement (Sowell, 2005). Curriculum policy-making, as stated by Saylor, Alexander, and Lewis (1981, p.58), is one of the most difficult tasks in curriculum decision making. The challenge of this task is that almost all citizens as well as professional educators feel that they have a stake in the educational process and that curriculum-policy makers have to determine orderly processes whereby the wishes of all concerned may be considered in the final determination of curriculum policy by the legally constituted authority (Saylor et al., 1981, p.58). For example, the curriculum policy-making process in the United States, involves professional organizations and more particularly legally constituted groups, namely, states and local boards of education. Decisions concerning what to teach and what not to teach in local school districts must be shared not only by the local board
of education and the professional staff, but by the taxpayers and parents, and the students themselves (Saylor et al., 1981; Sowell, 2005). However, the issue of the number of curriculum developers also needs attention, for having large numbers of people involved in curriculum decisions can confound the planning process (Sowell, 2005, p.20).

Therefore, given the fact that curriculum policy involves people from different groups and areas and/or it constitutes planning by groups which might include experts in the field related to the subject matter as well as others, then at the consultation stage, constraints in conceptualisation of the curriculum and constraints in planning are a natural part of the curriculum-policy making process. Rodgers (1989) developed what he called a "polity planning framework" which is the list of issues related to English language curriculum development that curriculum developers and syllabus designers can mutually discuss. The list includes a number of factors: knowledge factors, learner factors, instructional factors and management factors (Rodgers, 1989, pp. 28-34). Clearly, the developed framework implies that communication among developers is the central issue in curriculum development, especially at the policy level. On top of that, what is of importance is that the discussion should aim at clarification of the meanings underlying the curriculum policy.

Furthermore, the importance of clarity of philosophies and underlying principles should not be discussed only at the policy making level. To the extent that curriculum policy is informed by an established educational convention, it is likely to reflect prevailing expectations and attitudes on the part of both teachers and learners (Taba, 1962; Print, 1993; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Richards (2001) adds that a change in language curriculum and policy has vast effects, such as on a teacher's pedagogical values and beliefs, their understanding of the nature of language or their classroom practices. For example, Richards (2001) has suggested that the philosophies of the language program are related to teaching philosophies and should be made available in the curriculum for teachers to apply to their teaching practices. Such a practice can be found in the Australian EFL curriculum framework. The articulation of teaching philosophies in this way is appropriate in school-based decision making because it
helps clarify teachers’ decision making relating to classroom practice. Richards explains that

“In the case of a teaching model that is based on an existing teaching model, such as communicative language teaching, the philosophy and principles of the model are accepted as givens: teachers are expected to be familiar with them and to put the principles into practice. Unless a teaching model is agreed upon, it is difficult to make decisions about what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable teaching practices” (2001, p. 216).

Because it affects such a wide range of practice and even a teacher’s belief, the clarity of the development and the dissemination of underlying philosophies or theoretical bases of the curriculum are an essential task for curriculum developers. Thus, the issues of policy statement clarification and clarity should not be underestimated.
Part III: Curriculum Issues and Approaches to Curriculum Analysis

This part presents the analytic framework that combines the nature and principles of those two fields: applied linguistics and curriculum studies. It is worth noting that the analytic framework proposed will not limit the analysis to the sphere of the reviewed literature; the literature acts as a guide and provides the scope of the analysis.

This part begins with a discussion of the nature of curriculum analysis, a discussion of the distinction between analysis and evaluation of curriculum and the issue of coherent curriculum. The last section contains three major issues related to curriculum decision making in curriculum planning: participants in curriculum planning, philosophical and theoretical underpinning of curriculum, and forces involved in curriculum decision making.

2.14 The Nature of Curriculum Analysis

Posner (1995) defines “curriculum analysis” similarly to Gutek’s (2004) definition of “analysis”, that is, as a method of breaking a curriculum into parts, examining those parts, and the ways they fit together to make a whole. Curriculum analysis is different from curriculum evaluation. Schubert (1986) explains that evaluation is the attempt to assess or judge the educational practices or programs. The analysis, on the other hand, is the process of considering something carefully in order to understand it or explain it. Thus, the nature of making judgment will be mostly found in the process of evaluation rather than analysis.

Posner (1995) adds that to analyse the curriculum is “… to identify the beliefs and ideas to which the developers were committed and which either explicitly or implicitly shaped the curriculum, and to examine the implications of these commitments and beliefs for the quality of the educational experience.” (p.13). However, most curriculum documents do not explicitly state developers’ beliefs, nor ideas nor theoretical commitments, and even when they do, it is dangerous to take them at face value (Posner, 1995; Richards, 2001). Thus, the task of the curriculum analyst is to probe beneath the surface of the curriculum document or curriculum design in order to identify curriculum beliefs, ideas or theoretical bases of the
curriculum or the perception of reality held by educators (Freire, 2004, p. 130). Freire (2004) adds that the investigation of an educator’s perception of reality is the investigation of the thought-language with which educators (and politicians) refer to reality, the levels at which they perceive that reality, and their view of the world that is represented in the program content of education.

Furthermore, Willis (1978) asserts that the curriculum is the form of meanings that were asserted in relation to other items. He states “when the relations among selections that constitute the designs of curriculum have been explained, the meanings of the curriculum have thereby been disclosed” (p. 78). Willis (1978) suggests that to account for the meaning of a curriculum, therefore, is to account for the reason for the curriculum elements and why its meaning is chosen as well as to explain the relations among the selections.

Curriculum analysis is similar to an illuminative model of evaluation, a new wave of evaluation (Stenhouse, 1975), that focuses on description and interpretation rather than on measurement and prediction of the curriculum achievement (Parlett & Hamilton, 1976). An illuminative evaluation model does not justify the curriculum intent which is different from the form of evaluation that is based on empirical assessment, such as the rationale model designed by Tyler (1949). Evaluation in the rationale model is the process of assessing the effectiveness of curriculum objectives, content and curriculum implementation and making a judgement by having objectives as a set of criteria. On the other hand, an illuminative evaluation favours observation of the real and what is happening in particular contexts in the classroom as useful data for curriculum development (Stenhouse, 1975; Parlett & Hamilton, 1976; Richards, 2001).

Taylor and Richards (1979) argue that the fundamental concern of illuminative evaluation is with the basic tenets, philosophy, aims, and intentions explicit or implicit within the curriculum and it is qualitative rather than quantitative; it is an approach that focuses on the ideas and judgements of those involved in the curriculum. Eisner (1979) states that conventional training in evaluation still bears the imprint of psychometrics:
“Although psychometric techniques are useful in describing some aspects of education performance, they by no means embrace the entirety of what counts educationally...The reduction of educational evaluation to a set of limited quantitative methods, ones that harbour their own values, which often go unacknowledged or unapprised, is to reduce educational evaluators to technicians and to a technical process.” (p.188)

The illuminative model with its concern for description and interpretation shares a similar view: qualitative methods in curriculum evaluation, such as the account of what happens in the reality of the classroom or in curriculum implementation, could better contribute to curriculum development than the quantitative method’s concern for measurement and prediction (Parlett & Hamilton, 1976). However, the illuminative model only broadens the curriculum analysis perspectives. Curriculum analysis takes us further in-depth into the curriculum document and its planning process, whereas the illuminative model focuses more on evaluation of the curriculum development and classroom practice.

To conclude, curriculum analysis is the process whereby each element of the curriculum is delineated and explored by revealing its implicit and explicit beliefs, values, and meanings, imposed or decided on by curriculum developers in the decision making process. In addition, because each curriculum element is asserted to form the curriculum, the study of how the relationship of each element is formed for the quality of educational experience is also essential. This statement implies two main focuses of curriculum analysis which are: a) beliefs, ideas, theories and meaning underlying the curriculum, and b) the relationship between the underlying meanings of the elements of the curriculum. In addition, the curriculum analyst should take an eclectic position, which means having a broad view from different perspectives, but not encapsulated by them (Posner, 1995)

2.15 Curriculum Analysis and Curriculum Planning

From the definition of curriculum analysis, its nature lends itself to the study of the curriculum planning process. As mentioned by Print (1993), curriculum planning is the process whereby curriculum developers conceptualise the features of the curriculum. Print (1993) names the conceptualising stage the “Curriculum Presage” stage. This stage involves questions such as: What constitutes and validates
knowledge and how is this legitimated?; What counts as curriculum knowledge?; How is access to such knowledge determined?; Whose interests are being served by the selection, legitimization and production of curriculum knowledge?; What is the relationship between knowledge and pedagogy?; How and what strategies are needed to reconceptualise knowledge to the advantage of previously excluded epistemologies? (Brady, 1992; Print, 1993). It is the process where choices constituting the curriculum are chosen by curriculum developers or, in other words, it is the decision making process. As stated previously, curriculum analysis focuses on the selection of choices for a curriculum, thus, the analysis of decisions made regarding choices in the curriculum planning process is the central focus of curriculum analysis. In other words, in order to analyse the curriculum product, one needs to understand the curriculum planning process. As Graves (1996) states, products of course design or curriculum “products” are the tangible results of the processes involved in the process of planning.

2.15.1 Curriculum Planning Process

Curriculum analysis focuses on a curriculum planning process which is the stage of laying theoretical bases in curriculum development which can be captured in the form of documents (Print, 1993). Curriculum development is typically seen as ‘Goal setting, Curriculum design, Curriculum implementation and Curriculum evaluation’ (Rodgers, 1989; Brady, 1992; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Richards, 2001; Brady & Kennedy, 2003). This research focuses only on the first two processes of curriculum development which are the planning of curriculum goals and aims, and curriculum design. This is because the curriculum planning of these stages is the stage where theoretical bases of curriculum can be mostly found despite the theoretical bases of the curriculum affecting all of the curriculum development program (Brady, 1992). In general, curriculum design is concerned with the nature and arrangement of four basic curricula elements: namely - objectives, the organization of subject matter, methodology and assessment, but the greater expansion of each elements or parts depends on curriculum educators (Taba, 1962; Nunan, 1988; Tyler, Madaus, & Stufflebeam, 1989; Brady, 1992; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Print, 1993). The Thai ESB curriculum, as revealed in Part I of this chapter, also consists of four major curriculum elements that correspond with the general curriculum goals and design,
which are: the curriculum overarching goals, learning strands and standards (curriculum goals and aims); benchmarks (objectives and the organisation of subject matter); learning and teaching management (methodology); and learning assessment. It is these four major elements that will be analysed in this research.

Richards (2001) reiterates that “throughout this process the statements of aims and objectives are continually referred to and both course content suggestions and the aim and objectives themselves are revised and fine tuned as the course content is planned.” (p.147). Unlike curriculum implementation that involves making arrangements for and use of a curriculum in schools, curriculum evaluation is those processes used in the investigation of the worth or merit of the program of study (Sowell, 2005, p.12). These latter are the stages where the theoretical basis and curriculum meaning have already been interpreted into practice (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). Figure 2.1 shows the place of curriculum elements that will be analysed in this research and their relationship with the whole curriculum development system. Highlights identify the commonplace element in the curriculum planning stage that will be analysed in this research according to the analytical framework proposed in this section.
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**Figure 2.1**: The commonplace in the curriculum planning process.
Rodgers (1989, p. 29) adds that decision making in the curriculum planning process has a far greater impact on the success or failure of curriculum development than the implementation of curriculum per se. K. Johnson (1989b) calls the decision making process in curriculum planning ‘process decision’. He explained that process decisions are about curriculum management decisions. The questions he asked about management decisions are, for example, “Who will be involved? What are their powers and terms of reference? What resources will they have available to them? What constraints will they be under and what procedures will be followed?” From his proposed questions in relation to the ‘process decision’, it can be concluded that the language curriculum planning process is not only questions about details in the curriculum document, but questions about issues relating to society, human resources and educational management.

Thus, the product of ‘process decision’ is not only the curriculum document. As pointed out by Saylor et al. (1981), the products of curriculum planning include much more than the curriculum plans, for curriculum planning entails changes in behaviour patterns of learners, changes in teaching practices and changes in the teaching environment. They argue that the changes that happen are a type of social change and to real people, not only what is referred to in the curriculum paper, hence they lead to ultimate changes in learners and their teachers that are inextricably related to plans that are direct products of the curriculum planning process (Saylor et al., 1981, p.54).

In conclusion, understanding a curriculum planning process or ‘process decision’ is conducive to both an understanding of the curriculum product and changes in the learning, in teaching, in teachers and learners and in other areas related to the English language curriculum development. Thus, the decision making process at the curriculum planning stage is a particularly crucial process in policy making and curriculum development because it can affect changes related to one’s belief about what is worthwhile in education. Therefore, not only will the curriculum elements of the Thai ESB curriculum be analysed, but its planning process will also be explored as part of the full analysis. The next section explains in detail the core of “Decision Making” - the coherent curriculum.
2.16 The Coherent Curriculum

As outlined above, the elements of a curriculum are not selected and decided by themselves; the relationship between the elements is where the decision making needs to be made. The relationship between the elements should be such that they are formed into a coherent curriculum - the aim of decision making in curriculum development (K. Johnson, 1989b, p.22). The potential forms of coherent language curricula are equally varied (K. Johnson, 1989b). The coherent curriculum can be one in which policy (what is desirable) has been reconciled with pragmatics (what is acceptable and possible) and one in which the relationships among the four stages of curriculum development (setting aims and objectives, planning learning opportunities, implementation, and evaluation) are mutually consistent and complementary (K. Johnson, 1989b, p.12).

The crucial form of coherence is theoretical and philosophical coherence (K. Johnson, 1989b; Brady, 1992; Beane, 1995). The coherent curriculum is different from a consistent, coexisting or systematic curriculum, in the sense of its manifesting a larger, compelling purpose, and actions that are tied to that purpose. Beane (1995) delineates that further:

"The call for coherence insists that we undertake fundamental rethinking of the curriculum. It asks that we abandon our specialized loyalties to particular parts and reconsider what and whom the curriculum is for. This is quite different from most current efforts toward restructuring that seek simply to align or systematize those parts, to demand uniformity, or to tinker with one or more organizational features of the schools. Nor does it simply seek a peaceful coexistence of what is not fragmented and sometimes contentious. Instead, this search for coherence goes to the very centre of school life, to the curriculum that defines and mediates the experiences of young people." (p.2)

Thus, central to the discussion of the coherent curriculum is the interconnection between the fundamental thinking of the curriculum, curriculum developers, society, learners, and teachers as well as the knowledge and the purpose of education as a whole.

2.16.1 The Face of Incoherence and the Analysis of Policy Rhetoric

On the other hand, an "incoherent" curriculum is "one whose parts do not hold together in anyway; instead, they are disconnected and fragmented. Such a curriculum lacks a sense of unity, relevance, pertinence, or larger purpose. Actions are simply
something people do, "not necessarily for any clear or compelling purpose" (Beane, 1995, p.3). This means that teachers, learners, administrators and educators who are involved in shaping of an incoherent curriculum will not be able to make sense of the learning and teaching experience because the true meaning of education was not fully communicated or, worse, was mis-communicated and hence created gross difficulties in the pursuit of practices. As Fullan (2001) mentions in his series on innovation overload, "the main problem is not the absence of innovation in schools, but rather the presence of too many disconnected, episodic, fragmented, superficially adorned projects" (p.21).

One of the results of the implementation of incoherent curricula can be understood from the questions asked by learners such as, "Why do we have to do this?" with the teacher's response "Because I say so", or "Because it will be on the test". Beane (1995) argues that the teacher's answer leads to a possible conclusion that when teachers themselves answer questions in that way, they are not clear about what they are doing and also do not know why learners have to do what they are told. This implies an unclear intention of the curriculum and an unclear understanding of teachers about the curriculum having a larger educational purpose.

It also implies a lack of meaning that underlies practices and even conflicts with underlying meaning that leads to an untidy picture of education. Beane (1995) questions, "Is it possible that we ourselves [teachers] are unclear or do not know, apart from institutional timelines, what it is that the curriculum is all about?" He further asks teachers to consider "Why am I teaching this?", and "If this makes no sense to me, how can I keep asking students to learn it?" (p.2). And for some teachers, their teaching practices only follow state approved textbooks and national tests as the teaching purposes (Apple, 1995, p.136). Thus, what has been written in the curriculum, such as "the educated fully-developed person" and/or "education for the whole child", is too often left behind as hollow words in the curriculum document or to float airily in policy rhetoric (Apple, 1995, p.137).

The issue of the real meaning of policy rhetoric is not speculative but a realistic problem, one that can affect curriculum coherence. This implies that one of the
possible ways to sustain curriculum coherence, and hence practice, is to study the language used in the policy by unpacking and unloading those terms that were used to reveal meaning in its context. As Gutek (2004) argues, the study of language used in the policy, curriculum or in publicly written texts reveals that what purports to be knowledge is “human-made construction”, that language is a means of controlling knowledge and of giving control to those who purport to understand and interpret it. He further explains:

“In our professional discussions and readings as teachers, we hear such nice-sounding phase as “quality education,” “educating the whole child,” “authentic assessment,” an “effective school” and “critical thinking”...In our ordinary life, we need to be able to unload, unpack, and critically assess the claims made by commentators, preachers, politicians, self-help gurus, drug companies, and advertisers...Many of these educational promises are conveyed in language that is promising but also vague and ambiguous. While noble and high-sounding, they are often a kind of preachment or a political statement; somebody’s good intention or ideological preference.” (p. 109)

Another example found in the discussion of the word ‘critical’ is contained in the policy document by Lankshear, Gee, Knobel, and Searle, (1997, p.41). They argue that the word ‘critical’, such as in ‘critical thinking’, ‘critical literacy’ has become the magic bullet of many educational policies but often educators or policy makers pay little attention to its real meaning. They claim that the word ‘critical’ is merely inserted in curriculum or policy rhetoric with too little meaning and/or without any real indication being provided of what actually counts as critical practice in particular cases, which creates more work than generating positive contribution (Lankshear et al., 1997).

Questions relating to the analysis of language and relating to the meaning underlying language used in curriculum policy are: What is the real meaning of these snippets of information? Do they really contain valid knowledge? What do these phrases really mean? What do they mean for the speaker and for the listener? What did the text mean at the time of its origination or construction? What groups established and used the meaning of the text at its origination? What has the text come to mean over the course of history? What does the text mean at the present time for different groups? (Gutek, 2004, pp.108-110). Beane (1995) supports Gutek further in arguing that for curriculum committees who simply move from one idea to another - such as the trends of outcomes-based education, interdisciplinary instruction, integrated
curriculum, authentic assessment, whole language, etc., - for them "such a flurry of curriculum activity is a pretty picture" (Beane, 1995, p.2), but for local educators it is not. Beane (1995) asserts that what local educators want to know is whether when they adopt the proposed trends and spend time and energy on new practices, it will make some large and lasting difference, not just another passing fad with ambiguity attached to it.

2.16.2 The Possibility and Sustainability of Curriculum Coherence

Steller (1995, p.v) proposes that the way to increase curriculum coherence is for the curriculum to be developed with less ambiguity. In addition, it should be written with coordination between local, state, and national curricula and standards coming together into one increasingly centralized (and ostensibly coherent) system (Apple, 1995, p.136). This implies that a coherent curriculum is one that has philosophical, theoretical coherence without ambiguity, fragmentation and disconnection. It implies coherent practices among educational stakeholders and that they will make sense of the curriculum in terms of a larger purpose, not in pieces. K. Johnson (1989b) adds that achieving and maintaining coherence requires the active engagement and cooperation of all participants throughout the life of a curriculum. Winch and Gingell (2004) support Johnson and assert that "the work of curriculum must be seen as work in progress; one should not make the mistake of believing that what one has at the moment is necessarily the best" (p.33).

Again, as K. Johnson asserts (1989b) an investigation of the coherent curriculum can only be done by studying how the curriculum is planned and what the product of the curriculum is. K. Johnson (1989b) explains that

"The coherence can only be formally demonstrated and mismatches remedied to the extent that the processes and products of decision making are accessible to investigation. Without this precondition, it is difficult to carry out effective evaluation. If this precondition can be met, the analysis could be easily taken deeply into the essence of problems with some kind of solution."

(p.23).

Thus, this present study analyses the Thai EFL curriculum from a position which is based on the belief what makes up the essential form of curriculum development and education is the coherent fundamental thinking inherent in the curriculum and the coherence of the philosophical and theoretical bases underlying the curriculum. The
present study concludes that a curriculum with ambiguities and mismatches in its theoretical bases cannot be analysed as a unity and that persuading educational stakeholders, as well as young people, to make sense of the learning experiences and possibly the real world is delusory. The incoherent curriculum leads only to further confusion. To investigate the coherent curriculum is to investigate the decision making processes of curriculum planning and the larger curriculum itself.

