CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.0 Introduction

This study is a case study, which examines an Extensive Reading Course (Extensive Reading to be referred to henceforth as ER) at the tertiary level in India. The examination will yield the structure and composition of the course, illuminating which curricular forces promote reading development and which hinder it, within the particular circumstances of the case under purview. The study focusses specially on the effect and value of ER for the student who has studied through a vernacular medium in school and who therefore is a low achiever in English at the tertiary level where English is the medium of instruction.

There are therefore two Central Questions posited in this study.

Question A:
What 'curricular forces' operate crucially in the implementation of an ER course? How do these 'forces' interact with ER? i.e., How does ER 'emerge' in practice, or 'work' in the curriculum?
Question B:

What then is the value, even relative value of the ER programme in the college curriculum? Is ER an instructional programme worth retaining at the tertiary level? Further, is ER as an instructional programme relevant to the low-achieving student in English at the tertiary level?

1.1 Background to the Study

The area chosen for this study is ER in English for the low achiever at the tertiary level.

The intrinsic value of ER as a means for learner growth, development and autonomy and its claims as a goal in higher education (cutting through subject matter boundaries) mark the significance of the area, as being worthwhile for study.

The nature of ER is distinguished from Intensive Reading (IR), as an activity undertaken privately and independently by the reader, involving comparatively longer pieces of discourse. This posits in an ER Course: (1) more active learner involvement, and (2) comparatively less teacher intervention than in IR.

The particular concern of the study is what ER as a course means for the low achiever in English. The low achiever is defined in this study as a student who has studied in the vernacular medium in school, whose academic
performance has been satisfactory for entry into college, but who is suddenly confronted with English as a medium of instruction at the tertiary level. The concern of the study vis-a-vis the low achiever and ER is a natural consequence of what we understand by ER: that it is a private activity undertaken by the reader and involving longer pieces of discourse. What would such an ER course mean for the low achiever who is burdened by a great linguistic handicap and for whom ER is crucial?

The large proportion of low achievers in English at the tertiary level in India and the felt disinterest of these learners for reading and ER, coupled with the need for independent reading after the tertiary level point to a crucial curriculum problem that requires study. Attempts made to solve the problem have been undertaken. But these attempts have hitherto been through (1) updating and reviewing course content (titles of books, number of books to be read, examination requirements), and (2) re-organisation of the course infra-structure (semester pattern, streaming, internal vs. external assessment etc). These are 'solutions' which have however, been attempted without an examination in holistic terms of which curricular forces operate in tension with others and the causes for these tensions for the occurrence of course 'failure'. If considered at all, such factors are taken to be immutable
and not worthwhile to be considered for solutions. In other words, there is no attempt to look at underlying causes of course failure at a grass-roots and dynamic level. What results then, are solutions with surface, cosmetic value that cover up but do not suppress basic 'disorders' within the curriculum.

Quick surface solutions that do not account for dynamics at the grass-roots level, might or might not address the problem adequately. A survey of current results and practices in the classroom points in fact to the inadequacy of suggested solutions.

While it is true that no solutions are perfectly adequate, there is a distinction to be made between 'solutions' that do not move in the direction of addressing the problem at all, and those that do. An alternative to proposing solutions might be a more process-oriented mode towards problem solving which can be effected by the illumination of a field, rather than the more visible, product-oriented method of finding actual solutions without examining the field for identifying curricular factors that crucially operate in implementation.

An in-depth analysis of a course therefore that addresses itself to questions like "What curricular forces operate crucially in ER, especially for the low achiever?" "Why does the low achiever not benefit from the course?" "Why is
there a low motivation to pursue the course?" are questions which would illuminate the field to yield the factors and causes for a course being implemented the way it is. An intensive study of an ER course would show how the reader's interaction with a text is interrupted and influenced by factors in the curriculum, so that the activity of reading is either promoted or hindered. It would show, therefore, how the learner's personal agenda or 'inner' syllabus negotiates and establishes itself against the requirements and possible controls exerted by the 'outer' syllabus or curriculum.

An illumination of a problem would need an in-depth study to be seen and examined, moreover, within its own context. This would be looking at a problem holistically; looking at relationships between curricular factors that are academic and non-academic in nature. Such an examination would therefore provide insights peculiar to a particular situation alone and requiring a qualitative analysis. The need for a case study is therefore indicated.