The beliefs, ideas, theory and the meaning underlying the curriculum, as well as the coherence amongst those elements, make up the essential basis of the curriculum and are central to the aims of the decision making process. The next sections discuss four major matters related to the underlying meaning of the curriculum: the decision makers or participants in the planning process, the theoretical bases of the curriculum or the foundations of curriculum decision making called the “Foundations of Curriculum” (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Print, 1993), the essence of meaning underlying the curriculum, and the forces behind the decision making.

2.17 Three Major Issues Related to Curriculum Decision Making

2.17.1 Participants in Curriculum Planning – the Decision Makers

In general, it is undeniable that despite the bottom-up curriculum development (School-Based Curriculum) approach that is introduced to allow the curricula to be developed by those who implement the curriculum, the national curriculum, the policy and the knowledge relating to the development of the nation are all still decided at the national level. Print (1993) comments that

“in our complex, democratically based, multicultural society, decisions will be made in the curriculum development process which reflect competing forces seeking to influence future generations...It is important that educators realize, therefore, that curriculum development is essentially a manipulative strategy.” (p.15)

Thus, one of the ways to democratise national education is to ensure that the people who have power to make a decision at the policy level make the most of their responsibilities to their own generation and future generations in a democratic way. Pierre Bourdieu, a well-known sociologist, who worked against social injustice and oppression, believes that intellectuals have a major responsibility in bridging
intellectual work and the operations of politics (Giroux, 2004, p.7). What we can do is to try to understand the curriculum and its underlying principles which then allows us to understand what ways the nation is leading its citizens and how freedom can be exercised in the process of learning. We have to understand this legitimating process, and then we can be assured that education is not the place for any particular party to take advantage, but a place that advantages our children.

One of the crucial tasks of curriculum analysis is to disclose the meanings of the curriculum developers which are embodied in their selections of those possibilities which in fact constitute the form their work takes (Willis, 1978; K. Johnson, 1989b; Freire, 1998). Modern language curriculum development starts to question not only how the objectives are derived and how they are implemented but also to question who has the responsibility for holding the decision made, what is their expertise, their beliefs and ideologies concerning second or foreign language education and curriculum studies. Print (1993) adds that “if we are able to understand where curriculum developers are coming from, we can better understand the curricula that have been devised and can thus be more consistent with the curriculum’s intentions when it is implemented” (p.46).

Curriculum developers or policy makers are persons who participate in or commence the task of constructing a curriculum, to organize and conceptualize the curriculum, whether or not it includes a written document; as pointed out by Print (1993, p.57), they are participating in curriculum planning. Parsons (1995, p.154) explains that professional groups, such as scientists and academics, are often represented as the creators of public policy. Thus, they, the proponents of particular bodies of knowledge, play an important role in shaping both social policy and the institutions of everyday life and they are said to have power. Ornstein and Hunkins (1993, p.233) state that a person’s philosophical stance will affect his or her interpretation and selection of objective knowledge, influence the content selected and how it will be organised, affect decisions about how to teach or deliver the curriculum and guide judgements about how to evaluate the success of the curriculum developed.
Posner (1995) has posed questions relating to the decision making process as follows: Who made up the cast of characters in the development of the curriculum? What were their names, with what institution were they affiliated, and what were their roles in the project? Lian (2003) suggests that learning theory and practice are not the only influences on teaching; instead, administrative constraints and curriculum planning processes will have a major impact. His questions are, for example, (a) Who will decide on the content of syllabuses: administrators, teachers, researchers, the minister or all the above?; (b) Who will select the people who will develop the curriculum?; (c) How will these people be selected?; (d) Who will have the final say in the approval of the curriculum?; and finally (e) Who will select the people who select the people who will develop the curriculum? The questions here imply that the group of people who make decisions in the policy making process have power to determine what child should be developed and in what way. Curriculum developers have crucial powers in the way a child develops.

Print (1993) has indicated six stages of curriculum planning process. These six stages have shown curriculum developers’ significant roles and power in decision making and how these decisions affect the education and the future of children.

1. Curriculum developers have opinions about the nature of knowledge and what is worthwhile
2. These opinions are then set in the context of the developers’ understanding of society and culture and future social needs
3. The contribution of psychology - the nature of students and how they learn - then acts to modify the previously assembled opinions and data
4. Together these foundation sources provide a background of information upon which the curriculum developers rely to make a future curriculum decision.
5. When merged with the curriculum developers’ past experiences in curriculum, we can see how developers tend towards particular conceptions of the curriculum task.
6. When these foundation sources and curriculum conceptions are seen in relation to differing curriculum contexts, we can explain why the final curriculum products are, and need to be, somewhat different. (Print, 1993, p. 32)

If we accept these stages in the planning process, it is clear that the future aim of education is to rely on curriculum developers’ interpretation of the nature of knowledge, their judgment of what is worthwhile, their understanding of society and culture, and their understanding of the nature of learning, of learners and teachers.
Thus the people involved in the planning process must have knowledge within their expertise as well as knowledge related to multiple perspectives of education. As stated by Posner (1995), curriculum decisions are never limited to questions of how to do something but entail decisions about desirability, fairness, or legitimacy of content, of an approach to topic, or of a way to treat students, all of which have historical, social, political, moral, cultural, and economic implications. Thus, curriculum decision making is a very complex task that involves many kinds of decisions (Sowell, 2005) and one important characteristic of adequate curriculum development is that the decisions made in the course of planning rest on multiple criteria and consider a multiplicity of factors (Taba, 1962, p.6). Saylor et al. (1981) argue that the appropriateness of a curriculum plan will be improved when curriculum decision makers have knowledge of curriculum choices to be made and criteria to apply in making choices supported by knowledge (Print, 1993).

Thus, studying the curriculum planners themselves is an essential process in curriculum analysis. Three points relating to curriculum planners are - (a) their roles and representation in the planning process, (b) the beliefs and theories that they brought with them to the planning process and (c) their interpretation of the philosophies, ideologies and theory of English language teaching and learning in the curriculum document. The researcher’s aim is to draw together what members of the Thai EFL curriculum committee share in terms of professional concerns and options, regardless of any differences that make every setting, classroom, and pedagogical encounter unique (Van Lier, 1996).

2.17.2 Philosophical and Theoretical Bases Underlying a Curriculum

As stated previously, curriculum planning is the stage where the feature of the curriculum or the whole picture of the curriculum is conceptualized. The coherent curriculum is the result of the coherence of choices made in order to conceptualise the curriculum. This section describes theoretical bases or the common foundation knowledge that is the basis for decision making. The definition of philosophical and theoretical bases in this research means the nature of knowledge and worthwhile knowledge that school teachers, learners and stakeholders were told to value that advocate and reflect school goals or aims, content, as well as the processes of teaching
and learning (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993, p.34). For example, Thai national education contains educational philosophies that curriculum stakeholders, school teachers as well as people who are involved in educating the child have to take into account as bases for their decision making. One philosophy of life, for example, is to live with happiness and to smile. Allen (1984) states that philosophical orientation is a particular conceptual framework that entails a theory of what language is and how language is learned and it can have far-reaching effects on what takes place in the classroom.

This research will not explore philosophy as an ‘ism’ such as essentialism, progressivism, reconstructionism, but focus on “Education” itself. As Dewey notes,

"Those who are looking ahead to a new movement in education, adapted to the existing need for a new social order, should think in terms of Education itself rather than in terms of some ‘ism’ about education, even such an ‘ism’ as ‘progressivism.’ For in spite of itself any movement that thinks and acts in terms of an ‘ism’ becomes so involved in reaction against other ‘isms’ that it is unwittingly controlled by them. For example, progressive education has an educational philosophy which professes to be based on the idea of freedom” (Dewey, 1963, p.6).


2.17.2.1 The lack of theoretical bases of a curriculum

Not only the issue of theoretical coherence, but also whether the decision making is based on theory at all should be discussed. White (1988) shows us that it is especially important that the theoretical aspects of curriculum development be re-examined because of the strong tendency to assume that the theoretical foundations of our current curriculum are sound and that the difficulties occur chiefly in translating theory into practice. Taba (1962) argues that because of the very complexity and multitude of decisions and the fact that curriculum developers are selected by different segments in the educational organization, it is important that there is an adequate theory for curriculum development. Tanner and Tanner (1995) point out that the problem of design is compounded by the problem of theory. Theory had been largely neglected. School stakeholders have been more concerned with educational practice and with administration than with hard thinking concerning the direction in
which education is moving and ought to move. Dewey (1963), who believed in the unity of theory and practice, asserted that the practical conflicts and the controversies that emerge at the level of philosophy of education only set a problem. Kumaravadivelu (2001) in his pedagogy of practicality, emphasised that

"the practice of classroom teaching has a close relationship between theory and practice and [...] that general educationists have long recognized the harmful effect of the theory/practice dichotomy and others that constitute a dialectical praxis, an affirmation that has recently influenced L2 teaching and teacher education as well."(p.540)

2.17.2.2 Three foundations of curriculum

Philosophical and theoretical bases underlying the curriculum can be identified as three foundations of the curriculum. Stern (1989) asserts that fundamental concepts which are the essential building blocks in the second and foreign language curriculum, in policy decisions, in acts of teaching and even in the learner's conduct are 'the nature of language', 'social context' and 'language learning and teaching'. The clearer the underlying assumptions of the fundamental concepts proposed, the more a language curriculum becomes sophisticated, professional and effective (Allen, 1984; Stern, 1989). These three fundamental concepts are similar to the general curriculum foundation which consists of 'the nature of knowledge', 'the nature of society and culture' and 'the nature of learners and learning' (Taba, 1962; Saylor et al., 1981; Dubin & Olshtain, 1986; Brady, 1992; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Print, 1993; Richards, 2001; Sowell, 2005). Some define these as the field of philosophy, sociology and psychology respectively. The relationship between these three can be described in the following terms according to selected authorities.

From Saylor et al. (1981), we know that society helps to shape the aims of education. The purposes, interests, needs, and abilities of learners should guide curriculum planners and knowledge should be organized to assure its widest generalized meaning and most effective future use. From Michael Halliday interviewed by Prof. Steele (1988), we realize that

"any learning context - and that includes the context of the school - has to be seen as a sociolinguistic environment. The school like the home and the

---

6 It is worth noting that this research does not attempt to discuss the curriculum in these terms (philosophy, sociology and psychology), however, it can be implied that the discussion on the philosophies and theories of the curriculum will revolve around these issues.
neighbourhood, is more a component of an individual's early experience; and we need to have clear theoretical models to understand the concept of the cultural environment in which a child is growing up, and the specific situations in which that child is involved with family, peer group and teachers. All these contexts in which people interact with one another make very specific demands on our language abilities - and so develop the language potential that every human being has.” (Steele, 1988, p.36)

From Hass and Parkay (1993), we understand that knowledge about human development is necessary to provide a basis for continuity in learning and for the development of self-understanding. Knowledge about the nature of knowledge enables the curriculum planner to provide for learning that is useful, or problem oriented, or that can be transferred by the learner from any situation to another. It also assists the planner in providing for individual differences and balance in the curriculum. Understanding large and small scale cultures, as well as social forces, helps the curriculum planner to provide for relevance and the teaching of values. As Brady (1992) stated, the purpose of the study of society and culture is the analysis of organized human relationships, in which the focus has been understanding the direction of social change and the socialisation of the individual and the concern of the social change. Brady (1992) adds further that curriculum planners need to be aware of social change to ensure that curricula are not dated and irrelevant because “school should function [more] as an agent than a mirror of social change” (p.62). At the school level, the nature of society contributes to curriculum planning by helping teachers to understand the influence of social background as well as culture on the role of schools and teachers in the social change (Brady, 1992; Winch & Gingell, 2004, p.33). Thus, the nature of society and culture contributes to educational development. On the other hand, the nature of society and culture can also be viewed as ideologies and values of a society that influences the education, hence how one lives (Print, 1993; Apple, 1995). Saylor et al.(1981) and Hass and Parkay (1993) suggest that one secret of effective curriculum planning is to assign appropriate weights to a consideration of society, learners, and knowledge. However, these choices depend upon the curriculum maker’s answer to such value questions as: What is the good society? What is the good person? (Saylor et al., 1981, p.19). From these two questions about the relationship between the nature of knowledge, society, and the nature of learners and learning, emerges a crucial decision about curriculum foundations which is the balance between those three.
2.17.2.3 Ideologies and values

The nature of society and culture can also be viewed as the ideologies and values that influence how one lives. Brewer and DeLeon (1983, p. 219) state “Ideology is ...the concept that refers to thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs - taken in appropriate combinations - that prevail in political settings.” Values are a set of beliefs and attitudes that people share, the moral principles and beliefs, principles, ethics and moral standards that people think are important. Saylor et al. (1981) argue that values form an important basis for making appropriate choices in curriculum design. Culture is also part of societal values. Skilbeck (1984) comments that the common thread is that curriculum is inseparable from the total cultural pattern of a society and that ‘culture’ in this context is about fundamental social ‘knowledge, meanings, values and possessions’.

When theories and philosophies are reinterpreted within particular social contexts and culture, they will never be pure in nature (though the theories and philosophies themselves are never pure anyhow) and they become an ideology and values that can influence the curriculum planning process, the curriculum itself and how one lives (Print, 1993, p.32; Apple, 1995, p.130). As Freire (1998) states

“What is equally fundamental to the educational practice of the teacher is the question of ideology. Sometimes its presence is greater than we think. It is directly linked to that tendency within us to cloak over the truth of the facts, using language to cloud or turn opaque what we wish to hide. We become myopic. Blind. We become prisoners of artifice. Trapped.” (p.112).

Widdowson (1990) adds that language goals are formulated not only in reference to pedagogic effectiveness but also in accordance with ideological positions concerning the nature of education in general. Sowell (2005, p.23) states the values have been derived from different assumptions of the public who design them about the purpose of education and that the policy or societal curriculum reflects their values and ideologies. Winch and Gingell (2004, p.18) state that a curriculum is the main engine for the delivery of cultural values of society. Print (1993), thus argues that rather than searching for the culture-free curriculum one should reconsider a curriculum as a situation where judgments are made as to what aspects of culture are to be included and why.
Apple (1995) argues that curriculum planning is deeply involved in what might best be called "cultural politics." Apple (1995) adds that

"The curriculum - and our ways of organizing it and connecting its elements together and giving it coherence - is never simply a neutral object, somehow appearing in our texts and classroom. It is always part of a selective tradition, someone's selection, and someone's vision of the knowledge that needs to be taught to everyone. As such, it is produced out of conflicts and compromises that sometimes leave those land mines buried beneath the surface." (p.130)

Consequently, when developers devise curricula the cultural background, values and ideologies of those developers will become evident in the content they select, the methods they include, the objectives they set and so forth. Richards (2001, p.114) notes that in developing goals for educational programs, curriculum planners draw on their understanding both of the present and long term needs of learners and their understanding of society, as well as on their beliefs and ideologies about schools, learners, and teachers. These beliefs and values provide the philosophical underpinnings for educational programs and the justification of the kinds of aims they contain.

If, for instance, they consider that education is something that is entirely instrumental to something else, such as economic survival or adapting to the demands of the social environment, then this will profoundly shape the whole view the curriculum producing a means-end approach to curriculum design (Saylor et al., 1981).

Print (1993, p.32) names the values and ideologies of a curriculum 'curriculum conception'. In other words, when the three foundations of the curriculum (the nature of knowledge, the nature of learning and learners, and the nature of society) merge with the curriculum developers' past experiences in curriculum or their history, it can then be seen what the particular curriculum conceptions and perspectives of the curriculum task developers tended towards (Skilbeck, 1984; White, 1988; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Print, 1993; Posner, 1995). Ornstein and Hunkins (1993) add that "an individual's approach to or perspectives on curriculum reflects that person's view of the world, including what the person perceives as reality, the values he or she deem as important."(p.1). Print (1993) adds that when these foundation and curriculum conceptions are seen in relation to differing curriculum contexts, we can explain why the final curriculum products are, and need to be, somewhat different.
In the progression of the philosophy and theories of education in different periods, the ideologies have changed concurrently with the various movements. For example, in the traditional view of education, the academic rationale is the ideology that educators derive their decision making from, whereas in progressive education, the terms 'child development' or 'learner-centred' reflect the values of more modern education with its emphasis on the growth of child. When education becomes the tool for economic development, social efficiency and social reconstruction are the ideologies or the reinterpretation of the philosophies of progressive education. This will be discussed further in Part IV.

2.17.3 Forces of Curriculum Decision Making

2.17.3.1 Political constraints

The underlying ideologies and theories explain the characteristics of a curriculum. However, most curriculum developers do not work according to theories, educational philosophies or explicit values. What this research tries to identify is that even though the process of education is political in nature, the political constraints here do not refer to the personal politics of individuals developing the curriculum nor does it refer to the politics of those stakeholders interpreting and reinterpreting the curriculum, but to the politics of political power groups who are able to influence the interpretation of curriculum developers. Curriculum development could derive from political pressure (Tanner & Tanner, 1995). For example, in the case of educational reform, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) argue that it is very much a political process. It is about politically motivated change that is accompanied by, among other things, greater commitment of leaders, the power of new ideas, and additional resources. Goodlad (1979) states that the most controversial issues relating to education are the political constraints attached to the provision of education for the growth of child and society.

K. Johnson (1989b) argues that "we need to see successful language education programs as considerably more than a composite of well-chosen linguistics inventories, well-tested procedures and well-designed classroom materials. Perhaps even more than educational programs in other fields proposed and planned with political acumen" (p.25). As K. Johnson (1989b) further explains

"National Language policies are determined by socio-political pressures which vary from one culture and socio-political system to another; the
primary consideration of most governments begins to maintain, and if possible extend their power, influence and acceptability... There are well-established constraints on what can be achieved, for example in situations where opportunities for learning are brief and intermittent, opportunities for forgetting almost infinite, and where there is no contact with the target language outside the classroom... However, governments and language schools which promise only what they can perform are likely to go out of business" (pp.3-4).

Sowell (2005) mentions that governmental groups can and do enact legislation or use budget pressures to effect curriculum change and somehow influence curriculum decision making through sponsored research, and/or even through Supreme Court rulings as has happened in United States (Sowell, 2005, p.24). Saylor et al. (1981) argue that “Many educational institutions, especially public schools, colleges, and universities, are subject to political control and direction; they are instruments of social groups, and the groups collectively exercise their control through political action.” (p.147).

Rodgers (1989, p.29) describes the process of arranging, analysing and responding to political considerations in the English language curriculum and language policy as “polity determination”. He proposes two main issues related to “polity determination” in the curriculum planning process to be analysed: the analysis of the existing socio-political context into which a new educational program is to fit and the development of strategies to optimize the probable success and effectiveness of the program in such a political context. Therefore, the analysis of national curricula requires attention to the political constraints and influences on the theoretical and philosophical bases of the curricula. In other words, the process of forming a national EFL curriculum is not purely about learners and languages but it is also about political power that governs the whole educational process.

### 2.17.3.2 Western influences

From the foregoing analysis, it is clear that the Thai EFL curriculum has developed partly under the influence of Western education. The influences come both directly and indirectly. The direct influence is from the cooperation or a joint venture of education between the Thai and Western governments. The indirect influence is from the trends of education and English language teaching and learning. The Western influence sometimes produces unpleasant results in education planning because the
influences come with different perspectives towards teachers and learners and how to understand education. As Print (1993) argues, United States education has influenced Australian education for the past 30 years, and the results are a non-ethnocentrically based curriculum and the lack of national sentiment in Australia curricula.

Furthermore, globalisation has moved decision making in the policy agenda closer to international trends in education and economics. However, Parsons (1995, p.243) has argued that “the more nations are compelled to accept the global forces which shape policy options, the more they may seek to retain - or obtain - their capacity to be different.” Parsons (1995) adds further that despite the issues and problems that may be defined in global terms, decision-making and implementation are carried out within national contexts. Thus, the study of Western influence on the Thai EFL curriculum, especially in the globalisation era, is to identify any Thai contexts forming views on global education.