An examination of an ER course within the curriculum would, further, be reflective of larger ELT concerns. How is this so? Current ELT concerns centre around communicative language teaching (CLT) methodology issues, that range from the theoretical (how is language learnt) to the practical (how can language learning be facilitated in the
The CLT paradigm focuses for example on learner-centred methodology: on language use (as opposed to usage i.e., knowledge of the grammar of language), on fluency (as opposed to accuracy) as being the means and often the goal of language learning. CLT also regards learner output as not being directly related to teacher input and hence of teaching as being more a facilitating of language learning opportunities, rather than of being direct instruction.

These preoccupations of CLT theorising, are singularly shared by those of ER, as a private activity, undertaken by the reader and hence with minimal teacher interference. The ER course therefore is a ready-made field to observe the feasibility of CLT theory in practice and to examine the constraints which occur in implementation.

1.2 Orientations to the Study

There are two basic orientations to the study that need to be clarified:

(1) The curriculum and its links with ELT; and

(2) The case study as a research paradigm for ELT.

These two areas will be examined now, before the detailed pattern of the study is described.
1.2.1 **The Curriculum and its Links with ELT Syllabus Design**

A clear distinction is being made in this study between the concepts of curriculum and syllabus. Though the two terms have been used interchangeably in places like North America, the concepts are distinct. In this study, the curriculum refers to the larger educational environment of formal schooling, its processes being development, implementation, dissemination and evaluation, whereas the syllabus refers to a particular plan or public document of a course of study. This definition of the syllabus has been articulated in current ESL syllabus design (ELT Docs, 118, 1984) with a differential focus on different aspects. The syllabus is seen by different people in this document as a plan, map, a line of intention (Breen, 1984; Widdowson, 1984b) as a public document stating objectives, aims, examination requirements, content specification etc., and accountable in nature (Yalden, 1984; Allen, 1984).

Though it is generally acknowledged that there are larger curriculum concerns and philosophical, social and administrative factors that are related to the syllabus, this relationship in ELT theory is seen as additive in nature, the curriculum existing 'out there', as it were, and irrelevant almost to the real business of syllabus content and methodological specification. The relationship therefore is seen to be of a peripheral rather than of a fundamental
sort, seen as links which need to be considered, but outside the research scope of Applied Linguistics which is the orientation of most syllabus design and general theorising in ESL. Perhaps because of this linguistic focus, syllabus design has not gone beyond content - tasks or process or experience.

Current thinking in ESL syllabus design indeed points to its lack of links with general educational and curriculum theory (Stern 1984). Though there have been some distinctions made between those who discuss the WHAT of syllabus (Yalden, 1984; Allen, 1984) as Stern points out, and - more closely to curriculum concerns - the WHO and HOW of syllabus (Breen, Candlin and Widdowson in Stern, 1984:10-11) this discussion however still stays rooted within ELT syllabus theorising, and does not focus (consciously at least) on curriculum interests.

The relationship between the curriculum and the ESL syllabus in fact is more than a link; it is fundamental and transforming. The curriculum focus, we will demonstrate, crucially affects and increases our understanding of the nature and function of ESL syllabus design.

The more specific questions of ER are indeed couched within the larger question of how curricular forces impinge or constrain language learning. Taking our perception of the curriculum in rather conservative terms, we see it as a
force balancing between its dual roles of equilibrium and innovation (Morrish, 1976), resulting in change that is perceived to be incremental in nature. Our study seeks to illuminate this tilt, in a particular case, to see in which way the curriculum tilts - towards equilibrium or change, and to find answers to why this tilt occurs. We will in other words be examining the 'reflexive' quality of the case.

This larger curriculum focus, demonstrates the inevitable breaking of boundaries when an ELT question is to be studied in depth. Indeed, it would seem that unless course implementation is studied within larger slants or frameworks, crucial questions can be examined only as laboratory findings and theoretical positions, unanchored to actual classroom situations which differ from class to class.

Theorists in ELT in fact, have placed the discipline of ELT within larger frameworks. Stern (1983:36-50) refers to several models discussing the relationship between language sciences and language teaching. Of these, 3 models are those of Mackey (1970), Strevens (1976, 1977) and Stern (1983) which refer to the area of curriculum. But whereas Mackey's model clearly shows the influence of government education policy and society on the curriculum, teacher and learner, Strevens sees the influence of policy and aims and administration and organisation, together with
relevant professional disciplines on the learner, teacher training and the syllabus.

Both these models are the top-down variety, where the influence of larger structures percolate into lower ones. Stern's model however, introduces the bottoms-up component of interaction, whereby, practice informs and develops theory. Both Stern's and Streven's models however, unlike Mackey's, do not show educational theory as grounded within larger societal macro-structures in their analysis. However, the basic intent of Stern's model is to show the different areas that inform Educational Linguistics, and not to draw exhaustive hierarchical levels of knowledge vis-a-vis language teaching methodology (as more than linguistic theory alone). Stern's model, in indicating the plurality of theoretical influences on Educational Linguistics, is breaking new ground in ELT conceptualisation. Such rethinking and widening of boundaries will give depth to research in ELT. Though these models are not completely suitable for direct application in this study for the reasons given, the point that ELT horizons need to be broadened is taken.

This study, therefore, is an attempt to set an ELT problem within its larger curriculum framework, since we hold that the analysis of the problems and solutions to it
if
would then be different from what it would be/ELT problems
were seen on their own, in vacuum as it were. The link
between ELT concerns and the curriculum is, we hold, a
fundamental one. This point needs to be clarified further.

The fundamental link between the curriculum and syllabus
is not clearly perceived because the distinction between the
syllabus as plan on one hand, and implementation on the
other, is not clearly delineated. What does this mean?
It might seem a truism to say that plans are different from
implementation. But the fact is that a clear distinction
is not made in much of our discussions in ELT, resulting in
discussions that often take place at cross purposes. For
example, we are surprised when the best laid plans at the
inceptional and at the operational levels are 'sabotaged'
attributing such behaviour to 'vested political interest'
basically non-academic in nature, and immutable.

However, it is basically the non-academic, vested
interests which operate in contradiction with academic
interests in implementation. Our commitments and actions
are based on attitudes, some recognised and perceived, some
not. Moreover attitudes, voiced or not, perceived or not,
inform all educational documents, including the syllabus.
The different participants in the curriculum, moreover, the
learners, teachers, heads, principals, boards of studies,
parents, academic councils, the society at large, etc., etc..
react to an educational issue in differential ways. Thus a syllabus most often reflects the sorts of procedures and activities, objectives and aims held to be important and significant by authority structures and decision-makers - whoever they might be. As Musgrave (1979) puts it, a curriculum can be regarded as 'determining', 'determined' or 'adaptive'. This 'focus' is differential at different stages in the life of an institution. If large classes or the lecture method was seen as 'determined' or 'determining', discussions could be more constructive.

Unless the structure of the school is less authoritarian with the needs and opinions of learners and teachers felt actively in the decision-making set-ups, therefore, the syllabus will be reflecting only the attitudes and values of those organising the school. Thus in the average Indian schooling system, the syllabus does not reflect the needs of the participants in the classroom with rigour, and sometimes not at all, so that the traditional syllabus is just a document saying what ought to be done, as experts envisage it, without reference to what is being done.

When we come to implementation, one of the curriculum processes, however, the picture is very different. The held attitudes of the powerful factor in the average Indian
classroom will emerge it is true, but only in a public fashion. The head­master will see only what the teacher wants him to see, the inspector will see only what the head­master and the teacher will reveal. Only rarely will the students have an axis with authority in a direct way. Within the classroom, however, the weaker elements can express themselves. They do so, not in articulate ways but in more basic, incoherent ways, by resistances, by rejections, by acting contrary to policy and so on. Thus the teacher will not teach something in the syllabus s/he feels is unimportant, or s/he won't teach because s/he cannot. Or, students will not co-operate with one teacher whereas they might with another and so on. Such operations are what goes on in classroom dynamics, and what is the hidden curriculum of the classroom.