In conclusion, the three major issues discussed in this section are the bases for the analysis of the Thai EFL curriculum. These three issues basically revolve around the issue of the legitimacy of participants involved in curriculum planning and the issues of philosophical and theoretical underpinning of the curriculum which are fundamental to thinking about practices. The philosophical and theoretical bases of the curriculum provide knowledge of the nature of knowledge and the nature of learners and learning as well as of teaching and the nature of society. The study of society can be viewed in terms of ideologies, values and culture, of a society’s influence on how philosophies and theories are interpreted into practice. In fact, this implies that there is not a clear-cut view of what has influence over what, for theories may come from practice that was imposed by particular ideologies, values and cultures. Indeed, Michael Halliday in his interview with Prof. Steele (1988) states

“It is essential that the theoretical development should be seen as something coming from linguists and educators working together. The theory will only advance through feedback from its applications in practice: but equally, practice will only be improved by continual input from theory. Finally, let me stress that this is not going back to anything. That won’t help us at all. It’s going forward - with a sense of where we should be heading.”(Steele, 1988, p.39)
As Schwab (2004) adds, "curriculum will deal badly with reality and practice if it treats them merely as replicas of their theoretical representations." (p.110). Nevertheless, from the literature there is support for the conclusion that a lack of theoretical basis in curriculum planning leads to ineffective curriculum development and hence to an incoherent curriculum. Thus, while this research does not attempt to over impose the essentiality of theory, it accepts that the philosophies and theories of one curriculum in one society that contains different ideologies, values and beliefs and cultures from other societies, in someway influence practices and the way one perceives the larger purpose of education. In addition, this research attempts to discover whether the philosophies and theories underlying each element of the curriculum have undergone the same application and if the curriculum has been planned in a coherent way to ensure that the larger purpose of education will be mutually understood among those who planned and those who implemented it, as well as those who stand most to benefit from it – the nation's children. This research argues that the ideological positions and values of policy makers form particular curriculum perspectives that influence the way curriculum goals, curriculum designs, methodology and assessment, and hence practices, emerge. Furthermore, it is clear that the national language curriculum needs to take into account the fact that education is not purely the process of cultivating the child but the process of national, political and societal needs - as well as Western influence - that are all factors affecting the curriculum.

### 2.18 Conclusion of Analysis Approach

This part has given the analytical framework for the analysis of the Thai EFL curriculum. The analysis mainly focuses on the issues of decision making in the curriculum planning process. The aim of decision making is to achieve a coherent curriculum. The coherent curriculum is based on the coherence of choices made in decision making process. Three major issues related to decision making in the curriculum planning process are: participants in the curriculum, philosophies and theories underlying the curriculum and forces of curriculum decision making.
The Thai EFL curriculum contains correlated lists of general curriculum elements, namely curriculum goals, curriculum content, methodology and assessment (the last three are part of the curriculum design). Thus, investigating the theoretical coherence of choices made amongst these elements is the essential aim of this research. The diagram presents the overall analytic approach of the research.

The next section reviews movements in the nature of knowledge, the nature of English language learners, learning and teaching, as well as the nature of socio-cultural views that influence foreign language teaching and learning.
Chapter 2: Critical Review of Relevant Literature

Part IV: Reviews of Traditional-Contemporary Theoretical Bases of EFL Curriculum Planning and Curriculum

Paradoxically, education lies between the ideologies of absolute truth and absolute knowledge, on the one hand, and dynamic knowledge, on the other; it lies between transmission and self-actualisation, between the needs of society and the needs of the learner. And the most discussed issue at present is the tension between the individuality of the learner and the learner as an integral part of society (Eisner, 1994; Wells, 1995; Brady & Kennedy, 2003; Wallace, 2003; Marsh, 2004). The developed model of thinking about knowledge, learning, learners and life has been interpreted in different periods according to changes in society, both for survival and to maintain the democratic spirit. Within this paradoxical discourse, curriculum conceptions, or perspectives that represent the interpretations of philosophical, theoretical, psychological and sociological viewpoints of educators and of influential others in society are realised. As well, teaching and learning practices, which range from the traditional to the contemporary, are also devised and these also represent the various interpretations of philosophical, theoretical, psychological and sociological viewpoints of educators and of influential others in society.

Curriculum educators, including foreign language educators, propose several perspectives of curriculum that engage in and draw on this paradoxical discourse. For example, Clark (1987) basing his views on Skilbeck’s (1982) framework, referred to curriculum perspectives as a “value system”. Most foreign language educators (e.g. White (1988), Richards (2001), Nunan (2004), and Finney (2002)) refer to Clark’s values system as a basis for discussion of the philosophical and ideological underpinning of foreign language curricula. His value system encompasses academic rationalism, reconstructionism and progressivism. However, his values system refers to progressivism in relation only to ‘individual progressivism’, not to ‘social progressivism’ or social reconstruction perspectives which is one of the central issues in education movements in the reform movement and TESOL in the 21st century (Pennycook, 1998; Canagarajah, 2006; Ellis, 2006). Richards (2001), despite referring to Clark’s values system, discusses ideologies underpinning foreign language

---

7The two terms are used by Langford (2005) where the former represents a ‘learner-centeredness perspective’; the latter represents a ‘social construction’ perspective. These two will be discussed further in the later section.
curricula based on Eisner (1992). Richards's views are similar to those of Print (1993), a curriculum educator, on whom Eisner had also had some influence. A study of Richards, a leading language educator, and Print, a prominent curriculum educator, as well as Clark's value system - that has had a profound influence on leading foreign language educators at the present time - shows a closeness amongst the three and an overlapping of views regarding their proposal of curriculum conceptions, perspectives and values systems. Thus, from the overlapping and shared values derived from the paradoxical traditional-contemporary educational discourse, four curriculum conceptions or perspectives - academic rationale, social and economic efficiency, learner-centeredness and social reconstructionists perspectives - will be discussed. These four conceptions have had a profound effect on the way one thinks about the teaching of language and other subjects (Allen, 1984; White, 1988; Richards, 2001).

While the traditional-contemporary discourse represents mostly the debate in the West, it has also had great influence in the East (Langford, 2005, p.124). This can be seen in various countries' educational policies as well as research in classroom practices either in the form of policy borrowing (D. Phillips & Ochs, 2004) or the trends of education, especially in the present age of globalisation where the boundaries between countries have become blurred (Brady & Kennedy, 2003). Therefore, this review implies its theoretical relevance to Thai education and EFL curriculum development.
A. Traditional Views of Education and the Curriculum

The most discussed issue in traditional education is the emphasis on the transmission of knowledge that is imposed from outside the learner's own interests and his or her repertoire of experience (Dewey, 1963; Kilpatrick, 1993). Dewey's analyses of traditional education, show that traditionally the main educational purpose is to prepare the young for future responsibilities and for success in life by means of the acquisition of organized bodies of past information and prepared forms of skills (Dewey, 1963, p.17). According to this view of education, the role of teachers is to conduct and enforce knowledge. Teachers are the knowers who carry absolute truth and knowledge, and transmit social and cultural values (Kilpatrick, 1993; Gilbert, 2005). Thus, learners are passive recipients who are not challenged to question the imposed information and knowledge. Dewey names this phenomenon “spectator theory of knowing”. He argues further that all classic epistemologies were spectator theories, where the learner was depicted as a passive receptacle or spectator (D. C. Phillips, 2006). Thus, Dewey points out that learning here means acquisition of what is already incorporated in books and in the heads of the elders. It is taught as a finished product, with little regard either to the ways in which it was originally built up or to changes that will surely occur in the future (Dewey, 1963, p.18-19).

In the traditional view, the curriculum is viewed as a product and is designed with the purpose that all learners must try to achieve certain ends (Kilpatrick, 1993; Smith, 1996/2000). Two curriculum conceptions that are found to be based on this view of education are: the ‘Academic rationalist’ conception that values the mastery of subject matter as an end, and the ‘Social and economic efficiency’ conception that values the mastery of behavioural objectives.

2.19 Mastery of Subject Matter as an Educational Goal

Academic rationalists place academic disciplines and subject matter as ends or the objectives of education by encouraging our understanding of the structure of a discipline (Allen, 1984; Clark, 1987; Richards, 2001; Gilbert, 2005; Sowell, 2005). Clark (1987) refers to this ideology as ‘classical humanism’ and states that the purpose of ‘classical humanism’ is to maintain and transmit through education the
wisdom and culture of previous generations. The culture is to be transmitted through a hidden curriculum.

This approach views curriculum development as a procedure based on intellectual maturity, scholarly logic, and academic rationality (Medley, 1985; Richards, 2001). The curriculum is viewed as a body of content knowledge or a container of knowledge to be transmitted together with a list of items whose underlying rules and regularities should be studied and consciously mastered (Clark, 1987, p.5). The role of teachers is to pass on the knowledge that they claim to possess to learners to acquire.

Allen (1984, p.63) states that the academic rationalist viewpoint led to the establishment of grammar translation during the nineteenth century. A.-P. Lian (2000) explains that ELT (English Language Teaching) has tended to be governed by a linguistics paradigm. The linguistics paradigm approaches language as a scientific study in which language can be reduced to grammar, vocabulary, phonology and morphemes (A.-P. Lian, 2000; Nunan, 2001, p.88).

2.19.1 Curriculum Planning Approach – the Curriculum as Product

In the mastery of subject matter approach, curriculum is planned on the basis of content – it is content-driven curriculum per se (Clark, 1987). The planning is conducted for the most part by university scholars who claim legitimacy in decision making related to teaching and learning and knowledge in schools (Clark, 1987). They analyse content knowledge into its constituent parts and from what are deemed to be simple elements they sequence those parts into the more complex elements to be learnt. Clark (1987) further states that in this approach to planning the universities are able to control the examination system and act as guardians of the nation’s wisdom.

The scope, sequence and organisation of curriculum content both vertically and horizontally is organised within the subject matter, resulting in less integration across subjects and curriculum (Sowell, 2005). Textbooks are the most important materials and for teachers they contain details of what to teach in classroom (Clark, 1987; Kilpatrick, 1993). Thus, all of the class are expected to move at the same pace as a
block through units of work in the textbook. This process is represented as homogeneous achievement and learning speed (Clark, 1987; K. Johnson, 2001).

2.19.2 Academic Rationalists and the Foreign Language Curriculum

In foreign language teaching, this view advocates a grammar-based curriculum where the syllabus is a structural syllabus designed in such a way that it contains discrete linguistic items. The goals of the curriculum are to transmit knowledge of the language system to the learners to ensure that they master the grammar rules and vocabulary of the language (Finney, 2002).

2.19.2.1 Syllabus Type A

The content, or the syllabus, is a so-called “structural syllabus” or ‘Syllabus Type A’ (Allen, 1984, 1986; White, 1988). Wilkins calls it a ‘Synthetic Syllabus’. In the Synthetic approach, Wilkins (1976) notes that “different parts of the language are taught separately and step by step so that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of parts until the whole structure of language has been built up” (p. 2).

A selection and sequencing of individual grammar points and lexis and other formal features of language form the content of Syllabus Type A (Allen, 1984, 1986). Language is broken down into its constituent parts and each part introduced separately, step by step, from the easy to the difficult, from the simple to the complex, in the belief that the instruction role is to simplify the challenge for learners (Nunan, 2004, p.11) and assumes that second language acquisition is a linear and cumulative process (Rojas, 2001). Rojas (2001) asserts that the organization of discrete linguistic items in a linear form, until presently, dominates “our discourse in canonized scripts and canned curriculum packages” (p.327). As mentioned, such organisation represents the linguist’s formal analysis of language as phonology, syntax and morpheme in language learning (Brumfit, 1984; A-P. Lian, 2000; Nunan, 2001). Allen (1986) asserts that the justification for a Type A focus is that “beginning students can scarcely be expected to communicate in a second language until they have mastered the underlying principles of sentence structure, and acquired a basic vocabulary.” (p.5). It is hoped that through the study of the grammar of the target language, students will become more familiar with the grammar of their native language and
that this familiarity would help them speak and write their native language better (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p.4).

2.19.2.2 The organization of foreign language teaching and learning

The teaching technique used is rote learning, drills, grammar-translation and teaching and learning is associated with tests and assessments that view language teaching and learning as transmissive and the learners as passive recipients of knowledge (Richards, 1985; White, 1988; Ellis, 1997; Finney, 2002). This presumes that learners must first learn the language system, either inductively or deductively, and can only use it freely for themselves much later (Brumfit, 1984, p.78).

2.19.2.3 Assessment

Brindley (2001) asserts that in the period of the 1960s and 1970s language assessment under the influence of structural linguistics consisted of language tests that were designed to assess learners’ mastery of different areas of the linguistic system such as phoneme discrimination, grammatical knowledge and vocabulary. In addition, in order to maximise reliability, tests often used objective testing formats such as multiple choice and included large numbers of items (Brindley, 2001, p.138). K. Johnson (2001) adds that this kind of test is a discrete point test. Multiple choice tests can provide harmful “washback” to teachers that teaching to the multiple choice test is the objective. On the other hand, these tests are very easy to mark, which is particularly important when a large number of test results are required in a short time (K. Johnson, 2001, p.295). However, Finney (2002) states that this kind of assessment is based on the learner’s ability to produce grammatically accurate language that largely ignores factors such as context, appropriacy of use, modes of discourse or individual learner needs.

Teachers development, according to this conception, is based on the view that teachers with a mastery of knowledge of structure are assumed to be able to teach foreign language. As A.-P. Lian (2000) comments, teacher education has gone the same way as the education of the child in that in foreign language education, the more they master of the language form, the more they are assumed to be able to perform the language.
2.19.3 Criticism of Academic Rationalist Perspective and the EFL Curriculum

Clark (1987) argues that the curriculum planning that is controlled by and is left to the decision of experts, especially universities, results in lack of involvement of the schools and proves to be an ineffective planning approach. Clark (1987) explains further that the reason teachers do not read any materials or policy statements is because there is little dialogue between the universities and the schools. The policy statement, instead of being a means to support teachers in their curriculum improvement, has no link with a teacher's life; hence it is ignored in classroom practice.

In the organisation of teaching and learning, the expectation that the whole class will move as a block through the units of work in the textbook at the same pace, is not realised in practice. K. Johnson (2001) states that learners of language are different in their capacity to learn a foreign language and even if some are exposed to the language at a very early age, they could not be assumed to possess the target language in the same way as when they are exposed at an early age to their first language. Further, foreign language learners may experience hold ups in making progress and encounter 'sticks', or so called 'fossilization', which first language learners do not experience at this stage (Ellis, 1985, 1997). Foreign language learning classrooms should recognise those who are very talented in language learning, those who are hopelessly confounded and those who are incapable of modifying their native language accent in any way (K. Johnson, 2001, p.7).

With the advent of the communicative approach to language learning in the late 1960s and the 1970s, this approach to language learning curriculum design has increasingly fallen out of favour (Finney, 2002). Maley (1986) adds that "'grammar-translation'[exercises], focus very strongly on the language as language (not as use); 'explication de textes' is a prime example of this, where the text is removed from its total context of meaning and examined as an object for analysis; as a corollary, they emphasize the memorization of vocabulary and the internalisation of rules (many of which do not bear scrutiny), at the expense of appropriacy and use; restrict the quantity and variety of language to which students are exposed; offer very few opportunities for real communication among students; rely very heavily on strong teacher control, and apportion a major part of the total talking time to the teacher." (p.89)
Hymes (1970, as cited in K. Johnson, 2001, p.51) argues that if language learning and teaching were restricted to language form and a linear approach that simplifies language into discrete items, learners would learn nothing about how language is used as means of communication among humans. And that means learners may be able to perform grammatically correctly but cannot convey the message because it lacks appropriateness in a social context. It is all about appropriateness that deals with the rules of use in different situations and different cultures (K. Johnson, 2001). Rojas (2001, p.327) adds that the emancipatory potential of the communicative and proficiency movements seems lost when learners are taught to regurgitate fixed formulas in ritualistic roles. Dubin and Olshtain (1986, p.73) argue that language learning that is based on the practice of pieces of language form, that is grammar-driven, that focuses on the practice of isolated skills in discrete items until mastery of the accuracy of language form by repeating a dialogue presented in a textbook, may reinforce the accuracy of the language, but such language learning leads to the practising of sentences that cannot cope with real communication. Thus, there is a call for a ‘holistic’ perspective which Dubin and Olshtain (1986) claim involves the practices of appropriateness and meaning of language to serve real communication.

Edwards and Usher (2001) assert that emphasis on the mastery of subject matter implies the view of an educated person as one who completed school, who is trained in some form of sensibility and is an ‘end’ to learning. However, modern educators argue that change cannot be predicted, that the attempts at mastery only point to their inability to master and that the belief in truth has always produced uncertainty, insecurity, and ambivalence. They point out that this was recognized by Marx, Durkheim, Weber and many other contemporary sociologists (Edwards & Usher, 2001, p.273). Furthermore, Finney (2002) states that

“In the age of globalisation and the growth of multicultural societies, it [classical humanism] cannot justify the transmission of one particular culture; within the ethos of ‘education for all’ it is unable to take account of the widely different needs of a massive student population, where the ‘educated’ are no longer an elite trained to rule the next generation of workers; and the basic premises of science no longer rest on objective, logical, value-free theories but are shaken by the discoveries and uncertainties of quantum physics; the foundations of universal knowledge are no longer secure and an educational philosophy based on these foundations is no longer acceptable.” (p.71)
2.20 Training of Technical Skills as an Educational Goal

In the behaviourist approach to education, education is viewed in terms of skills practice. The curriculum conception that takes this view as its philosophical and theoretical basis is a ‘Social-economic efficiency’ conception with a ‘technological perspective’ (Allen, 1984; Sowell, 2005) or a ‘technical-scientific approach’ (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). Ornstein and Hunkins (1993) assert that the technical-scientific approach values the means-ends logic as defined by behaviourist or technocratic educators. A social and economic efficiency approach argues that the curriculum should focus above all on knowledge and skills that are relevant to the learner’s everyday life needs and that the curriculum should be planned to meet the practical needs of society (Richards, 2001).

In addition, Richards (2001) states that in many countries where English is a foreign language, the movement of socio and economic efficiency has overtaken an academic rationalist conception as the underpinning philosophy of the foreign language curriculum. Brady and Kennedy (2003) explain that the aims of this ideology were to ‘manage’ the social sphere in just the same way as advocated by scientific managers. They add that the school curriculum that takes this view has as its aim to produce citizens and workers who can ensure the efficient running of society. The key curriculum concept is relevance and the issue is to make the curriculum relevant to the needs of society (Brady & Kennedy, 2003, p.82). Richards (2001) reiterates that this approach stresses the economic needs of society as a justification for teaching English; Japan is an example. The debate about English language teaching in Japan included the proposal that a poor standard of English contributed to Japan’s economic malaise in the late 1990s (Richards, 2001, p.116).

Charlesworth (1988) argues that this ideology contributes a utilitarian justification to curriculum objectives where the learner’s intrinsic values toward the subject matter are overlooked. Charlesworth (1988) gives the example of a social-efficiency perspective in the 1988 Australian language policy:

"In Australia, as claimed in 1988, the motives behind our politicians’ newfound interest in languages are of course mixed. Partly they spring from our national commitment to multiculturalism and the recognition of community languages; partly they derive from a belated awareness that Australia is situated in south east Asia and that we need to speak the
languages of our region to communicate with our neighbours; partly they come from commercial considerations - trade, tourism, scientific and technological exchange etc. - which require knowledge of the languages of our trading partners and tourist sources. In these entrepreneurial times when the spirit of economic rationalism dictates so many educational initiatives, it may seem rather impish to attempt to justify the study of languages in a 'non-utilitarian' way. These are all, no doubt, valid utilitarian reasons for promoting the study of languages.” (p.33)

2.20.1 The Curriculum Planning Approach – Curriculum as Product

The curriculum planning approach that is based on this social-economic efficiency conception is a goal-oriented approach (Clark, 1987), that is, it is a so-called 'rationale approach or objective approach'. The rationale model was mainly developed around R W Tyler’s four rationales. Tyler’s rationale approach proved particularly useful in pulling together into a related set of questions matters which often had been addressed disparately before and provided basic major commonplaces of curriculum development (Goodlad, 1979; Skilbeck, 1984; Posner, 1995). The four questions are

(a) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
(b) What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
(c) How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
(d) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

(Tyler, 1949, p.1)

Later, Dr. Hilda Taba extended Tyler’s four curriculum rationales into seven processes. Taba (1962) further develops the model, places emphasis on the relationship between those elements and asserts that a change in one element affects the others. Most language curriculum developers also develop the elements in a particular language curriculum from the rationale model and define that language curriculum planning process as consisting of: Analysis of the Situation, Defining objectives, Designing the Teaching-Learning Program or Syllabus design (groupings and combinations of subject matter, the scope, sequence and structure of teaching content, the proposed methods of teaching and learning), Interpretation and implementation, and Assessing and Evaluating (White, 1988; Richards, 2001; Nunan, 2004).

According to Tyler and Taba, in rationale planning, the planning begins with the call for a carefully selected committee of ‘experts’ identifying a body of knowledge to be
covered in the curriculum (Skilbeck, 1976, as cited in Medley, 1985; Clark, 1987; White, 1988; Auerbach, 1992; Crookes, 2003). Clark (1987) asserts that different from an academic rationalist perspective, rationale planning is based on a research and development approach where experts carry the research and develop the curriculum based on that research. Learners' needs are predicted by those in the mainstream society in an *a priori* fashion, and predetermine what students are supposed to lack (Auerbach, 1992, p.12).