Whereas the syllabus is a formal document, the hidden curriculum contains the non-formal. The syllabus cannot by its very nature incorporate these rejections and resistances into its statements and structure. As a 'public' formal document it includes only the positive, the articulate, the respectable. It does not and cannot, by virtue of its public quality include the indeterminate, the flux of classroom activity, the 'unrespectable'. The syllabus has to be economical, including only what is
categorised and identified in its statements. It can talk of the motivation of students, not of vested interests, of student interest, not student boredom, of teacher's workload not of teacher distrust with policy, disagreement with stated aims etc. It speaks, moreover, only in academic terms: for example students are given a choice of reading four books out of ten or two out of six in extensive reading. This will be mentioned in the syllabus. What will not find a place is that the choice is limited to 10 or 6 because of the lack of availability of adequate texts, and because teachers find it difficult to read more books for 'trapping' students in evaluation. A syllabus is limited therefore by including only the 'mentionable' - in the sense that anything public is limited, a dressed-up window, hiding behind it the 'murky depths' of the hidden curriculum which however crucial in implementation in the classroom, cannot be stated in economical and positive procedural plans.

Seen in this light the syllabus as a document emerges as qualitatively different to and conflicting with the operationalism of classroom activity, the implementation of a syllabus. While a syllabus is 'academic' in nature, the curriculum includes the syllabus and the non-academic forces which operate in implementation of even the syllabus. There is a gap here between policy and methodology, a "dual relationship" as Widdowson (1984b) calls it. Policy can be
seen in documents, lesson plans, school biases etc. There is a conflict in methodology too - stated and actively done. And if the learner is not considered, if learner needs and wants are not important in planning, there is bound to be a dichotomy between expectations and actual practices. Tensions are operating - a whole web of them - between and within participants.

The syllabus is seen therefore as a formal document, whereas the hidden curriculum is the non-formal which, however, is crucial in implementation. This establishes the fundamental link between the curriculum and the syllabus.

The analysis of these tensions: Why a teacher says X and does Y or why a student feels or does X and not Y, why a department wants something that is obviously inferior in quality instead of something better etc., can be called the illumination of the hidden curriculum. This reveals the tilt that the larger curriculum is making in the balance between maintaining stability and order on the one hand and developing, encouraging innovation and change on the other - the double responsibilities of the curriculum. Is an act of the teacher's tilting towards stability or a status quo, towards stability or change, towards change or irrational autocratic change? To what extent are creative factors in operation? Is an innovation real or only on paper or felt mainly by the teacher? Or in syllabus terms, why is a syllabus not successful? Are we considering enough what we
have before we expect something new to be learnt? And what is happening in the classroom, something in keeping with policy or contradictory to it, and why?

The analysis of the curriculum to find the hidden suppressed one (Apple, 1971; Wilson, 1981) gives a realistic picture of the 'givens' of a particular educational context and is practical in developing the syllabus as plan. Learning and reading theory, talk of schemas, of cognitive positions from which and in relation to which a person operates with new information. Similarly the curriculum and the syllabus has to work with what they already have—only then will it make sense in a particular environment. In Piaget's (1958, 1964, 1970) terms it is assimilating the new and accommodating the new to old structures— an adjustment—not an out-and-out radical change that is not feasible. Unrealistic syllabus requirements arise when decision-makers outside the hidden curriculum generalise on differential student schemas and plan a syllabus in carefully graded lock-step. Such unrealistic syllabus construction will meet with course failure, and solutions that do not address a problem in grass-root terms.

The analysis of the hidden curriculum, moreover, gives a new meaning to a learner/learning based syllabus. It is a rigorous method supporting the educational insight that the learner be considered to encourage student learning.
It gives meaning to the process syllabus as considerations based on the 'here and now', the 'is' factor or reality principle as opposed to the 'ought' factor that much of ELT syllabus designs and ELT discussions rest upon. Questions like: "Why does this teacher do X and be claiming to do Y? Why does this teacher who is so enthusiastic about classroom participation have such a quiet class?" or "Is this teacher's belief in the autonomy of student learning reflected in the choice of texts, in methodology and comprehension questions?" or "Why are students so bored in the third semester when they were so keen in the first?" or larger questions like "When the intentions and outcomes are so different what contributed to such a disparity?" - are the questions which compare policy and action in simple but rigorous ways.

The methodology proposed is a way not only of clarifying the murky interior regions of the classroom, in a qualitative way but is a way at the same time of transforming what is exposed to functional currency. In brief, we have something of value here which is not just negative and undesirable, but transformed in exposure as valuable resources to be utilised productively. The very act of exposure of attitudes unperceived and perceived, will give not only a clearer understanding of what the syllabus is and can do as plan, but also the difference between implementation and planning. We
are therefore discussing a step between planning and implementation, a step that is not trivial in nature. The analysis of a hidden curriculum clearly shows the syllabus as it exists, as a plan which is crucially related to and is made operational by the curriculum and its concerns in a fundamental way.