This approach developed from the view that a curriculum is a finished product imposed on curriculum implementers and that a curriculum consists of behavioural objectives - specific statements of intended learner outcomes that are observable and measurable (Brady, 1992; Print, 1993) rather than consisting only of subject matter knowledge. As MacDonald-Ross (1973) states

"Behavioural objectives lay the foundations for a thorough-going attempt to improve the effectiveness of educational systems. By specifying what the student should be able to do after the learning experience, the hope is that the outcomes of education can be brought in line with the intentions of the educators. To achieve this goal, it would be minimally necessary to ensure that the objectives were relevant, and that they could be used to prescribe fairly exactly the design of the educational process and the evaluation which would follow." (p.1)

K. Johnson (1989b) states that the specification of objectives in behavioural and verifiable forms is the result of a general concern throughout education for accountability and cost effectiveness. Finney (2002, p.72) adds that today the emphasis on accountability has led to various terms being used to relate to objectives, such as intended learning outcomes, performance indicators, learning objectives, performance objectives and expected outputs.

**2.20.1.1 Bloom's Taxonomy of objectives**

With the movement of specification of precise objectives, a massive attempt was made to translate objectives into behavioural terms by Bloom (1956) in the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Clark, 1987; White, 1988; Brady, 1992; Posner, 1995; Sowell, 2005). Bloom, (Bloom, 1956, p. 64) explains that the Taxonomy is used as a means of clarifying the specific meaning intended and it can add greatly to the usefulness of objectives by making them more operational. The major characteristic of this taxonomy is that it is a way of insuring that the meaning intended by the
curriculum maker is the meaning understood by test constructors, teachers, and others and "In all instances it is understood that the objective is to describe the student behaviour to be attained." (Bloom, 1956, p.64). Bloom (1956) also states that

"The taxonomy has been used by teachers, curriculum builders, and educational research workers as one device to attack the problem of specifying in detail the expected outcomes of the learning process. When educational objectives are stated in operational and detailed form, it is possible to make appropriate evaluation instruments and to determine, with some precision, which learning experiences are likely to be of value in promoting the development of the objective and which are likely to be of little or no value." (p.76)

Objectives were classified into three domains: the cognitive, which is concerned with intellectual abilities and operations; the affective, which is the domain of attitudes, values and appreciation; and the psychomotor, the area of motor skills, important in technical contexts. The cognitive domain lists the cognitive objectives in order from what (Bloom, 1956, p.49) names 'higher order' to 'lower order' skills in hierarchical order. Bloom (1956) explains that

"the cognitive continuum begins with the student's recall and recognition of knowledge, it extends through his comprehension of the knowledge, his skill in application of the knowledge that he comprehends, his skill in analysis of situations involving this knowledge, his skill in synthesis of this knowledge into new organizations, his skill in evaluation in that area of knowledge or judgement of the value of material and methods for given purposes." (p.49)

Figure 2.3 illustrates Bloom's cognitive domain of objectives.
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The affective domain emphasises feelings, tone, emotion, or a degree of acceptance or rejection (Bloom, 1956, p.7). Bloom (1956) explains that

"the affective continuum begins with a student’s merely *Receiving* stimuli and passively attending to it. It extends through his more actively attending to it, his *Responding* to stimuli on request, willingly responding to these stimuli, and taking satisfaction in this responding, his *Valuing* the phenomenon or activity so that he voluntarily responds and seeks out ways to respond, his *Conceptualization* of each value responded to, his *Organization* of these values into systems and finally organizing the value complex into a single whole, a *Characterization* of the individual.” (p.49)

However, though defining cognitive objectives separately from the affective, Bloom (1956) asserts that nearly all cognitive objectives also attain an affective component; for example, teachers hope that their students will develop a continuing interest in the subject matter taught. Bloom (1956) explains that the psychomotor domain is objectives related to some muscular or motor skills such as in the literature: handwriting and speech; in physical education; trades or technical courses.

Bloom’s Taxonomy has been discussed in terms of whether it represents what cognitive psychologists are interested in, such as “critical thinking” skills especially of the higher order level of Bloom’s cognitive domain – analysis, synthesis and evaluation - or are merely a thinking skill. This of course depends on one’s definition of ‘critical’ (Lankshear et al., 1997, p.43). Bloom (1956) himself, views the list of proposed skills under the umbrella terms “critical thinking,” “problem solving,” or “higher mental processes” and states that those are suitable for large goals and the aims of education. What he proposed are further defined behavioural objectives in the process of being critical thinkers and problem solvers, to enable teachers to analyse an examination or evaluation technique to determine whether it does or does not appraise the kinds of educational outcomes they have specified (Bloom, 1956, p.21). In 2001, Krathwohl, Anderson, and Bloom (2001), introduced a more developed version of Bloom’s taxonomy of objectives. This version, instead of specifying objectives into measurable specific behavioural objectives, introduced learning outcomes that consisted of an intended cognitive process and a list of types of knowledge for students to construct (Krathwohl et al., 2001). (This will be discussed further in section 2.22).
2.20.1.2 The organization of teaching and learning under the curriculum as a product

The organisation of teaching and learning in the curriculum as product approach revolves around preplanning practice. Morgan (1997) adds that in “the educational textbooks, teacher training courses and narratives about teaching, curriculum planning has been presented as a science, governed by rationality in planning and outcomes, or as an art which depends on a teacher’s creativity, flair and intuition.” (p.29). Hence, learning is defined as the acquisition of pre-specified skills and knowledge with the assistance of teachers. Auerbach (1992) comments that despite some flexibility in teaching materials compared to the curriculum based or an academic rationale, the classroom is controlled by an imposed responsibility to meet the pre-specified behavioural objectives.

The evaluation of those who meet the objective is the essential process in this planning approach. The learning objectives are broken down into smaller pieces in order that skills and knowledge can be precisely justified and assessed. The evaluation is accomplished by measuring learning outcomes against these predetermined objectives. Thus, this planning involves issues of high predictability (Auerbach, 1992; Sowell, 2005).

The planning approach is highly regarded as the best-known planning approach and many governmental and administrative curriculum planners took it as a planning model (Rodgers, 1989). This is because the rationale planning model provides a clear direction for the remainder of the process which supports the belief that the effectiveness of a curriculum is a function of the precision and clarity of objectives and helps those who are uncertain about the curriculum process (Finney, 2002; Brady & Kennedy, 2003).

In planning teacher education, this educational philosophy has close links with one component of teacher-education which is teacher training. Freeman (2001) explains that teacher education comprises two components: one is training in the content knowledge about language, while the other is teacher development. Freeman (2001) explains that the teacher training program that aims to transmit content knowledge
that is external to teacher-learners and promotes assessment that is based on whether they have mastered the content, often looks for behavioural evidence. In contrast, a teacher development program stems from the teacher's experience and a focus on the learning process.

2.20.2 Social and Economic Efficiency and the Foreign Language Curriculum

Two important movements in foreign language teaching and learning contributed to foreign language curriculum development in a social and economic efficiency perspective: the emergence of the audio-lingual approach and the emergence of the notional-functional approach to communicative language teaching.

2.20.2.1 The emergence of the audio-lingual method

The emergence of the audio-lingual method is the most striking example of this curriculum perspective as claimed by (Allen, 1984, p.63). The audio-lingual method was developed under the combined influences of structural linguistics, behavioural learning theory, availability of electronic gadgetry, and commercial enterprise (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Allen names this "a technological behavioural" method (Allen, 1984). It is based on the belief that learners should over learn the language until they can use it automatically, that is to say, learners form new habits in the target language, the dialogues are learned through imitation and repetition, there is student-student interaction in chain drills or when students take different roles in dialogues and this interaction is teacher-directed (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p.43).

- Further developed teaching methods in the social and economic efficiency movement

The 1970s ushered in an era of change and innovation in language teaching methodology. This was the decade during which Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) came to replace Audiolingualism and the Structural-Situational approach. And it was during this decade that the Total Physical Response, the Silent Way, and Counselling Learning emerged (Richards, 2002a). These methods took a humanistic approach, based on psychology rather than linguistics and considered affective aspects of learning and language as important (Williams & Burden, 1997, p.37). Larsen-Freeman (1986) explains that the Silent Way emerged during the time that cognitive
psychologists and transformational-generative linguists argued that language learning does not take place through mimicry but that learning is initially based on the building block of sound, and teachers set up situations that focused student attention on the structures of the language, one structure at a time (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). The Total Physical Response or “the comprehension approach” took a step closer to the change in language teaching for communication. Importance was given to listening comprehension, which also created a relaxed learning environment. However, it limited language learning mostly to listening comprehension. The method focused on speaking in the target language, began with developing listening skills through listening to the spoken target language commands of their teachers. Grammatical structures and vocabulary were also emphasized over other language areas and were embedded within imperatives (Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Ellis, 1997). Thus, these methods limited the practice of language to the processes of imitation and reinforcement, the practice of drills, habit formation, and isolated skills practice (Richards, 1985; Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Ellis, 1997; Richards & Renandya, 2002).

**The introduction of the “Communicative Approach”**

The introduction of the Communicative Approach, influenced by sociolinguists, embarked ELT on a concern to use a target language communicatively rather than on the mastery of language usage. Widdowson (1990) explains that language usage is learning about language rules and regulations, while language use deals with the communicative side of language. The concept of communicative competence plays a vital role since Hymes (1972), and in general communicative competence entails knowing not only the language code or the form of language, but also what to say to whom and how to say it appropriately in any given situation. In other words, it includes knowledge of what to say, when, how, where, and to whom (Dubin & Olshtain, 1986; Swan, 1990, p.73). Dubin and Olshtain (1986) explain that it is a move toward a holistic perspective of language teaching that encompasses sociocultural appropriateness and the meaning of language, rather than a discrete view that concentrates on separate elements of linguistic form as a basis for activities, learning situations and testing items, and materials development (Dubin & Olshtain, 1986, p.74).
2.20.2.2 The emergence of Notional-Functional Approach and Syllabus Type B

The communicative approach movement to language pedagogy in the 1970s and 1980s resulted in an alternative method for the scope and sequence of learning content. The scope and sequence of learning content were organised in the light of a notional-functional approach (Wilkins, 1976; Clark, 1987; White, 1988; Ellis, 1997; Richards, 2001; Finney, 2002). According to this approach, curriculum content is sequenced by functions and the notion of a possible language that students need to use in communication within the target language. The ‘notional-functional’ approach to syllabus design or the so called Syllabus Type B is different from Syllabus Type A that emerges from the linguists’ analysis of language, because Type B emerges from international analyses of various kinds, such as those of psychologists and anthropologists (Brumfit, 1984, p.77). The Type B syllabus, defines objectives in terms of categories of communicative language use and focus on discourse features of language and functional aspects of language proficiency (Allen, 1984; Brumfit, 1984; Allen, 1986). As opposed to the synthetic syllabus (Type A), Wilkins proposed the ‘analytical’ approach that focuses more on the function of language; the grammatical system is determined afterward (Clark, 1987; Nunan, 2004). Wilkins argues that learners should be exposed to ‘chunks’ of language, rather than language broken down into parts as proposed in the synthetic or Type A syllabus (Clark, 1987; Nunan, 2004). Larsen-Freeman (1986, p.123) adds that this approach became widely known by definition as the Communicative Approach, that is an approach that uses the target language to accomplish some function, such as arguing, persuading, or promising.

Further, during the functional approach movement, research into the processes of second language acquisition (SLA), which studies the natural order of language learning, gave an alternative principle in the sequence of language learning (White, 1988; Widdowson, 1990). Ellis (1997) argues that Syllabus Type A sequences language learning into linguistically discrete language, and learners can move onto the next level of learning when they acquire a level perfectly. However, as Ellis points out learners learn numerous items imperfectly and often almost simultaneously at the same time (Ellis, 1994 as cited in Nunan, 2004, p.11).
The Council of Europe and the Threshold Level

One of the well-known syllabuses based on this approach is the Threshold Level, developed by van Ek that includes social as well as linguistic contexts. The Threshold Level contains language learning objectives that are defined in behavioural terms as close as possible to what learners are expected to be able to do based on a language learner’s needs in a particular social context (van Ek & Alexander, 1980). The Threshold Level lists the notions and language functions that learners might want to use in situations rather than dividing language activities into the four skills - speaking, listening, writing, reading - and argues that activities that focus on the four separate skills are not ‘fully adequate’ (van Ek & Alexander, 1980, p.7). The Threshold Level is also seen as a proficiency level that rates scales of linguistic and communicative competence or the way that language is used into levels that are defined as clearly as possible in relation to the expected performance levels of the students for whom the curriculum is intended (Medley, 1985; Stern, 1989).

Syllabus Type B and Proficiency Guidelines

A number of proficiency guidelines have sprung up over the years. These include the Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating Scale (ASLPR) - now developed as the International Second Language Proficiency Rating Scale (ISLPR) (Wylie & Ingram, 1999) - and the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines from the U.S.A. The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines, developed from 1982 to the present, are used widely to grade language communicative competence into details both for teaching and learning purposes and for a proficiency test (Omaggio & Levy, 1985, p.9). However, the guidelines are based on the predictions of designers as to what language competence second language learners have to master in real life (similar to functional-notional syllabus). ISLPR is a more empirical research based set of proficiency guidelines drawn from the study of learners’ language competence (Wylie & Ingram, 1999).

Nevertheless, they share the same principle of trying to provide precise descriptions of competence in a language in terms of functions one can carry out in the second language, the contexts in which the language user can operate comfortably and adequately, and the accuracy with which those various functions are carried out in a given context. The main focus is on functional ability and accuracy in contexts (Omaggio & Levy, 1985; Wylie & Ingram, 1999). Omaggio and Levy (1985) add
further that the ACTFL proficiency guideline is not a list of methods of teaching, sets of goals and sets of priority skills. The description includes a statement of the kinds of tasks that people at certain levels can perform as well as the contexts in which they can perform them as well as the language forms. These guidelines benefit most the articulation problems between classes, schools and institution.

“Guidelines facilitate the goal-setting process, as well as promote articulation from course to course, level to level, teacher to teacher, and institution to institution. This is an important benefit of a proficiency orientation, since articulation has been a perennial problem in the past. Students moving from course to course, either vertically or horizontally, often encounter completely different expectations, goals, and instructional formats, all of which leads to a feeling of frustration and potential failure. In some cases, students experience a great deal of overlap from course to course; in others, tremendous gaps have to be bridged to assure success in the new course of study. If courses can be compared against a backdrop of commonly understood guidelines, articulation can be greatly improve in the years ahead.” (Omaggio & Levy, 1985, p.10)

2.20.2.3 The organization of teaching and learning of Syllabus Type B

The Functional-notional syllabus, represents the stress of specification as well as controlled communicative practice (Allen, 1986, p.6). Allen (1986) explains that the value of a controlled communicative practice is that it extends the ways the learner acquires formal linguistic knowledge to be made use of in accomplishing social relations, seeking and giving information, determining the most effective fit between language abilities and subject-matter knowledge, and so on. Thus, the methodology used is a controlled communicative teaching technique with pre-specified content and practice of language patterns (Allen, 1986). The methods that are likely to associate with this movement presume that learners learn to discourse, to interact and to communicate, either inductively or deductively (e.g. certain types of ESP course, or some of Savignon’s work in 1972) (Brumfit, 1984, p.78).

2.20.2.4 Foreign language learning assessment

As far as assessment is concerned, there has been a failure in the discrete item tests that do not provide information about a learner’s ability to use language for communicative purposes (Brindley, 2001, p.139). Brindley (2001) adds that language testers therefore began to look for other more global constraints which then, in the

Articulation refers to the smooth transition from one level of proficiency to another in a progressive fashion (Louisiana. Dept. of Education, 1997)
1970s and early 1980s, saw the emergence of tests of a learner’s use of linguistic and contextual knowledge to reconstitute the meaning of spoken or written texts (Brindley, 2001). The proficiency test is one of them. A proficiency test is the test of a learner’s proficiency level or a statement of what a learner can do that is not related to any specific content or program (K. Johnson, 2001).

2.20.3 Criticism of Social and Economic Efficiency Conception

2.20.3.1 Imposed knowledge and linear approach to learning

Proponents view curriculum planning and development under this perspective as a linear and static process (Skilbeck, 1984; Brady, 1992; Heslep, 2002; Richards & Renandya, 2002; Brady & Kennedy, 2003; Marsh, 2004; Nunan, 2004). The curriculum is often viewed as a product that is planned in a linear, top-down fashion and control is exercised over the learning process where the learner’s voice is silent (Stenhouse, 1975; Skilbeck, 1984; Freire, 1981 as cited in Auerbach, 1992; Marsh, 2004, p.202). The curriculum, which is imposed from outside, also provides learning that is remote from life and unknown to the learner’s own experience and environment (Kilpatrick, 1989), and leaves the duty of naming reality to the experts to act as a problem-solver for learners (Auerbach, 1992, p.12). Freire calls this situation the “banking system” of education, where all students are fed with bits of information by teachers and then must memorize and store them (Freire, 1998). It is a model related to training rather than educating, a model that views education as training in skills; it is one that overlooks the interaction between teachers and learners and limits the expression of inquiry and creativity of learners (Finney, 2002). What is to be learned is all predicted from an analyst’s view of language - not a learner’s - as similar to the structural syllabus that is not centred on the language user’s intrinsic values (K. Johnson, 1979; Widdowson, 1979).

Heslep (2002) argues that there is a danger that “establishing education’s purpose before a consideration of education’s other aspects might encourage the mind set that the end justifies the means, thereby posing the risk of deciding upon courses of action for no other reason than the promise to achieve the given purpose” (p.83). Indeed, this kind of planning assumes that the pre-planned curriculum or syllabus, when handed down to teachers, can be quickly absorbed and implemented. Similar to the problems
that occur with learners, the development of a curriculum that is imposed from outside by experts with their prediction of what teachers should teach, leads to the silencing of teachers’ voices. Thus, the planning of curricula in this way creates change only in the curriculum and not in the people (Fullan, 2001, as cited in Sowell, 2005)

2.20.3.2 Overemphasis of accountability and measurability of learning product

Learning outcomes are not all measurable (such as appreciation, critical thinking) (Richards, 2001, p.127). Reducing teaching and learning to the scope of measurability does not cultivate the learner’s growth as a human but views the learner as a machine in operation (Brady, 1992; Brady & Kennedy, 2003; Marsh, 2004). Further, the breaking down of learning into small units for the purpose of measurement leaves the integration of essential knowledge to the learners (Sowell, 2005), hence the learning cannot be seen as a larger purpose of education (Beane, 1995). Auerbach (1992, p.12) adds that, worse, the recent concern with accountability has led to very detailed specification of content, linguistic/behavioural tasks, outcomes and performance standards. Grundy (1987) states “when interest in product predominates, however, this tends to exclude, by its very nature, a concern for understanding and meaning-making.” (p.100).

Furthermore, Wilkins claims that the synthetic syllabus or notional functional approaches promote learners’ language use by exposing learners to a chunk of language, not discrete linguistic items; some criticisms point out that it might be that the chunk of language itself is a discrete item. Language learning should be seen a complex enterprise of language use, not just the practice of chunks of phrase or sentences (Widdowson, 1979, p.248). Widdowson (1979) comments that such practice “presents language as an inventory of units, of items for accumulation and storage. They are notional rather than structural isolates, but they are isolates all the same.” (p.248).

Similarly to Widdowson, Schulz (1984) argues that some may use a notional-functional approach as an audio-lingual drill method that instead of memorizing and reciting dialogues and grammatical patterns, students memorize lists of various phrases to fulfil communicative functions. Rojas (2001) states that if teaching
language functions and notions without the thinking or conceptual exploration, they are not better than a list of vocabulary with no connection with learner’s meaning negotiation. Rojas (2001) asserts

"...teachers are frequently unable to answer the simplest question - "What are the concepts that students should know about food" - making it seem that food is less a content element than a vocabulary list (Rajas, 1998). Some teachers eventually respond that they want their students to know something about culture; for example, that different foods are eaten across cultures and at varying times of the day. These are still facts, though, and facts are rarely engaging. Besides, these content-based attempts are most often reserved for the advanced levels of language study that some feel student reach (Met, 1995)" (p.327)

Thus, at the end of the day, learners learn vocabularies through memorisation processes, rather than constructing meaning and building understanding on their own. Finney (2002) argues that planning an EFL curriculum based on the rationale approach reduces learners to the level of automation who can be trained to behave in particular ways and precluded from such concepts as autonomy, self-fulfilment and personal development. It is too unsophisticated, and attempts to impose a linear process on something that is spiralling and cyclical (Kelly, 1989, as cited in Finney, 2002, p.72). Therefore, viewing learning in this way supports the view of education in the area of vocational training and in subjects which require the transmission of particular skills rather in mainstream education that emphasises whole child development (Kelly, 1989, as cited in Finney, 2002, p.72).
B. Contemporary Views of Education and Curriculum

As opposed to traditional education, contemporary educational philosophies and theories put learners first. Education is a place of freedom to learn and full attention is placed on developing the growth of children, not the subject matter (Kilpatrick, 1993). Hooks (1994) adds that the practice of freedom in education means that those who teach do not merely to share information but to share in the intellectual and spiritual growth of our students. Hooks (1994) further comments that if students and professors regarded one another as "whole" human beings, it would mean that teaching and learning are not striving merely for knowledge in books, but for knowledge about how to live in the world. In other words, this is 'holistic' education that aims to provide a learning process that emphasises growing that is not only physical but intellectual and moral (Dewey, 1963).

The contemporary view of education is influenced vastly by progressive education. (Dewey, 1963), the most prominent and influential proponent of progressive education and pragmatism, makes a clear distinction between traditional education and contemporary education:

"To imposition from above is opposed to expression and cultivation of individuality; to external discipline is opposed free activity; to learning from texts and teachers, learning through experience; to acquisition of isolated skills and techniques by drill, is opposed acquisition of them as means of attaining ends which make a direct vital appeal; to preparation for a more or less remote future as opposed to making the most of the opportunities of present life; to static aims and material is opposed acquaintance with a changing world." (Dewey, 1963, p.37)

Kilpatrick (1993) explains that what the newer curricula here advocated (compared to the traditional and later ones) is first of all actually living - all the living of the child for which the school accepts responsibility. The teacher's work is to help develop and steer this desirable living; it cannot be made in advance and handed down either to teachers or to pupils (Auerbach, 1992).

Two curriculum conceptions emerge from the concept of learners as the primary concern of education: the conception of learner-centeredness (or Child-centred progressives (Gutek, 2004)) and the conception of social reconstructionism (or Social-reform progressives (Gutek, 2004)). While supporting the promotion of individual
freedom over imposed knowledge and pre-described curriculum, the social reconstructionist argues that learners should be aware of social issues, and that freedom should be exercised within the condition that they are living in society as a 'social living' (Glatthorn & Jailall, 2000).

2.21 Learner-Centeredness as an Educational Goal

The 'learner-centeredness conception' aims to develop individuals to their fullest potential. It takes account of the needs and interests of the whole person who is not merely a disembodied intellect or a skilled performer (Clark, 1987; Sowell, 2005). According to this view, as opposed to the previous two curriculum perspectives, learners become the central discussion in the organisation of subject matter, teaching and learning and testing. Further, the curriculum becomes a place where teachers and learners can freely negotiate what constitutes their learning (Clark, 1987; Sowell, 2005). Clark (1987) states that

"In foreign language learning the progressivist approach [Clark uses the term 'progressivism' which has a similar perspective to this learner-centeredness (Richards, 2001)] is generally represented by those who see progress or growth in terms of interlanguage development. Language learning is seen as an implicit intuitive developmental process for which human beings have a natural capacity, rather than as the product of the deliberate study and practice of knowledge elements and skills towards predetermined objectives.”

(p.51)

This 'learner-centeredness conception' is greatly influenced by Piaget, psychologist and constructivist, whose learning theory emphasised the ability of the individual's knowledge construction (Clark, 1987; Williams & Burden, 1997; Richards, 2001; Langford, 2005). Langford (2005) names this learning theory 'individual progressivism'. He stresses that Piaget believed that children discover everything for themselves, out of their own interests and curiosity. It is a self-actualisation and self realisation process that learners come to know by discovery, by being encouraged to make their own choices for themselves in what and how to learn (Williams & Burden, 1997, p.36). Williams and Burden (1997) adds that Piaget is interested in the learning process, how learners 'come to know things', rather than what is learned. However, both learning process and learning product are important in the process of learning. This view is also influenced by cognitive theorists such as Berlyne (1960), McV. Hunt
(1960) and Bruner (1986) as cited in Downey and Kelly (1989), who also believe in the importance of intrinsic curiosity inherent in human beings, as opposed to the traditional view of education that sees education as having extrinsic value for children.

Richards (2002a) adds that language educators in the past tended to assume that learners were alike in their needs to learn language. The learner-centeredness movement as well as the more complex thinking about "Communicative Language Teaching" embarked language educators on rethinking language courses that recognize learners' prior knowledge, recognizing learners' needs, goals, and wishes, recognizing learners' learning styles and learning preferences, recognizing learners' views of teaching and the nature of classroom tasks (Diffey, 1992; Kumaravadivelu, 2001; Beglar & Hunt, 2002; Reagan & Osborn, 2002). This raised research on motivation, learning styles and strategies that tried to understand the learner's ability to change their own learning and language learning (see Oxford, 1989; Oxford, 1990).

- **The construction of knowledge**

According to Piaget and the constructivists, the process of knowledge construction is not simply a habit formation nor is the learner passively involved in the process; it involves an active reshaping of knowledge (Reagan & Osborn, 2002; Wren & Wren, 2006). Piaget sees the process of learning as not achieved simply by replacing one set of schemata by another, but based on two concepts: *accommodation* and *assimilation* (Clark, 1987; Williams & Burden, 1997). It is the process whereby the learning is accomplished by gradually building on existing conceptual structures through the *assimilation* of new perceptions and the adapting of what exists to *accommodate* these. K. Johnson (1989a, p.5) states that the schemata and conception process has taken communicative competence to more border concepts in which lists of target behaviours are inadequate and possibly counter-productive either as end specifications or as the basis for program and classroom implementation. Williams and Burden (1997) give examples of the application of accommodation and assimilation to the learning of new language:
“When we receive new input of the language, for example by listening to a conversation, we need to modify what we already know about the language (accommodation) so as to ‘fit’ the new information into our existing knowledge (assimilation). In this way our knowledge of how the system of the new language operates gradually develops” (Williams & Burden, 1997, p.23).

Langford (2005) notes that in the extreme form of individual progressivism, it is suggested that teachers should not impart knowledge, for it is important for children to discover by themselves. Its leading principle here is ‘Do not teach, let the child discover’ (Langford, 2005, p.135). On the other hand, the weak progressivists, as stated by (Clark, 1987), encourage teachers to determine what is to be learnt in the first place and discussions between teachers and learners are simply to ensure an understanding of the predetermine objectives. Learners have less choice to negotiate what is to be learned and how (Clark, 1987, p.77).

- **Learning as a meaning negotiated process**

Thus, the construction of knowledge depends on one’s prior knowledge and skills (Wren & Wren, 2006, p.248), and a process of ‘historically-formed meaning-generation’ (A. B. Lian, 2006, p.1). In the process of reshaping knowledge, learners accommodate by making meaning out of the new knowledge through their prior knowledge and their history, as well as through interaction, and they interact and negotiate with peers, teachers and others in order to function (A-P. Lian, 2000).

Learning through interaction or negotiation of meaning is opposed to habit formation and memorization of sets of grammar rules in language learning (Richards, 2002a; Nunan, 2004). Interaction requires attention to meaning, to the transfer of information (Richards, 2002a). Bruner (1990) adds that the point of learning is an all-out effort to establish meaning as the central concept of psychology; it is not about stimuli and responses, not overtly observable behaviour, not biological drives and their transformation, but a meaning making process (Bruner, 1990). Rosen and Kuehlwein (1996) point out that knowledge and the meaning we imbue data with is a construction of the human mind.

A.-P. Lian (2000) sees meaning-making as essentially a dynamic process rather than a static process which relates to the simultaneous management of both known and
unknown variables. Dynamic processes are seen as the process of constructing and re-constructing meaning and static processes are the processes of finding or remembering meanings (A-P. Lian, 2000). According to Rosen and Kuehlwein (1996), from a psychological point of view, the process of meaning-making (or making sense of things) is seen as an individually-generated process based on an individual's history, but shaped by the interactions in which an individual engages. Rosen and Kuehlwein (1996), add that meaning-making is about the journey of development and the creation of self; it is about the activity of each person. This activity will both shape a self and shape a coherent, meaningful life. Development is a transformation shift that occurs as a person moves from one system of structuring the world to another. It is not a simple cumulative process but a transformational one (Rosen & Kuehlwein, 1996). With increasing complexity of thought and self-knowledge comes increasing capacity to achieve personal creative solutions and new forms of knowledge (Carlsen, 1988, pp. 12-13, as cited in Rosen & Kuehlwein, 1996).

Michale Halliday, interviewed by, Steele (1988, p.39), argues that what children are doing is learning how to mean. He proposed a three-fold theory of meaning: semantic - a theory of meaning, and of learning how to mean; developmental in the sense that it accounts for the potential growth of the meaning system; and interactional - a theory which interprets meaning and learning as interactive processes and is sensitive to the social contexts in which they take place. A.-P. Lian, Hoven, and Hudson (1993) agree with Halliday and add that language learning is not limited to appropriating words, grammatical rules and pronunciation, but is about dealing with the large number of complex, integrated skills and the very least control in order to cope with variables. As Downey and Kelly (1989) argue, language learning is not simply reproductive but is active, highly individual and unpredictable. Furthermore, students incorporate, through interaction with communicative phenomena, their conscious and unconscious understandings of these phenomena into their own personal systems of logic rather than having logical systems imposed upon them (A-P Lian et al., 1993; A-P. Lian, 2001). Learning, and therefore language learning, is internal not external to learners.

Negotiation in the classroom is the essential feature in order to meet the learner's needs and to encourage the intrinsic values of learners (Charlesworth, 1988). Allen
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(1984) explains that this perspective has led to the development of a number of approaches which stress the importance of a more natural and co-operative learning environment based on the belief that interaction and communication among peers and teachers are the key components in learning. SLA suggests that the interaction hypothesis is important because learners can acquire new forms when input is made comprehensible through negotiating of meaning (Ellis, 1997). Piaget (1932, as cited in, Light & Littleton, 1999, p.2) added that peer facilitation of individual learning is also important. Piaget saw children's active construction of their own understanding as fundamental to their cognitive growth, and viewed peer interaction as a peculiarly potent source of progress (Light & Littleton, 1999).

- **Experiential learning**

Learners are encouraged to learn how to learn and how to make their own meaning through experiential learning environments in which learners are the 'active inquirers' and teachers are 'facilitators' (Allen, 1984; Skilbeck, 1984; A-P Lian et al., 1993; A-P. Lian, 2000, 2001; Richards, 2002a; Nunan, 2004). Learners are seen as active participants shaping their own learning with the teacher cast in the role of guide or facilitator (Clark, 1987). The teacher's task is to create the classroom conditions that would generate in the child a sense of disequilibrium so that the situation could be made problematic by the child and therefore resolved through inquiry (Eisner, 1994). It is the process that increases the child's ability to frame and pursue their own purpose and take more responsibility for their own learning (Downey & Kelly, 1989; Eisner, 1994). "It is about learning how to learn that learners are able to take a growing responsibility for the management of their own learning so that they learn how to learn and how to learn a language" (Breen, 2001, p.158).

Clark (1987, p.50) asserts that this approach (progressivism) has great interest in learning by doing rather than learning by imposing knowledge, and in the negotiation of what to learn rather than in predetermining objectives. This opens up a more relaxed relation between students and teachers with a focus on activities based on an open inquiry process (Skilbeck, 1984; Kilpatrick, 1993; Gilbert, 2005; D. C. Phillips, 2006). According to this argument, learners are provided with a learning environment that is genuine and authentic since it is an experiential learning and teaching environment that focuses on the learner as an organiser of communicative systems
through the practice of participation, observation and reflection; it is not a set up classroom or teacher’s imposed environment (Hymes, 1996, p. 9, as cited in A-P. Lian, 2001). Kolb (1984, as cited in Nunan, 2004) proposed an experiential learning model that encompasses the following features:

(a) Encourage the transformation of knowledge within the learner rather than the transmission of knowledge from the teacher to the learner.
(b) Encourage learners to participate actively in small, collaborative groups.
(c) Embrace a holistic attitude towards subject matter rather than a static, atomistic and hierarchical attitude.
(d) Emphasize process rather than product, learning how to learn, self-inquiry, social and communication skills.
(e) Encourage self-directed rather than teacher-directed learning.
(f) Promote intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation. (Kolb, 1984 as cited in Nunan, 2004)

The active involvement of the learner is therefore central to the approach. The focus is on the experiential nature of the process, that is, ‘learning by doing’, and/or activities-based learning, which contrasts with a ‘transmission’ approach in which the learner acquires knowledge passively from the teacher (Nunan, 2004).

2.21.1 Curriculum Planning Approach – Curriculum as Process

The rationale planning approach has been criticized by contemporary planners who view educational design as a non-linear, multi-directional, organic, context-dependent process (Short, 1983, as cited in K. Johnson, 1989b; Sowell, 2005) and as one primarily shaped by intermediate rather than one-time, long-term, decision making (Yinger, 1980, as cited in K. Johnson, 1989b).

Lawrence Stenhouse (1975), one of the best-known exponents of a process model of curriculum theory and practice, developed the so called ‘process curriculum’. The central principle of this model is a mutual construction of content and meaning by both teachers and students (Stenhouse, 1975). Thus, curriculum planning, based on a learner-centeredness conception, is viewed as a process not a product. In other words, the curriculum is a place where curriculum implementers’ and/or learners’ interests and relevant needs can be negotiated through a meaning-making process. As opposed to the rationale approach where the implementers and learners are not part of curriculum planning, developments nor the change process, the process curriculum sees change within people as important, and calls for the participation and interaction.
of curriculum implementers as a part of curriculum development (Sowell, 2005). Downey and Kelly (1989, p.21) assert that if part of curriculum development is seen as a joint enterprise between teachers and pupils, a model of classroom interaction that allows for openness, flexibility and collaboration is essential. Education can then be a truly cooperative and interactive process. Learners in this model are not objects to be acted upon. They have a clear voice in the way that the sessions evolve (Brady, 1992). Stenhouse (1975, p.77) explains further that the syllabus still exists but it has a different form and plays a different role from the traditional syllabus. Curriculum here becomes a form of specification about the practice of teaching, not a package of material or content to be covered (Brady, 1992). Stenhouse (1975) explains that at the very minimum a curriculum should offer the following:

In planning
1. Principles for the selection of content - what is to be learned and taught.
2. Principles for the development of a teaching strategy - how it is to be learned and taught.
3. Principles for the making of decisions about sequence.
4. Principles on which to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of individual students and differentiate the general principles 1, 2 and 3 above to meet individual cases.

In empirical study
1. Principles on which to study and evaluate the progress of students.
2. Principles on which to study and evaluate the progress of teachers.
3. Guidance as to the feasibility of implementing the curriculum in varying school context, pupil contexts, environments and peer group situations.

In relation to justification
A formulation of the intention or aim of the curriculum which is accessible to critical scrutiny. (Stenhouse, 1975, p.5)

Thus, the process curriculum is a means not an end. It focuses on the process that allows meaning making, and negotiation to occur between teachers, learners or curriculum developers and implementers. Furthermore, it is a dynamic process that allows any elements of the curriculum to be raised for discussion; it does not strictly begin with the goals and objectives elements to the methodology as in the linear form. Clark (1987, p.52) notes that this process approach is designed to bring about a classroom where inquiry, activity, discussion, reflection, and open-ended personal interpretations feature, rather than predetermined objectives, content, and, mastery levels. It is necessary, Stenhouse proposed, to provide only a very light syllabus specification to assist teachers to create their own scheme of work adapted to their
own context (Stenhouse, 1975). For subject matter, it is not designed in isolation, but integrated with other subject matter across the curriculum (Sowell, 2005).

White (1988) states that Stenhouse (1975) arrived at four general conclusions about educational aims: induction into knowledge; initiation into social norms and values; training, and instruction. Though repudiating the role of objectives, he acknowledged that behavioural objectives may appropriately be used to specify the goals of training and instruction, but not of induction and initiation.

2.21.2 Learner-Centeredness and the Foreign Language Curriculum

Based on the educational philosophy that meaning-making and the negotiation of ways of making meaning is the essential learning process for the learner to be able to construct his or her knowledge, and a curriculum planning approach that values process over product, then the development of the foreign language curriculum is not discussed in terms of static language knowledge or measurable behavioural objectives but rather it has become a negotiable system to be performed (Brumfit, 1984, 1986; Clark, 1987). Allen (1984) states that

“When the emphasis is on classroom interaction, the aim [of foreign language curriculum] is not so much to accumulate separate grammatical items or functions in an ordered series, but rather to encourage the students to use all the resources of the language that are available to them to meet the demands of a particular target situation. The dominant concept is that of a functionally effective body of knowledge which exists at a particular stage in the learning process and needs to be practised in circumstances which approximate as closely as possible to natural language use.” (p.67)

The curriculum has changed its face from the traditional content–based and goals–based syllabus to a process approach. Nunan (2004) notes that in the rationale approach, curriculum elements such as syllabus design, methodology, and assessment work well in a separately designed context. However, after the emergence of the process approach to curriculum design, the distinction between syllabus design and methodology becomes more difficult to sustain. One needs to specify both the content (the ends of learning) and the tasks and learning procedures (the means to those ends) in an integrated way. Henry G. Widdowson, a leading member of what is known as ‘the London school’ of applied linguists, supports the principle of process curriculum, introduced by Stenhouse, which emphasises methodology rather than a list of items.
He states: "there is no such thing as a communicative syllabus; there can only be a methodology that stimulates communicative learning" (Widdowson, 1984).

2.21.2.1 Syllabus Type C

The process syllabus of Breen and Candlin (1982) and the task-based or procedural syllabus of Prabhu (1987) are essential steps in foreign language curriculum development and syllabus design (White, 1988). Based on the educational philosophy of interacting and negotiating comprehensible input is Syllabus Type C, or the "natural growth" approach syllabus (Allen, 1984, p.65). This syllabus type aims to immerse learners in real-life communication without any artificial pre-selection or arrangement of items. It is contrary to both Syllabus Type A and Syllabus Type B that are based on pre-selected inventory items and sequencing (Allen, 1984, p.65; Brumfit, 1984, p.78). In Clark's analysis of Breen and Candlin's (1980) process syllabus it is evident that learners are to be involved in learning language, learning through language, and learning about language. The learning materials are authentic, not a rehearsal of real-world activities (Clark, 1987).

This type of curriculum seriously challenges traditional concepts of curriculum planning. They focus on the natural unanalysed use of language where the goal of language teaching and learning is to allow learners to use language effectively in any contexts as a tool to acquire information, or a means to acquire knowledge and hence they indirectly learn the language (Allen, 1986). Therefore, the sequences and scope are not limited to the teacher's selection, rather the students' selection of what to learn is based on their interests and repertoire of their experience (Allen, 1986).

2.21.2.2 The organisation of teaching and learning under the curriculum as a process

Thus, most of the teaching and learning is organized around tasks and/or an immersion program (Brumfit, 1986; Nunan, 2004). Viewing language in this way, the subject matter is sequenced according to topic and theme based on learners' own interests (Mincham, 1995, p.65). And this means that subject matter is not an ends but is a means to the learning of other subjects which enhance the greater integration across the curriculum. Language thus is not an ends to be achieved but is a means to acquire information for personal or social or academic goals (Allen, 1986; Mincham,
1995). In an interview of Professor Michael Halliday by Steele (1988, pp.36-37), Halliday states

“How would you see a course aimed at developing more advanced oral skills?: I’m not sure that you need to pick out oral skills as an object in themselves to be addressed in the teaching. Let us look at the concept of language across the curriculum. Providing a place for the spoken language in the learning context of different subjects (English, History, Science etc.) is the most effective way of developing oral skills. In my view, the best way of developing oral skills is by using those oral skills as a means of learning.” (p.38).

Syllabuses such as task-based, content-based, text-based (Feez & National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research (Australia), 1998), problem-based and the immersion program are also categorised as Syllabus Type C. These syllabuses are profoundly influenced by the Communicative Language Teaching development, especially the task-based syllabus that draws most attention from educational policymakers in both ESL and EFL settings (Nunan, 2004, p.11). Ellis (1997, p.209) comments that tasks enable learners to discover new linguistic forms during the course of communication and that learners develop fluency, accuracy and language use in natural and spontaneous circumstances.