**Conclusion**

The fundamental link between the syllabus and curriculum is not really seen clearly, firstly because the distinction between the syllabus as plan on the one hand and implementation on the other is not delineated in our discussion in ELT. This might be because it is that the syllabus is regarded as academic in quality, whereas implementation includes the non-academic which is not given the same value in analysis as the academic. But it is the non-academic or non-formal which is what is crucial in the implementation of the academic or formal and cannot be ignored. Implementation in analysis reveals the hidden curriculum of an educational environment to scrutiny. And it is this hidden curriculum, which is the experience of the student (or the 'is' factor) in schools that needs to be considered in analysing problems for achieving solutions towards change. The illumination of the hidden curriculum, also reveals the fundamental links between ELT and the curriculum, which links give a context to the study.
1.2.2 The Case Study - Research Methodology

It is clear that an analysis of the hidden curriculum needs a methodology which will illuminate a particular educational, historical, cultural and social context. An appropriate methodology that would capture all these would be the case study, so this is the methodology that has been selected for this study.

The Case Study: Characteristics

The case study (CS) is the basic method used in sociology of education (Lacey, 1978; Simons, 1980; Delamont, 1983 etc). It uses the basic ethnomethodological and anthropological practice of participant observation. It encourages in-depth studies of a field without rigid, a priori categories of observation. A CS is 'grounded' in a particular educational context and hence is suitable for in-depth studies.

Indeed, the CS has established itself as an alternative research paradigm to the psychometric one in general, and is specifically suited for studying classrooms, for the CS captures the uncountable, the fuzzy areas, the uncertainties of a classroom giving a sense of holistic fabric, not reductionist in nature. Thus the CS adopts an iterative and idiographic mode of discourse, as against the nomothetic strategies of physical sciences. The images used in CS
research shows research as an exploration, as in art (Oram, 1979), an illumination of the particular, as in journalism (Wilby, 1980), a matter of editing as in film (Walker, 1980a) and leaning heavily on the viewer's understanding for a response (Graef, 1980). The researcher fictionalises reports, using 'portrayals', 'scripts' and 'log-books'. The CS demands 'an imagination of the case and an invention of the study' (Kemmis, 1980).

Proponents of the CS however, have had to establish the credentials of it vis-a-vis: (a) generalisability and (b) objectivity. This defense is necessary perhaps and is undertaken even today (see Long, 1986).

To (a) generalisability, there have been defensive solutions, which are however, still responding to the psycho-metric demand for large sampling. Thus, the case study review, and proposals for case study archives have been suggested; CS is claimed to generate hypotheses; the validity of long-term case studies have been stressed. There have however also been less apologetic solutions as for example the tacit knowledge of the reader, responding to the lay language of the CS reports generating the generalisable component of it (Stake, 1980).

To the question of (b) objectivity, CS again has interesting counter arguments. Hamilton (1980) points out the arbitrary nature of assumptions adopted by Galton and
Fisher, mathematicians of the botanist-agriculturist paradigm, responsible for developing psychometrics. It has been pointed out that the 'objective' categories used e.g., in classroom observation is as subjective as that of the participant observer, but because it is more conscious in the latter case, steps are taken (1) to establish the history of the researcher; (2) to offer a public access to records and data; (3) to describe the process of the study including reformulations and retrospective interpretation e.g., differences between the field work and report - thus operating the reflexive quality of CS; (4) to establish a 'responsive' evaluation, where the researcher reacts with the researched; and (5) to offer the strategies of triangulation and cross-checking to authenticate the researcher's interpretation.

The CS, finally is conducive to changing attitudes within the curriculum. In articulating the 'known', in discussing the issues, the research process itself is, it is claimed, a responsible vehicle for change and teacher education, proceeding with the known (what the teacher knows), to the unknown. The assumption behind such teacher education (as against teacher training) is that knowledge is not transmitted from the knower to learner, but that knowledge
(as Paolo Freire, 1972, would say) is created in shared interaction, between two parties. Such curriculum development is what Schwab (1969, 1971, 1973) would refer to as the art of "deliberation".