The task-based syllabus shares the same principles with CLT, (Nunan, 2004). Nunan notes that pedagogically, task-based teaching has strengthened the following principles and practices:

1. A needs-based approach to content selection.
2. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language
3. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
4. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus not only on language but also on the learning process itself.
5. An enhancement of the learner’s own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
6. The linking of classroom language learning with language use outside the classroom (Nunan, 2004, p.1)

The organization of the classroom should draw on activities based on the learners’ own interests as well as authentic material that focuses on present, here and now experience or based on situational factors or a choice of topic (Allen, 1986; Maley, 1986; Mincham, 1995). Field (2002) comments that authentic materials are, for example, authentic passages that have a naturalness of language; and real-life
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listening experiences that have not been graded to reflect the learner’s level of English, afford a listening experience much closer to a real-life one. Field (2002) says it is a challenging experience to the learners to extract information from an ungraded passage. Van Lier (1996) argues that texts (including pictures, realia, etc.) are authentic when they are taken from the world at large, not especially written or prepared for the language learner. Thus, newspapers articles, novels, poems, TV soap opera episodes are all authentic in this definition, whereas dialogs, exercises, reading texts, illustrations, and so on, written to be included in language textbooks, are not (Van Lier, 1996, p.13).

2.21.2.3 The issue of grammar teaching in Type C syllabuses

Nunan (2004) adds that a communicative curriculum needs to place the focus both on means and ends and in consequence the content and process, which need to be compatible. It is the combination of ‘knowing that’ and ‘knowing how’ (see Ryle, 1949) that is a combination of knowing and being able to deploy grammatical knowledge to communicate effectively, rather than knowing and being able to regurgitate sets of grammatical rules (Nunan, 2004). Ellis (1997) argues that though the new proposed syllabus such as the process, task-based syllabus continues to attract a lot of attention, it has never totally replaced the structural syllabus. Nunan (2004) states that it is even possible to see grammar-translation as part of the curriculum in CLT. Widdowson (1984) points out that, for example, the notional-functional approach is no better than a Type A syllabus if it is taught with a habit formation approach, rather than with genuine capacity to communication. Allen (1984) also argues that even though Type A teaching should in no circumstances be seen as an end in itself, the main purpose of a Type A course is to provide a coherent structural foundation on the basis of which a genuinely spontaneous use of language can be developed.

Based on Krashen's hypothesis of learning and acquisition where learning refers to formal learning that is related to language grammar and acquisition refers to informal experiential learning of language, the target language may be used realistically in the classroom (Schulz, 1984). According to Krashen's hypothesis, language learners should be exposed to both formal and informal approaches: exposure to informal alone, without formal instruction and correction, is insufficient for adults and often
leads to error fossilization and pidginization of a language (Schulz, 1984). While learning increases the grammatical accuracy of a communicative exchange, semantic fluency develops only through acquisition.

As mentioned above, grammar teaching definitely claims a place in CLT, however, there is not a consensus on how, when and even what grammar to teach (Ellis, 2006); it depends on the language educators' interpretations of CLT (Nunan, 2004). Nunan (2004) has concluded that there are two major interpretations of CLT related to grammar teaching in CLT, especially in communicative tasks. He calls them the strong and weak interpretations of a communicative approach related to the view of grammar teaching. Nunan (2004) discusses the strong interpretation of communicative approach and argues that learners would develop knowledge of grammar automatically in the process of learning language meaning. On the other hand, in the weaker interpretation of the communicative approach, Halliday (1994) argues that grammar learning is an important component in the language classroom as a resource for meaning making (Halliday, 1994, as cited in Nunan, 2004).

Ellis (1997) comments that when to teach grammar is a matter of learners' differences. It depends on the situation and the contexts. While some classrooms might need fully communicative tasks with less grammar focus, in other classrooms, communicative tasks with more output in terms of grammar are more suited to a greater grammar focus (Ellis, 1997, p.209). Allen (1986) reaches a similar conclusion to Ellis in that the how and when to introduce language structures or linguistic forms and language functions depends on the classroom situation. Allen (1986) asserts that a comprehensive curriculum model should reinforce Type A and B practice if the nature of the task requires particularly close monitoring of the formal and functional features of the language being used.

In addition, there is an attempt to combine the three curriculum types - grammar translation, functional-notional and process curriculum - within the organisation of a language program in order to provide learners of the foreign language for communicative purposes with accuracy, appropriacy and fluency in the target language according to the CLT approach (Maley, 1986; Finney, 2002). Allen (1984)
proposed a blend of the three syllabus types: A, B and C – structural, functional and experience. Similarly Yalden (1987) proposed a ‘proportional syllabus’, that is, for learners in the beginning stage, emphasis is placed on structure, before moving on to function and then using tasks or topics to apply and creatively use the language at a later stage. Finney (2002), based on Yalden (1987) and Allen (1984) developed further the proposition that the most realistic approach for both the curriculum process in the educational mainstream and the world of English language teaching facing accountability as well as financial and administrative constraints, is a blend of content, objectives and process. Finney (2002) argues that a curriculum that is based on a mix of content, objectives and process is the most realistic approach because in reality these three are likely to blend. Table 2.2 shows Finney’s (2002) mixed focus methods.

**Table 2.2: A Mixed-Focus model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure/function</th>
<th>Function/skills</th>
<th>Task/theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater emphasis on structure and functions. Introduction of learning strategies and techniques.</td>
<td>Targeting specific functions. Application through task-based and problem-solving activities.</td>
<td>Remedial structure work. Task-based syllabus, focus on learning processes and strategies to encourage creative language use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary levels</td>
<td>Pre-Intermediate levels</td>
<td>Intermediate level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mixed-focus syllabus is an alternative, but its implications are still under question. For example, the emphasis on structure at the elementary level causes concern because if the elementary level refers to children at age up to seven, the model is in conflict with Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s learning theories. Piaget and Vygostsky are both influential theorists, though they have slightly different views on language learning, both agree that children at a very young age up to seven should be given opportunities to discover learning by themselves and for themselves and should not be exposed to abstract knowledge or language grammar (Williams & Burden, 1997; Langford, 2005).
Even though Ellis argues that a task-based syllabus alone could not produce grammatical correct learners, he did not suggest the mixed-syllabus design that separates learners into different stages and imposes on them different syllabus types. Rather, he implies only that communicative tasks alone could not produce grammatically competent learners. Ellis (1997) notes that

"the complaints of the lack of grammar accuracy as a result of the implementation of communicative tasks are that the pedagogic rationale for the use of communicative tasks rests in part on the claim that they will help to develop learners' communicative skills and in part on the claim that they will contribute incidentally to their linguistic development."(p.209)

His study of focused communicative activities or communicative tasks does not show that focused communication tasks are more effective at developing grammatical proficiency than other pedagogic options. Thus, if the goal of language learning is to master equally grammatical correctness as well as fluency, a task based-syllabus is not the only teaching pedagogy to serve this goal (Ellis, 1997, p.209). Further, Ellis (1997) argues that

"...there is in fact growing evidence that a communicative classroom environment does not necessarily result in high levels of grammatical accuracy in learner language, because learners spend most of the time in interaction, but they should not be considered failures, because they did succeed in communication."(p.52)

Ellis (1997) adds further that it is possible that a communicative classroom could still achieve higher levels of grammar acquisition than a classroom where grammar instruction takes place. He argues that learners who fail to acquire grammar do so not because there is not enough knowledge of language input, but rather it is because of learner inability to acquire these features in any circumstance, or it may be a lack of access to universal grammar (Ellis, 1997, p.52).

When and how to teach grammar is still a controversial issue (Ellis, 2006). What has been discussed above implies that it is a matter of interpreting CLT, classroom contexts, and the learners themselves.

2.21.2.4 Assessment and Testing

The nature of the process curriculum led to a test that is based on a student's achievement of tasks (Beglar & Hunt, 2002; Nunan, 2004). The assessment of a learner's achievement requires an 'alternative assessment' that entails multiple
methods of assessment of more authentic circumstances - such as self-assessment, peer assessment, learner's diaries, journals, student-teacher conferences, interviews, portfolio, observation, oral interviews, listening to and reading extracts from the media and various kinds of 'authentic' writing tasks which reflect real-life demands that are based on qualitative assessment rather than quantitative (Brindley, 2001; Richards & Renandya, 2002). Gripps (1999, as cited in Wells, 2001, p.174) notes that the evaluation of what students have learned cannot be adequately achieved by standardized assessment, using decontextualized multiple-choice or short-answer tests. Wells (2001) adds that the purpose of authentic assessments or alternative assessment is to encourage "the student's ability to bring his or her knowledge and skills to bear in solving new problems that are of some personal significance, and an assessment of the strategies that he or she uses in the process" (p.175).

However, Brindley (2001, p.139) comments that if teachers are required to construct and administer their own alternative assessment they need adequate support from education authorities or the government such as the development of materials and the systems for ensuring the quality of assessment tools used. In addition, alternative assessment brings with it issues of the reliability of the procedures that are used as well as administrative feasibility and cost effectiveness of alternative assessment (Chapelle and Brinley 2002, as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002). Thus, alternative assessment, compared with multiple choice tests is less attractive in terms of time, finances, human resources and accountability, despite being more effective in terms of learning quality.

- **Washback: The controversy between alternative assessment and accountability**

Thus, at present, most educators are concerned with the effects of assessment and testing on teaching and learning in process curriculum or so-called “washback” (Brindley, 2001; K. Johnson, 2001). One of the purposes of assessment, which is influenced to a considerable extent by the social and political contexts in which assessment takes place, is the accountability function. This has become paramount in many industrialised countries as educational policy has become increasingly driven by the need to measure outcomes and report against national standards in order to justify public expenditure and decision (Brindley, 2001; K. Johnson, 2001). Auerbach (1992)
questions, "How could we document what students were actually learning in a way that corresponded to our philosophy, and, at the same time, satisfy demands for accountability?" (p.108). Auerbach (1992) argues that paradoxically the discourse about assessment is a kind of a tug of war between administrators and educators. The former require concrete, quantifiable, and objective indications of progress, often in numerical form; the latter are on a quest driven by an opposing view that what is valuable is a qualitative analysis of the learner’s progress. As Stenhouse (1975) comments, the process model is essentially a critical model, not a marking model. It runs counter to a public standards assessment testing requirement that is a barrier to the emphasis on the contexts of interaction between teachers and learners, and is a supportive environment to teaching and learning.

K. Johnson (1989b) argues that “washback” is a kind of hidden curriculum that limits language teaching and learning to a form of test-driven learning. K. Johnson (1989b) explains that it can be the case in the education system that the key question for students, teachers, parents, school administrators, and even inspectors is not, ‘Are students gaining in communicative competence?’ but, ‘Are they on course for the examination?’ In this case, the end is the examination and the means are the item types, and official syllabus credibility relies on whether it contains the list of what to test. K. Johnson (1989a) suggests that item types in examinations need to be selected and constructed with this “washback” effect in mind. For example, “if cloze is used in testing, doing cloze passages will occupy a considerable portion of teaching and learning of items. If oral skills are judged by reading aloud, reading aloud will be practised, conversational fluency will not” (K. Johnson, 1989a, p.6). A test is very important, for if it is a good one its nature is well understood by teachers, it affects positively a teacher’s teaching and there will be positive “washback”. If it is a bad one, as K. Johnson (2001) states, one in which the teacher’s interpretation of the test is very narrow, it results in negative “washback”, which most often results in teachers suffering in providing the test, such as in providing linguistic items to learners (K. Johnson, 2001, p.292). Auerbach (1992) argues that most of all, this problem stems not from the grassroots but from mainstream professional organizations and educators.
2.21.2.5 Teacher Development

Instead of objectives, Stenhouse proposed principles for the selection of content, the development of a teaching strategy, making decisions about sequence, and so on. The distinction Stenhouse raised between training and education, between mastery and speculation, is at the heart of much argument about the aims of teaching (Stenhouse, 1975). According to the argument that learners learn best when they are exposed to an interactive and meaning-negotiated environment, teacher development has also developed to the extent that a teacher development program should proceed in the same way as the learners’. This shift in the focus on teacher development occurred when previous training principles could not effectively facilitate teachers’ curriculum implementation over the period of reform. The shift in teacher development has been where the development of teachers has not been seen solely as the process of knowledge imposition but rather as knowledge construction. As McLoughlin and Holly (1989), point out, “The view on the teacher’s role has changed to a focus upon what a teacher can do, rather than upon what the teacher is and can become.”(p.2).

2.21.3 Criticisms of the Learner-Centeredness Perspective

In essence, the process model is designed to enable the individual to progress towards self-fulfilment. In this model the goals of education are not defined in terms of particular ends or products, but in terms of the processes and procedures by which the individual develops understanding and awareness and creates possibilities for future learning. Content, then, is based on principles derived from research into learning development and the overall purpose of the educational process, which allows the formulation of objectives, is related to procedural principles (Finney, 2002, p.73). Finney (2002) notes that in practice, however, as a basis for national curriculum development projects, the process model is less attractive than the objectives model for large-scale curriculum development and planning related to Western government trends towards vocational training to meet employment needs.

The process model demands teachers of high quality who also have a clear understanding of the process, such as the negotiation of meaning making and interaction itself. There have been some attempts to overcome this problem by developing materials and curriculum packages which focus more closely on the
'process of discovery' or 'problem-solving', for example in science. But there is a
danger in this approach. Processes become reduced to sets of skills - for example, how
to light a Bunsen burner. When students are able to demonstrate certain skills, they
are deemed to have completed the process. As Grundy comments, the actions have
become the ends; the processes have become the product. Whether or not students are
able to apply the skills to make sense of the world around them is somehow
overlooked (Grundy 1987, p. 77).

Furthermore, the testing system that relies on standardized tests cannot work well in
the process model where learners must take tests in their stride as they pursue other
aspirations (Stenhouse, 1975, p.95). The exchange between students and teacher does
not float free of the context in which it arises. At the end of the day many students and
their families place a high premium on examinations or subject success and this
expectation inevitably enters into the classroom. This highlights a second problem
with the model we have just outlined - that it may not pay enough attention to the
context in which learning takes place.

2.22 Social Reconstruction as an Educational Goal

Social reconstructionists criticized the present education enterprise as an oppressed
process where the new generation has social ideologies imposed on it and unequal
opportunities facing it in society (Apple, 1990, Giroux, 1983 and Canagarajah, 1999
as cited in Wallace, 2003). Social reconstructionists stress the needs of society as a
whole, and view a school curriculum as a means of bringing about desirable social
change and preparing people for living in an unstable, changing world (Allen, 1984;
Morrison, 1989; Print, 1993; Richards, 2001; Sowell, 2005). Critical theorists, who
are highly influenced by the social reconstruction perspective, criticise the educational
objectives of traditional education as hegemonic devices in both direct and indirect
ways. They argue that the dominating group, the oppressor, either consciously, as in a
conspiracy, or without conscious awareness, attempts to legitimize its interests at the
expense of those of the oppressed group (Posner, 1995, p.118). Social
reconstructionists aim to extend the benefit of democracy to all citizens (Brady &
Kennedy, 2003) and are concerned with such issues as domination, exploitation,
resistance and what constitutes legitimate knowledge, and they question whether education serves the interests of children or a particular powerful group (Gutek, 2004; Marsh, 2004). Thus, they are like the child-centred progressives, in that they account for the learner's interest; however the social reform progressivists take into account the importance of schools and teachers in dealing with important social contemporary issues as well as in working to build a new, better, and more equitable society (Gutek, 2004, p.297).

Paulo Freire, a Brazilian educator and prominent critical theorist, strongly disagrees with traditional education that transforms the experience of educating into a matter of simple technique that impoverishes the capacity to form the human person (Freire, 1998). Through this kind of learning, students never learn to reflect upon their circumstances; they eventually become the kind of social members who passively accept, if not actively support, the oppressive practices of their society (Freire, 1993, as cited in Heslep, 2002, p.123). Freire (1998) argues that the utilitarian view of education is an oppressive education. He asserts that education should be the place to empower children, not to oppress learners into particular ideologies. Freire names that education that is concerned with the issue of social practice “Critical Education” and asserts that Critical Education requires critical learning, critical pedagogy and critical educators and learners (Freire, 1998). Inspired by Freire, a number of critical pedagogy writers have emerged who are against education that is dehumanizing and anti-democratic and thus against the effects of humanism (Heslep, 2002; Kellner, 2003; Wallace, 2003). Kellner (2003, p.51) argues that critical to the theory of education is the key themes of a democratic reconstruction of education in the 21st century.

- Powerful Language Users
This view has changed the face of language learning from learning to master the accuracy or fluency of language as an end in itself, to become a powerful language users' tool for different ends in different political causes, such as combating their own oppression or supporting both awareness of and a commitment to counter the oppression of others (Wallace, 2002, 2003). Reagan and Osborn (2002) advocate that the language classroom should be a venue for teaching more about the social and
political aspects of language and society in order to “challenge oppression” (p.137) and prepare “for life in a democratic society.” (p.138). Wallace (2003) states

“English is necessarily and always was a political activity, rooted in the power of capital. At the start of the twenty-first century the role of English as a second language has taken on a new urgency with its ever-extending global reach. However, debates about ELT ideology still tend to take place among applied linguists or language planners and a practical critical pedagogy for ELT remains largely undeveloped, as is evidenced by the continuing dominance of what has come to be known as communicative language teaching. That is based on the premise that the goal of language is communication with native speakers in natural, everyday environments.” (p.67)

Furthermore, within the context of globalisation, capitalism, the industrial era and fast growing technologies thrive and so do the world’s Englishes that are likely to impose ideological information on learners through media, newspapers and the internet (Wallace, 2002; Canagarajah, 2006). Wallace (2002) reverses van Ek’s counsel of twenty-five years ago that foreign language learning in its present form has more functions than ‘buying tickets’ and ‘asking for directions’;

“the need today is to help our learners to deal with ongoing contexts with a world community of intellectuals, most of whom will not be native speakers of English, in the public arena beyond the national boundaries either of their own country or any other, English speaking one.” (Wallace, 2002p.69)

Wallace (2002) argues that we should talk about becoming a literate language learning community who are able to read and write, not only talk or speak (Wallace, 2002, 2003), and further that we should now talk about critical literate language learners and critical communicators who not only process the skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening but who are also able to make value judgements about spoken and written information. To Wallace, foreign and second language learning does not mean the learning of oral English, the English favoured by every contemporary teaching approach such as CLT, but of “English language literacy”. English language literacy includes both reading, writing and oracy, or both spoken and written language. Prof. Halliday, interviewed by Prof. Steele (1988), states that

“in the total learning experience in a literate community, both the spoken and written language are going to have a place; but they’re going to have somewhat different and complementary places...in order to build a rounded picture of the world you live in, even in fairly technical contexts, you need to be able to use both.” (Steele, 1988p.37)
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Noting that though everywhere oral language is emphasised, Wallace questions what kinds of English to teach – British or American (Wallace, 2002). Canagarajah (1999) adds further that rather than passively accept those dominant languages, ESL learners and teachers should be enabled to develop critical consciousness and question those dominant Englishes. As Pennycook (1998), A.-P. Lian et al. (1993) and A.-P. Lian (2000, 2001) assert ESL teaching and learning is about critical language awareness that empower ESL learners to reflect on their own language experiences and practice as a part of the wider society within which they live. Toh (2003) adds that a critical literacy approach to English language teaching in Southeast Asia is more beneficial to learners and users of English, than one that views ELT purely as imparting a technical skill. Duzer and Florez (1999) digest the critical literary in ELT that “critical literacy takes learners beyond the development of basic literacy skills such as decoding, predicting, and summarizing and asks them to become critical consumers of the information they receive” (p.2). In other words, rather than viewing English language teaching as a functional skill or as an acquisition of a fixed body of cultural knowledge, critical literacy in ELT, based on a view of knowledge as socially constructed, should be promoted (Pennycook, 1990, as cited in Toh, 2003).

Wallace (2003) also argues that talk in CLT is not critical and quality talk. Wallace, is supported by Canagarajah (1999), Pennycook (1998) and A.-P. Lian et al. (1993) and A.-P. Lian (2000, 2001) who argue that the talk for learning, should be either a tool for learning more about language and/or as a means for exploring ideas; more specifically, it should be argumentative or constative speech⁹. Wallace (2003) argues “This kind of talk is opposed to the spontaneous and fluent speech which tends to be favoured in the foreign and second language classroom. This is not about speaking against native speakers’ standard. The kind of English serving this function will not necessarily be standard in form - there will inevitably be (usually mirror) regional variations phonologically, lexically, and syntactically - but functionally it will be elaborated to serve global needs, the most crucial one, being as a tool for resistance.” (p.107)

In other words, it is critical literacy and critical talk that should be discussed and promoted in ESL classroom learning in the 21st century. Lankshear (1997, as cited in Wallace, 2003) comments, the “critical literacy approach is widely advocated as a

⁹ Habermas’s term, constative speech, refers to the language of debate committed to the pursuit of truth and to the provision of support for views expressed (Wallace, 2003)
means to making learners more powerful/empowered language users” (p.40). Thus, literacy must be approached as discursive practice, as discourse or, more accurately, as so many discourses which in inscribing meaning are crucially involved in the formation of human subjects (Lankshear & McLaren, 1993, p.10).