In this study, our analysis puts into practice the theory proposed by Schwab (op.cit.) the art of the practical for curriculum research, going beyond the theoretical speculation that is a large part of present curriculum deliberations (e.g., Apple, 1971, 1980, 1985; Musgrave, 1973). This study examines the hidden curriculum of a case where ER is being conducted.

The analysis of the hidden curriculum therefore will be of particular significance to a particular classroom environment and none other. The instruments of research are special to the focus of enquiry and special to the background and history of an institution, the cultural and social forces operating in the particular curriculum. It is an analysis that is interested in on-going action that does not imply a perfect central syllabus with items balanced one against the other and theoretically useful for the next ten or twenty years. This action-oriented approach to classroom implementation rejects a priori content specifications, since input is believed to have no meaning by itself and thus cannot foretell outcomes outside use and outside the learner.
Conclusion

Since the focus of research is on the illumination of the hidden curriculum a particular context is indicated for in-depth study. This means that a CS approach has to be adopted, with a suitable method of analysis that is qualitative in nature. This analysis includes the processes of reformulation, of retrospective interpretation, methods of triangulation and cross-checking as well as the potential revelation of the emerging hypothesis. The reactions of readers as well as larger ELT questions involved in the analysis, ensure the generalisability of the study. The study therefore involves a responsive evaluation, a powerful tool in teacher education.

1.3 The Case Selected

The Case Study is a college for boys in South India. Briefly, it is selected for the following reasons (details in 3.4):

1. The college was granted autonomy in 1976. This means that the college has full responsibility for its programmes. Any wide gaps between stated claims and actual operations cannot be because of the disinterest of outside formal decision-making agencies therefore, but because of operations of agencies which directly influence the case. The field is 'bounded' by its autonomy, making the canvas to be surveyed more available to the researcher.
2. The college is committed to **communication** (Bulletin, 1985) and to a communicative programme in ELT. This programme is more than ten years old. The case chosen is one where there is considerable commitment to the educational programmes undertaken, so that, while we miss out on the 'average' quality of the tertiary system, where content, design and planning are singularly absent, we gain in that the findings are those of a genuine educational system with results of a system in operation by design, and not by chance. The observed and emerging 'hidden curriculum' therefore will be related to genuine learning/teaching situations, where vested interests, political attitudes and variously motivated action happen naturally and inevitably, and inspite of planned learning and teaching.

3. The department of English in the college has one of the most developed courses in ER in the country, with a commitment to learner-based systems of education. Indeed, in 1986, it won an award for its innovative schemes.

4. The Department of English in this college regularly reviews and changes its programmes.

5. The department streams its students of whom it has a cross-section, in terms of language ability. Since the study is concerned with the low achiever in English the 'streaming' (A, B, C streams) in the college facilitated the researcher's task, raising several sociological implications of streaming at the same time.
1.4 The Pattern of the Study

In examining the ER syllabus and the hidden curriculum in ER in the curriculum, we are in effect examining held, stated and unstated claims against the actual practice of ER. Further, we are contrasting these held, stated and unstated claims of ER and practice of the hidden curriculum of ER, against the optimal positions of ER. In other words, we are examining the relationship between the 'ought' and 'is' factors of the ER course. This examination will show, to what extent the 'ought' factor can be logically present or exist in the classrooms, the subsequent quality of ER in the classrooms and the nature of the curricular forces that operate in ER in the curriculum.

The 'ought' factor is identified as not only the optimal theory of ER, but also the held and stated claims of ER in the curriculum. The 'is' factor, on the other hand, includes not only operations, but also syllabus as plan and as an existing document in use. The syllabus and held claims in documents, therefore, has a dual role ambivalent in nature, where it is at once in tension with the 'ought' element of the theory of ER, and is at the same time in tension with the 'is' factor of the hidden curriculum.

The analysis will be undertaken therefore across three parts: Theory I, Theory II and Operations. This can be represented in the following way:
Theory I: Sources, Questions and Constituents

The sources for Theory I, or the first part come from several areas that contribute findings, theory, concepts and principles to constitute it. The plurality of these sources reflect the composition of Educational Linguistics or the kinds of relationships language pedagogy has with different theoretical areas.