All this implies that language learning is not about or for language itself, and communicative purposes are not limited only to communication or only to sending a message. It is communication that is not limited to the orality that Pennycook (, 1994, as cited in Wallace, 2002; Wallace, 2003) calls phonocentrism; it is not limited to the concern with orality in current ELT that talks of native speaker-ness and standard English. Foreign language learning here has more meaning than simply talking with foreigners; language learning becomes the process of generating freedom, of becoming critically literate persons who are capable of using language to acquire knowledge and interact with both texts and other people for reflective actions, for more knowledge and more interaction.

**Learning Has Both Individual and Social Aspects**

Vygotsky, the best-known social constructivist, proposed a view of learning that extended Piaget’s epistemology that learning is not only the process of self-construction, but also the process that is shaped by society (Vygotsky, 1986). Donato and McCormick (1994, p.453) add that sociocultural theory maintains that social interaction and cultural institutions, such as schools, classrooms, etc., have important roles to play in an individual’s cognitive growth and development. Similar to the socio-cognitivists, Atkinson argues that language and language acquisition are simultaneously occurring and interactively constructed both “in the head” and “in the world” (Atkinson, 2002, p.525). Atkinson (2002) adds that socio-cognitivists also view language and its acquisition as social phenomena - as existing and taking place for the performance of action in the socially-mediated world.

As Freire (1998) states, men and woman are ethical beings; it is not possible to imagine the human condition disconnected from the ethical condition. Langford (2005, p.131) names social reconstruction as ‘social progressivism’ and states that the rationale of social progressivism given by Vygotsky, is that it was better than education by compulsion and rote learning for that was the kind of education that
might produce people who are smart in books, but who are perhaps unfit for social interaction (Hooks, 1994). The products of a social progressive education would be active and involved members of the new socialist society, rather than just passive factory fodder (Langford, 2005, p.131). Langford (2005) states that both Dewey and Vygotsky view education in these terms:

"...education should be based on the principles that the child is part of society and that its learning is social. The school should encourage what is social within the child to blossom on an individual basis. What is relevant to social needs and issues determines the curriculum, preferably in such a way that the child sees social needs as its needs. The teachers often tunes to the child's interests for information about what the child needs to know, because the child is a social animal and exists as part of society. The child's needs are imbued with the social needs of the society around it and in turning to them we find the best way to make the child's education relevant to the society around it, as well as to the child." (Langford, 2005, p.124)

Langford (2005) asserts that Vygotsky's methodology of self-chosen project work - such as free choice of essay topics - reflect, in theory, a learner's understanding of what is socially relevant to them. Langford (2005) gives examples of classroom methodology based on Vygotsky’s theory. The general area is set as the study of the environment and students choose a topic within that area. One group might choose the pollution of a local river and its effect on things that live in the river. Assistance will come both from the input of other members of the group and from the teacher. Freire (1998, p.36) also suggests similarly, as a learning content - "Why not, for example, take advantage of the students' experience of life in those parts of the city neglected by authorities to discuss the problems of pollution in the rivers, for example". Dewey also wanted the inquiry to be based on genuine problems, not merely problems teachers imposed (D. C. Phillips, 2006, p.238).

When the learning is organised in this way, subject matter is not viewed as subject alone and as an end, but the learning is organized in themes or through project work based on the learner's interest as a major concern in breadth and variety of educative activities both in and outside the school (Skilbeck, 1984). The theme encompasses subject matters across the curriculum. Skilbeck (1984) states that organising subject matter in this way, "...denotes a shift in basic educational constructs and strategies including the abandonment of transmission theories of learning and subject-defined curriculum, and a resolute rejection of what now is termed the socially and culturally
reproductive functions of schooling” (Skilbeck 1975, 1982b, as cited in Skilbeck, 1984, p.24).

- **The Provision of Learning Opportunities by Dialogue**

Freire (1998) argues that most of all for critical learning to occur, learning is not teaching to transfer knowledge but to create possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge. Freire (1998) explains further that teachers are not just knowers, for teachers are learning as well as learners and they can swap roles.

“...to teach cannot be reduced to a superficial or externalized contact with the object or its content but extends to the production of the conditions in which critical learning is possible. These conditions imply and demand the presence of teaching and learning simultaneously in the context of a rigorous methodological curiosity anxious to explore the limits of creativity, persistent in the search, and courageously humble in the adventure. In these conditions, those who are engaged in critical learning know that their teachers are continuously in the process of acquiring new knowledge and that this new knowledge cannot simply be transferred to them, the learners. At the same time, in the context of true learning, the learners will be engaged in a continuous transformation through which they become authentic subjects of the construction and reconstruction of what is being taught, side by side with the teacher, who is equally subject to the same process. Only in this way can we speak authentically of knowledge that is taught, in which the taught is grasped in its very essence and, therefore, learned by those who are learning.” (Freire, 1998, p.33)

Furthermore, the construction of knowledge is not merely based on interaction between teachers and learners but interaction in the form of dialogue. Freire does not support the teacher's-alone-criticism-of-society in the classroom but supports strongly teacher-student dialogue where neither party is simply student or teacher (Morgan, 1997; Heslep, 2002, p.123). Freire (2004) explains the term 'dialogue' -

“dialogue is the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world. Hence, dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming - between those who deny other men the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them. Those who have been denied their primordial right to speak their word must first reclaim this right and prevent the continuation of this dehumanizing aggression. Finally, true dialogue cannot exist unless the dialoguers engage in critical thinking - thinking which discerns an indivisible solidarity between the world and men and admits of no dichotomy between them - thinking which perceives reality as process, as transformation, rather than as a static entity - thinking which does not separate itself from action, but constantly immerses itself in temporality without fear of the risks involved.” (p.126)
Hooks (1994) names this critical engagement as “engaged pedagogy” where both teachers and learners engage in life experience within academic discussions. Hooks (1994) states that engaged pedagogy encourages both teachers and students to take risks, to bring any narrative about their experience and discuss how experience can illuminate and enhance our understanding of academic materials. Progressive professors working to transform the curriculum to allow individuals willing to take the risks that engaged pedagogy requires and to make this their teaching practice are sites of resistance (Hooks, 1994). Canagarajah (1999a, as cited in Wallace, 2002) states “…pedagogies of resistance need to be rooted in the everyday life of our students” (p.194). Giroux (1983, as cited in Wallace, 2002) distinguishes between resistance and opposition: opposition can be seen as an instinctive, unreflected upon response to domination; resistance can be seen as a considered, reflected upon, rational stance, where earlier instinctive responses have been subjected to analysis (Wallace, 2002).

From the description of dialogue, we may understand that critical thinking is an essential part of dialogue and is different from critical thinking in terms of higher order thinking or logical thinking as proposed in Bloom’s Taxonomies. Friere’s critical thinking is the continuing transformation of reality and questioning of social orders, a challenge to existing knowledge. In this sense, it is a social practice, while critical thinking in terms of higher order thinking can be thought of rather as a decontextualized cognitive skill (Benesch, 1993; Gieve, 1998). Benesch (1993, p.547) argues that in ESL contexts, critical thinking is more related to the latter that conceives of critical thinking as evaluation and analysis skills and is divorced from the social origins of what is evaluated and synthesised. He argues that the special meaning of critical is lost in this definition. The former definition encourages ESL learners to engage their experience in its relationship to language and politics; and it is this that is “critical” (Benesch, 1993; Gieve, 1998). For example, in classrooms that feature critical thinking as a social practice, students are encouraged to participate actively, raising issues of concern in their daily lives, such as work, school, housing, and marriage, as topics for class scrutiny (Auerbach & McGrail, 1991, as cited in Benesch, 1993).
Thus, in regards to dialogue, the skills of memorization, deductive reasoning, and inductive reasoning are not the focus. Rather, it is a process of empowering learners to become powerful learners (Wallace, 2003, p.60) through communication not only for the purpose of an understanding or problem solving as the learner-centeredness conception proposed, but also to encourage the ability of problem posing - the identification by students of questions which are triggered by the text and visual representation (Wallace, 2003) and reflection with ‘emancipatory interest’ (Grundy, 1987; Wallace, 2003).

- Holistic, Whole Person and Collaboration

Critical pedagogy promotes critical awareness and engagement in the learning process where everyone claims knowledge as a field in which we all labour (Hooks, 1994; Wallace, 2003). Not only are students empowered but also teachers are/should be empowered in the process. That is what is meant by a holistic model of learning: in this model participants are not merely intellectuals but encounter the essence of being human in the process of learning (Hooks, 1994).

The process is similar to Vygotsky’s holistic approach in which learning encompasses the learner’s life and social living experience. According to Williams and Burden (1997), Vygotsky rejected the view that what is to be learned can be broken down into small subcomponents and taught as discrete items and skills. Instead he argued that meaning should constitute the central aspect of any unit of study. Moreover, any unit of study should be presented in all its complexity, rather than skills and knowledge being presented in isolation (Williams & Burden, 1997, p.40). This view is different from Dubin and Olshtain’s (1986) holistic approach, discussed previously, that limits language learning to a sphere of language competence, not to the development of the whole person.

According to Vygotsky’s view, learning best occurs in a collaborative environment where it is the interaction that can enhance the knowledge and shape what learners will be and become rather than simply focusing on the individual through language (Wells, 1995; Light & Littleton, 1999; Nunan, 2004). Vygotsky criticized Piaget’s work on language learning which focuses on the learner’s own construction of knowledge. Vygotsky advocates the crucial role of parents, teachers, peers, and the
cultural milieu in the learning process of the individual rather than the individual’s own isolated and independent efforts (Light & Littleton, 1999). This position was nicely encapsulated in his concept of the “zone of proximal development,” the zone or arena in which children develop with the assistance of others (Phillip and Soltis, 1998, as cited in Williams & Burden, 1997; Light & Littleton, 1999; Richards & Renandya, 2002; D. C. Phillips, 2006, p.239).

Furthermore, Vygotsky emphasised the importance of language in interaction with people, not just through speech, but also through signs and symbols. This implies that language learning is not only about oral communication, but entails others skills related to interaction between one another (Williams & Burden, 1997). Vygotsky adds that it is by means of language that culture is transmitted, that thinking is developed and that learning occurs (Williams & Burden, 1997; Lantolf, 2000). Williams and Burden (1997) add that Vygotsky also focussed on the use of language in all its aspects as a tool in both bringing meaning to and obtaining meaning from learning activities.

Vygotsky’s approach to language learning expands the study of second language acquisition (SLA) from an instructional context to a new approach based on ‘sociocultural theory’ (Lantolf, 2000). Lantolf (2000) extends Vygotsky’s combination of mind and language -

“sociocultural theory clearly rejects what some now call the communicative view of language (see Carruthers and Bourcher 1998), which holds that thinking and speaking are completely independent phenomena, with speaking serving only as a means of transmitting already formed thoughts. Sociocultural theory argues that while separate, thinking and speaking are tightly interrelated in a dialectic unity in which publicly derived speech completes privately initiated thought. Thus, thought cannot be explained without taking account of how it is made manifest through linguistic means, and linguistic activities, in turn, cannot be understood fully without 'seeing them as manifestations of thought' (Bakhurst 1991:60). To break the dialectic unity between speech and thought is to forego any possibility of understanding human mental capacities, much in the same way, as Vygotsky observed that independent analysis of oxygen and hydrogen fails to generate an explanation of water’s capacity to extinguish fire. What is needed then, is a unit of analysis that preserves the dialectic unity of elements (thinking and speaking).” (Lantolf, 2000, p.7)

This view of language learning has the support of Wallace’s ‘English language literacy’ that has been discussed previously. Talk in CLT produces only linguistic
activities; talk lacks a necessary critical element of pursuing language learners to generate thinking quality.

Sociocultural theory also supports the view that language learning is about developing an ability to engage and participate in particular environments both in the classroom and other cultural settings (Lantolf, 2000). Reagan and Osborn (2002, p.31) state that according to this approach, language teaching and learning is not an additional linguistic system, but is also about social and cultural knowledge, and as outlined previously, it is about helping students to develop critical approaches to examining and understanding such knowledge.

Sociocultural theory proposes a new way of approaching the learner’s styles and strategies that go beyond the cognitive psychological conceptions of strategic language learning, which assume that language tasks and contexts are generalizable when, in reality, the contexts in which strategies are used are different (Donato & McCormick, 1994). Sociocultural theory views language learning tasks and contexts as situational activities that are influential upon an individual’s strategies and orientations to classroom learning. Thus, the matter of using a strategy efficiently or otherwise, is a by-product of socialisation into the classroom practices of language and learning (Donato & McCormick, 1994). Donato and McCormick (1994) strongly argue that the emergence of strategies in this context is a process directly connected to the practice of cultural groups through which novices develop into competent members of the communities (Donato & McCormick, 1994). In other words, the term ‘learning strategies’ is not seen as a static term; rather it is a dynamic term that identifies the process whereby individuals experience the process of participation in the sociocultural practices of the classroom and the community in which they live.

The Issue of ‘Culture’ in ELT

In general, the issue of culture in language teaching and learning is presented at the macro level, such as the identification of the appropriacy of language use in the contexts of target language (Allen, 1986, p.3; Dubin & Olshtain, 1986; Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Diffey, 1992). Lo Bianco (2004, p.37) suggests points of articulation between culture and language, where there are five levels of culture ranging from articulation, the closest to the culture language is related to the knowledge of culture
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and the least close refers to the knowledge of linguistics related to the target language, as shown -

**Culture and Language**
- culture in context – world knowledge
- culture in general structure of text – spoken/written genre
- culture within shorter units of text - pragmatic norms
- culture in organization of units of text – norms of interaction
- culture in linguistic structures/words/syntax/non-verbal - grammar/lexicon
- kinesics/prosody/ pronunciation

**Language** (Lo Bianco, 2004, p.37)

As Diaz-Greenberg and Nevin (2004, p.49) state, the challenging task of language educators is how to prepare learners to participate meaningfully in a multicultural population in 21st century classrooms. K. Johnson (2001) reminds us that as the planet becomes smaller and the means for moving round it easier, so it has become more multicultural and multilingual. More micro level study of language is proposed or the larger scope of culture-multicultural in language is proposed in order to prepare learners for this change.

Phipps and Guilherme (2004, p.3) state that “a critical pedagogy of (foreign) language culture education and of intercultural communication implies a critical use of language(s), a critical approach to one’s own and other cultural backgrounds and a critical view of intercultural interaction.” However, Phipps and Guilherme (2004) argue that despite the importance of reflection in education being unquestionable, it has been too often neglected in the study of cultural difference. It has been replaced by memorization and interpretation of facts and by cultural generalisations or even stereotypes (Phipps & Guilherme, 2004).

Lo Bianco (2004) uses the term intercultural language teaching and learning that encompasses three elements of cultural teaching in a multicultural society and world: learning about cultures, comparing cultures, and intercultural exploration. Lo Bianco (2004) supports the claims that most of the teaching of culture is on the first two. Intercultural exploration which is about the critical discussion of a multicultural world is somehow the least explicitly discussed in current professional discourse of language teaching. Lo Bianco (2004) explains what he means by intercultural competence –
"Intercultural competence is now a wide ranging concept which encompasses all the strategies and approaches any given person might use to shift from a monocultural to a more multicultural view of any subject. Intercultural competence is more than learning about cultures and contrasting cultures. Intercultural competence is the ability to create for oneself a comfortable third place between one's first language culture and the target language-culture. Intercultural competence is not in this sense learning how to parrot foreign cultural codes in order to interact seemingly successfully with foreigners." (p.42)

Research on the teaching of culture in multicultural contexts in the USA carried out by Diaz-Greenberg and Nevin (2004) supports the claim of Phipps and Guilherme (2004). Diaz-Greenberg and Nevin (2004) found that the States' guidelines entitled *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century: the Five Cs: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities* proposed a framework of critical engagement of cultural teaching and learning. Nevertheless, despite the guidelines' broadly based fields of cultural teaching and learning, teachers merely taught culture in the context of a Four Fs approach: Food, Fashion, Festivals, and Folklore. However, Five Cs emphasise critical discussion such as the influences of the target language cultures, its values and attitudes over other societies (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1996). Diaz-Greenberg and Nevin (2004, p.49) argue that the Four Fs approach assumes that the students will recognise their own stereotypes, put them aside, and then discern that their culture is not superior but only different from the culture of the target language, but that they will do this by a process of comparison without critical discussion and engagement.

### 2.22.1 Curriculum Planning Approach - Curriculum as Reflective Action

Grundy (1987), in his book *Curriculum: as product or praxis*, clearly states that the question of curriculum as a reflective action puts curriculum central to society and individuals. It is similar to the "process curriculum" that values the negotiation of meaning between stakeholders, teachers and members of society in the curriculum planning process. Curriculum as a reflective action stresses the critical communication and critical interactions that take into account the relevance of social contexts and learning contexts that affect the learner's frame of reference which, in turn, affect the learner's meaning and interaction (Grundy, 1987). The idea of Friere's of praxis-action and reflection upon the world in order to change it influences Grundy's curriculum as praxis, and is similar to Thich Nhat Hanh's philosophy of engaged
Buddhism - the focus on practice in conjunction with contemplation (Hooks, 1994, p.14). Kaewdang (2001) also adds that Buddhism according to “Pra Dhammapitaka, (Ven. P.A. Payutto)”, the famous scholar monk, consists of two learning principles: hearing or learning from others, and analytical reflection. Professor Sumon Amornvivat, Thailand's leading scholar as cited in Kaewdang (2001) states that

"According to Buddhism, learning is a process of receiving knowledge by the coming in contact of sense organs, namely eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body and mind; each comes in contact with its appropriate sense objects. The result is knowing and reaction to it, by training oneself until one achieves knowledge and goodness, capability, happiness and freedom (freedom from suffering and enslavement)." (Kaewdang, 2001)

To conclude, curriculum as praxis focuses on the curriculum negotiations that are based on practices of analytical thinking and reflection, and are not centred on issues of individually constructed meaning, but pay attention to the relevance of meaning between individuals, groups and society as a whole (Smith, 1996/2000).

Similar to those supporting the process curriculum, social reconstructionists locate the value of curriculum planning and development in the experienced curriculum, not in the planned curriculum. However, curriculum implementers when participating in a planning process, not only employ interaction for understanding, making sense and making meaning, but to pose questions as well as to advocate critical discussion relevant to social issues. Context is the most important; interaction in the curriculum is not only to make meaning, or critical contribution, but to take into account hidden elements of the curriculum such as administrative and/or political constraints that are centred around social life. Sloane-Seale (1997) adds that

Praxis, or reflective action, is at the heart of the program planning process. Planners are involved in a continual process of constructing and deconstructing planning activities, reflecting upon these activities, and renegotiating and analyzing these activities...It also recognizes that those involved in program planning come to appreciate that values, beliefs, ideologies, and contextual factors are not only constructed, but are also culturally transmitted, provisional, and relative. This awareness facilitates their challenge of the taken-for-grantedness of institutional settings within which program planning is practised, relationships are mediated, and political and economic agendas dominate." (p.11)

Therefore, in this context, the official syllabuses and curriculum documents cannot be used in any passive way as a teacher-proof curriculum. Marsh (2004) states that this requires collaborative engagement between teachers and administrators in creative
collaborative interpretation. This is quite different from traditional curriculum planning where teachers were and are not a part of curriculum renewal, and different from process curriculum where teachers may take part in developing their understanding of the process but do not engage in critical engagement and values judgement.

Further, Marsh (2004) asserts that in the context of social reconstruction, despite personal construction of knowledge being more important, there is a belief that somehow, people, in planning, in enacting what is planned, play a key role in influencing the quality of one's experience. Thus, they approach the curriculum as accessible, questionable and changeable (Morrison, 1989), where their role is to unravel imposed ideologies and question the dominants who affect the shape and content of the curriculum. Morrison (1989) adds that social reconstructivists propose curriculum in the realms of politics, philosophy and sociology which results in advanced thinking about curriculum theory where curriculum planners or the status quo are questionable, requiring that their hidden ideologies and philosophies be revealed. Giroux (2004) points out that Pierre Bourdieu, the well-known sociologist, was deeply concerned about the role that intellectuals might play as a progressive force in entering into the realm of politics. According to Giroux (2004), Bourdieu is concerned about the way language policy has been uncritically developed and implemented, that the curriculum is seen as a static, liberal view of society which is unable to deal with the issues of social justice.

2.22.1.1 The hidden curriculum

Social reconstructivists are concerned about the impact of hidden curriculum. They suggest that the hidden elements should be made explicit in discussions in the classroom. The hidden curriculum is the real curriculum, for it is the one that carries social messages, status, dominance, valued and not valued knowledge, proper and improper ways of behaving and so forth (Bernstein 1977; Giroux 1980; Gordon 1982, as cited in Skilbeck (1984, p.22)). Furthermore, communication in the classroom also contains hidden elements and these hidden elements are equally crucial to the manifest or official curriculum (Barnes, 1976). Barnes (1976) adds that teachers are unaware of the influence of especially their unplanned communication on the
boundaries of pupils' of thinking and/or acting out who they are and what they become.

2.2.2 Social Reconstruction and Foreign Language Curriculum

Similar in view to a Syllabus Type C that focuses on the learner's complexity of language use, this type of foreign language curriculum, however expands the learner's self construct to engage with a world view. It is not only to find the answers or solve problems but also to reflect on answers and pose questions (Grundy, 1987; A-P. Lian & Lian, 1997; A-P. Lian, 2004). A.-P. Lian and Lian (1997) argue that the central issue of foreign language curriculum is the development of an environment that conceptualises learners as socially living beings; an environment that allows learners' "dispositions to think and act in certain ways rooted in [their] discursive histories" (Lantolf, 1995, pp. 116-117, as cited in A-P. Lian & Lian, 1997); an environment that enhances learning without necessarily subjecting learners to pre-determined and pre-organised procedures which claim their legitimacy either in teachers' experience or in theoretical models of acquisition. Within this environment, learning processes drive the learner's explorations of the relationships between the language and the social practices which have shaped its place and function in speech communities (A-P. Lian & Lian, 1997). In other words, learners engage in an unpredictable and complex environment, but with the ability to cope with it.

This type of curriculum can be called "critical literacy curriculum" (Reagan & Osborn, 2002). Critical literacy curriculum development proposes an interdisciplinary approach to language teaching that is developed around posing problems that could incorporate other disciplines and life outside school (Reagan & Osborn, 2002). The focuses of critical literacy curricula may range from the macroscopic (social practices including cultural, political, and historical literacies themselves) to the microscopic (particular texts within sociocultural contexts in that classroom) that is shaped by the macroscopic (Morgan, 1997; Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

2.2.2.1 The subject matter - The extended meaning of TASK

Wallace (2002) argues that the organisation of teaching and learning of language should go beyond task-based learning that deals with small-scale, day-to-day encounters between friends in familiar setting such as parties, school or the workplace.
or engaging in everyday transactions (as we see in an example from the *Threshold Syllabus* of the 1970s (Wallace, 2002, p.111). A.-P. Lian (2001) adds that foreign language communicators require the development of critical awareness and they should be sensitive to a broad range of circumstance and engage in practical tasks that are related to real world uses or in everyday life experiences.

Thus, the organisation of subject matter in this perspective is limited to the pedagogical task, that is, the teachers are the organisers of the task which has close links to mere language activities. It is the reality itself that is the task; learners process along with the learning that is complex and is not graded by teachers. And this is authentic in its nature both in the way classroom, tasks and materials are organized, and in the experiences learners engage in.

A.-P. Lian (2004) argues that in order for learners to cope with the task, which is a reality task, it is the learners themselves who proceed to the task of engaging with reality and it is not about seeking to uncover a pre-existing reality; rather, the learners are involved in an interactive process of knowledge creation. A. B. Lian (2003, as cited in A-P. Lian, 2004) states that we need to provide a learning environment that makes it possible for different perspectives to collide and for the participants to explore forms of legitimation in terms of what they construct and enact of reality, not merely reinterpreting imposed knowledge. Thus, the learning process is moving away from the process of recording pieces of knowledge that were passed on from the knower or from an expert to a naive person. A.-P. Lian and Lian (1997) assert that

"... its task is to meet the challenges implicit in the view that the process of learning is that of relating the old to the new: a genuinely individualised understanding of learning directed toward facilitating development of principles for generating appropriate cultural behaviours. In practical terms, this requirement leads to a necessity to create conditions where the learner is given access to a multitude of devices to facilitate the linking and organising of information. This may be achieved through exploration of systematicities of communicative practices in ways which allow learners to investigate the ways in which these may combine or integrate with one another (cf. Guberina, 1972, p. 29)." A.-P. Lian and Lian (1997)

Furthermore, according to this perspective, learners' needs are possibly served as well as society's needs. A.-P. Lian and Lian (1997) argue that teachers themselves would never know what pieces of language learners need and when learners will use them; it
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is a matter for learners themselves to discovery what they need. A.-P. Lian (2004) adds further that because needs are unpredicted and unpredictable and are likely to be different from one another, it is not possible therefore to offer a sequenced intervention strategy capable of simultaneously meeting the needs of all; hence, the difficulty of determining the learner’s path. Thus, there should be a visible learning structure of learner’s needs and that structure itself should be developed around multiple needs of learners to be engaged at the same time without chaos resulting. In addition, as opposed to the sequencing of language learning such as from easy to difficult or from simple to complex that exposes learners to non-authentic language phenomena, there should be learning environment where learners can engage in “multiple, non-hierarchical entry and exit points in data representation and interpretation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, pp. 6-7, as cited in A-P. Lian, 2004). A.-P. Lian (2004) names this approach to language learning “a rhizomatic structure”.

The concept of multiple engagement of ESL/EFL learners in reality or authentic contexts is not a theoretical or ideal one. In fact, this approach of presenting real world tasks and critical pedagogy has become the central discussion in EFL/ESL and TESOL especially in the 21st century (Canagarajah, 2006). One of the projects that was successfully based on this critical theorist approach was carried by Auerbach (1992). Auerbach (1992) names this planning approach a “participatory approach”. Auerbach (1992) states that in this approach the curriculum emerges from an engagement of the interaction and collaboration and investigation of critical themes in students’ lives based on the interests of learners and their own choices. Auerbach (1992) describes the overall process of the project in this way -

"the curriculum development process involves students at every step of the way, from needs assessment through evaluation. Students are assumed to be the experts on their own reality and very much involved in researching that reality with teachers. This collaborative investigation of what is important to students is at the heart of the instructional process, the direction of which is from the students to the curriculum rather than from the curriculum to the students. In place of a static body of knowledge defined by outside experts, students and teachers have a set of principles and processes to guide their own selection of content and production of knowledge. Not only are students involved in deciding what is to be done, they are involved in deciding how to do it; as they participate increasingly in creating and producing their own forms and materials, they take more control of the learning process. Learning is seen to be a collective process, where participants share and analyse experiences together in order to address concerns, relying on each others’
strengths and resources rather than addressing problems individually or relying on outside experts to solve them.” (Auerbach, 1992p.19)

From this statement we learn that teachers do not walk into the classroom armed with a predetermined set of objectives or outcomes, a syllabus, lesson plans, and texts, but they are not empty handed either. This participatory approach does not mean that the curriculum is created along with chaos, rather it contains a “structured process” (Auerbach, 1992) for developing contextualized, context-specific, and variable curricula. Auerbach (1992) suggests that teachers or educators need to have a clear conceptualisation of rationale of approach and overview of the process in order to implement the participatory approach. Auerbach (1992) approaches literacy as a socio-cultural activity rather than as a collection of discrete decontextualized skills.

Within the participatory project, the assessment revolves around real-life contexts in relation to particular tasks, strategies, and purposes. Auerbach (1992) explains that “it focuses on how students read and write particular kinds of texts in specific contexts and how they use what they’ve learned in their everyday lives. The particular forms that assessment takes can vary accordingly.”(p.114). Assessment in this approach goes beyond the one-shot test, or competency performance. Assessment includes ongoing changes that indicate progress in literacy use both inside and outside. Furthermore, it includes changes in self-concept, attitudes, or conceptions of literacy, diversification of reading and writing practices in everyday life, actions resulting from program participation as well as totally unexpected, unpredictable changes (Auerbach, 1992).

This implies that language learning revolves around the issues of self-realisation and the development of the whole person within real social contexts. As Reagan and Osborn (2002) add, the teacher is dealing not only with classroom issues but also with the different cultural and social issues that present and buttress the challenges. That supports Auerbach’s position that it is about contextualizing the classroom through social activity, and maintaining a world view. In order words, language learning is a social phenomenon that cannot be tested by context independent means (Brumfit, 1984).
Some may assume there is a lack of grammatical correctness in language performance in this approach. For Auerbach (1992), the teaching of grammar also has its place in this participatory model. In addition to discussing the issues that drive the curriculum, grammar teaching and grammar learning are discussed as part of the observation of language use within contexts (Auerbach, 1992).

The work of Canagarajah (1999) on the language classroom of Tamil students of English in civil war-torn Sri Lanka is another example of how L2 learners were encouraged to resist and challenge Western representations of English language and culture in language textbooks produced by Anglo-American authors. ESL learners are encouraged to reinterpret and rewrite the texts that are relevant to their own life experiences rather than remain committed to one that has no relevant context relating to them (Kumaravadivelu, 2001; Wallace, 2002). In his projects, Canagarajah (1999) encourages teachers to question ESL mainstream pedagogies (MP) that were developed in countries such as the USA and Great Britain. Canagarajah (1999, p.13) argues that MP ‘fail to accommodate the type of questions arising in the periphery educational context’.

Another approach to foreign language teaching and learning that is similar to the proposed approaches already discussed is the ‘Whole Language approach’ that believes that language is learned best when learners are engaged in a whole learning situation that includes activities, self-reflection, self-construction of meaning, socially constructed learning and the negotiation between teachers and learners in the curriculum (Schwarzer, 2001, 2003). Its perspective is anchored in a vision of an equitable, democratic, diverse society as asserted by Edelsky (1993). Edelsky (1993) analysed the Whole Language (WL) approach in this manner -

“In a WL perspective, language is an exquisite human tool for making (not finding) meaning. The WL is what people learn when they learn a language: it is not separate parts (words, sounds, sentences) but a supersystem of social practices whose conventions and systematically both constrains and liberate. That system is not only doing exercises so that they can really use it later but rather by actually using it as best they can with others who are using it with them, showing them how it works and what it is for (Smith 1981). Whole language is not a recipe, however. There is no one way to create a whole language classroom. They are varied in how they bring those principles to life. It is not a set of methods or activities; however it is how the material is used, how activities are developed. Whole language teaching entails close observation and collaboration.” (p.548)
All approaches and proposed research implies that even with adverse classroom conditions of large numbers of students, schools with fewer native speakers (or without native speakers at all), with schools situated in remote areas where English language communication cannot be accessed, learners and also teachers can benefit from foreign language education because the goal of language learning is not only to speak with foreigners but to become critically literate in the foreign language, to become learners who are capable of reading and writing critically, who are capable of make critical comments, comparing, confronting and contrasting the information for their own growth as well as that of society (A-P Lian et al., 1993). It is not about training in a foreign language for a communicative purpose that is external to the student’s purposes. The curriculum that proposes a learning environment in this manner is an integrated curriculum that the structured organisation of teaching and learning experiences revolved within and across learning areas that extend the learner’s understanding of the world (Wilson & Jan, 2003). It is the way to develop the learner’s understanding, concepts, values that is beyond the traditional constraints of individual learning areas (Wilson & Jan, 2003).

2.2.2 The teaching and learning management and Pedagogy

Thus, as discussed above, the social reconstructionist curriculum does not propose any new promising method, rather it offers a pedagogy. H.D. Brown (2002) explains that a method implies a static set of procedures, whereas a pedagogy suggests the dynamic interplay between teachers, learners, and instructional materials during the process of teaching and learning. H.D. Brown explains that the pedagogy is

"a set of principles or approach-theory of language teaching and learning - the theoretical rationale that underlies everything that happens in the classroom. It is the cumulative body of knowledge and principles that enables teachers in classroom, to diagnose the needs of students, to treat students with successful pedagogical techniques, and to assess the outcome of those treatments. The interaction between one's approach and classroom practice is the key to dynamic teaching.” (2002, p.11)

This is similar to what Kumaravadivelu (2001) calls a postmethod pedagogy

"its emphasis on context sensitivity demands that various participants actualise it variously to suit various necessities. However, it should be feasible and indeed desirable to chart a broad road map that indicates the path the actualisation process might profitably take.” (p.545)
Therefore, what teachers and learners require in the language classroom is not a list of what to learn and to do, but rather principles of learning that allow dialogue to occur among them.

2.22.2.3 Reflective action for teacher development

If one perceives education as a freedom practice, teachers must be actively committed to a process of self-actualization that promotes their own well being if they are to teach in a manner that empowers students (Hooks, 1994, p.15). Diaz-Greenberg and Nevin (2004), state that

"critical pedagogy helps teacher candidates to deconstruct preconceived notions that only benefit the dominant minority. The result, hopefully, is more liberatory approach that promotes the transformation of the self; a dialogic retrospection process is one way to become aware of the transformation. Reflection plays an essential role in this process, since it provides an opportunity to look back and connect previous experiences to present realities and construct new meaning. That is the concept of conscientization (Freire, 1998) that refers to the development of an awareness of one's self in the world." (p.50)

Mackinnon and Grunau (1994), and L.Butler, Novak, Beckingham, Harvis, and Elaschuk (2001) suggest that one common feature of new teacher development programs is to engage teachers in activities that promote ongoing reflection on practice and underlying assumptions and to increase the sense of ownership over new teaching methods. Ornstein and Hunkins (1993) suggest that one possibility to create a sense of ownership for sustainable teacher development is to move teachers away from their comfort zone, where teachers play safe and keep a low profile. Teachers should be encouraged to participate more in decision making in school administration, to be part of the school management of change and even to be in positions of leadership in teaching and learning in schools and communities. Fullan (2001) adds that development occurs at an individual level, with teachers themselves. Professional development is more likely to be effective when it encourages teachers to participate in their own renewal rather than imposing prepared information and training on teachers. Ornstein and Hunkins (1993) point out that the implication is that government should be mindful of these points and sensitive to the needs of those involved in change. This will greatly enhance smoothness of change.
In addition, the strength of professional development is the centre of educational reform because it is closely linked with school improvement and student learning (Bredeson, 2003), especially in a democratic society. Diaz-Greenberg and Nevin (2004, p.59) add that when teachers or professors become liberators themselves, the advantages and benefits of education can be more equally distributed to all the people. However, Ur (2002) argues that language teachers to date have been educated with the knowledge imposition approach and experienced traditional training programs rather than become part of the professionalism where the interaction and exchange of ideas, acquiring new knowledge and experimenting with new ideas are the central role of a professional community. Therefore, Pettis (2002) and Edwards and Usher (2001) suggest that professional development should be seen as a lifelong process that teachers undertake with a wide range of activities to improve their teaching competence as part of their professionalism, rather than short term training programs.

Therefore, the central issue of teacher development programs is not about the mastery of language knowledge, neither about what skills teachers possess; it is about how to encourage teachers to take part in the learning community or to be part of the sphere of professionalism where research, ongoing development and reflective action on their values system can be promoted within teachers themselves. In other words, should the question be posed in the same way as was posed to the learners of language, “How should a teacher development program provide a learning environment conducive to the internal growth of teachers, rather than impose subject matter or external skills development that teachers-learners cannot link to reality?”

Above all, an environment that creates opportunities for professional development should be provided, as suggested by (Grimmett & Neufeld, 1994). Hargreaves and Fullan (1992, p.16) have identified the key focal point in the proper environment for teacher professional growth. It is an environment where the culture of teaching is recognized. This culture of teaching encompasses the school culture, where professional growth is supported. It also promotes collaborative work cultures that appreciate collaborative work. It is the environment where top-down, bureaucratic decisions are not accepted because this top-down process devalues the nature of improvement (Collins, 1991, p10).
In conclusion, Marsh (2004) concludes that the critical theorists propose two approaches to treat problems of schooling and curriculum. One is an emphasis on the link between schools and social order. Another is the discussion of the individual experience in learning and how curriculum and teachers contribute to this process because they believe that though learning and curriculum is an individual construct, the process of planning and enacting what is planned have an influence on the quality of the learner's experience in schools. This approach proposes learning that requires an effort from administrators as well as both teachers and learners. However, Hooks (1994) comments that many professors remain unwilling to be involved in any pedagogical practices that emphasize mutual participation between teacher and student because more time and effort are required to make this work.

2.23 An Eclectic Curriculum

"Man's competence at the construction of theoretical knowledge is so far most inadequate when applied to the subject of man." (Schwab, 2004, p.110). In a rapidly changing and increasingly globalised society, it is quite unlikely that any one of the different purposes of education can be adapted to the exclusion of others. No single theory claims to dominate one curriculum and no single design claims to portray the curriculum and education (Auerbach, 1992; Longstreet & Shane, 1993; Posner, 1995; A. B. Lian, 2006). Rather there is a range of conditions conducive to learning from which to draw (Longstreet & Shane, 1993, p.86). Thus, an eclectic curriculum represents a mixture of theories drawn together, depending on the historical and cultural contexts of that curriculum (Schwab, 2004, p.110). Longstreet and Shane (1993) state "Eclecticism represents a school of thought that would seek to bring together and integrate the most promising ideas put forth by competing schools of thought."(p.86). Posner (1995) gives an example of an eclectic curriculum that is possible based on four different perspectives, though it is not often the case -

"we could in principle develop a viable curriculum based on four theories, one for each commonplace - say a cognitive theory of child development, a critical theory of teacher empowerment, a philosophical theory of how scientific knowledge evolves, and a progressive theory of the school's role in community development." (p.257)
However, it is often the case that teachers and administrators base their theoretical and philosophical decision making on whatever is the trend and they fuse unconnected pieces of principle into a problematic eclectic curriculum (Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Longstreet and Shane (1993) point out that

"Eclecticism may also be a meaningless conglomeration of poorly understood ideas. In this latter context, eclecticism probably reflects a hodgepodge of rationally deprived positions and cultural mindsets that all too frequently dominate the reality of curriculum design." (p.86)

Tanner and Tanner (1995) argue that the concept of eclecticism can be beguiling and that “selecting the best from each of all possible worlds is deceptively seductive.” They add further that the problem of the eclectic curriculum “lies in the inconsistencies and contradictions that are inevitable when conflicting philosophical elements are drawn together” (such as the conflicts between the behaviourist’s conception and the humanistic conception) (Tanner & Tanner, 1995, p.318). This implies that whether the curriculum is based on traditional methods or contemporary alone or a mixture of the two, curriculum developers need to ensure that the holistic features of the curriculum have theoretical coherence. Otherwise, it is not an eclectic curriculum, but an incoherent one.

Conclusion: The relevance of the literature review

From a review of the literature and research related to foreign language curriculum development both in Thailand and in general, particularly in the West, we see that the national English language curriculum context clearly is a complex network of variables. These variables include the national education movement, concepts of learning, approaches to ELT and EFL curriculum development, and ways of analysing what happens in English language curriculum planning and the field of curriculum and education. The analysis of the EFL curriculum and the planning process is thus a large scale analysis.

There are indications from both English language curriculum and general curriculum theory in regard to components which might be included in a curriculum analysis framework. A procedure for analysing the English language curriculum has been
suggested in this chapter and key questions used in applying the procedure have also been presented.

This chapter discussed in detail the four main issues related to EFL curriculum analysis. The first section of Thai EFL curriculum development stresses problems in EFL education in Thai school system. This review left questions about how the new ESB curriculum helps to solve problems and improve the Thai EFL education. The second part of this chapter discussed in general the development of an EFL curriculum. It raises awareness that in order to create an effective EFL curriculum, broad issues of education and curriculum development must be taken into account. EFL education should be seen not only as part of the study of linguistics but as education as a whole. This section discussed also the Standards and school-based curriculum movement. Issues of accountability that greatly influence the school EFL curriculum's fundamental values and classroom practices were raised as part of the Standards movement.

The third part proposed an analytical framework for analysing the Thai newly developed EFL curriculum. The coherence of choices made related to philosophies, theories and society contributed to curriculum development and hence to the change in learners and society. Political and Western influences, and the decision makers themselves, greatly influence those philosophies and theories underlying the curriculum. These issues are the main discussion of this analysis.

The last section encompassed theories and research in the area related to EFL curricula. It provided an in-depth analysis of four curriculum conceptions from traditional practice to the contemporary which are the bases of most EFL/ESL curricula, and curriculum and educational development over the past two centuries both in the West and the East. This review then is the theoretical basis for the data analysis, discussion, recommendation and implications of this research. By applying this review, the analysis is regarded as generalizable, reliable and comprehensible.