In 1.2.1, we have referred to Stern (1983) who discussing the relationship between language pedagogy and areas of theoretical orientations, points to several models showing interrelations between areas (e.g., like Mackey, 1970; Strevens 1976, 1977; Ingram, 1980; Spolsky, 1980; and Stern, 1983). The variety and plurality of theoretical orientations, is in fact what Educational Linguistics is based upon.
Though there is no consensus on which orientations are relevant in pedagogy, the concept of a multidisciplinary focus in ELT or Educational Linguistics, reflecting a difficulty in compartmentalisation and establishing boundaries, has been commonly articulated. The models described in Stern (1983) are conceived for different purposes, concentrating on different areas so that we can say that though no model is 'exhaustive' from the particular focus of this study, they indicate the general belief that ELT has to go into several theoretical areas for successful research. Indeed for a proper consideration of pedagogy many areas need to be drawn on.

This point can be illustrated, even in practical terms. A consideration of a pedagogic problem, or an ESL problem as in this study, involves many different participants and their interests, biases, priorities and hence multiple perspectives.

That many areas need to be resorted to in discussion is argued cogently by Schwab (1969, 1971, 1973) within whose research paradigm this study is set. Schwab, in postulating the paradigm of the practical (the singular) as opposed to the theoretic (the general) discusses the arts necessary for practical operations. One of these is taking account of the eclectic, i.e., taking account of "all these sub-subjects which pertain to man" (1969:9). Since each theory is true
"in its own terms," the curriculum should avoid a "tunnel vision" that concentrates on only one focus, one theory, which is uni-faceted. It should instead recognise pluralism by going beyond the "mere conspectus", by helping students discover what a variety of theories can offer. The arts of the practical according to Schwab (1971:503) are:

Practical arts concerned with particulars of the practical omitted by theory ... eclectic arts concerned with the incompleteness of each subject of the behavioural sciences ... other eclectic arts which select among, adjust, and sometimes combine the incomplete views which constitute the plurality of the theories generated in each behavioural science.

What is being attempted here therefore is a bringing together, or a selecting, combining and adjusting activity from various foci on a problem, conceived of differently and discussed differently according to different priorities of disciplines.

Having discussed the general need for different theoretical orientations in ESL curriculum deliberations we will point out which areas our study covers. We begin first with Theory I or the Theory of ER as presented in this study. Theory I is a review of the concept of the schema which is a construct that captures the development of inner cognitive structures as adapting to and being adapted by new knowledge. An understanding of the concept of schema is necessary in reading and learning terms, in order to get a clearer understanding of what operates when an 'inner syllabus' is
activated. The schema is discussed as it emerges in:

(a) Developmental Psychology
(b) Learner-centred theories of Education and Language Learning
(c) Reading theory
(d) ER in the CLT paradigm (i.e., Theories of ER in ESL)

This section will form the 'optimal' or 'ideal' definition of ER, against which actual implementation will be examined. This area covers therefore psychologically-oriented discussion on reading and learning, emphasising the activation of cognitive structures and hence the inner syllabus of the learner.

Theory I answers questions like: How does learning and reading take place? What are optimal pedagogic models for learning, language learning and reading? How does ELT specifically look at these questions?

**Theory II: Sources, Questions and Constituents**

Theory II will be an analysis of the operational constructs of a well-developed ER course at the tertiary level. This will be based on data from one college. This data will be an analysis of:

(1) Documents - Syllabus, Prospectus, College Philosophy etc.
(2) Teachers' and Students' held views.
The questions asked in Theory II will be of the following kind.

What are the stated objectives of ER, the texts prescribed, the editorial machinery involved in these texts, the sort of teacher intervention envisaged, the type of evaluation/examination questions expected, the format of examination questions? What are the types of classroom activities discussed, and the type of formative evaluation and feedback expected in the syllabus? What are the limitations of these stated objectives, why do they take the forms they do, what does it tell us about what the power structures might be, what is the relationship between knowledge and curriculum methods and principles of authority and social order?

What we are discussing here are policy statements, the formal syllabus, the prescribed textbooks etc. Some history of language teaching is involved in this part. What we describe here is the 'outer' syllabus against which the 'inner' syllabus, it is claimed, is in tension.

Operations-Sources, Questions and Constituents

Operations will continue the analysis of the case under study - this time in the area of actual implementation and practice of the ER course - the hidden curriculum in ER,
actual classroom interaction. The operable aims will be discussed, in the light of classroom data and analysis; the actual practice involved in the ER programme.

The questions asked in this part are: What is the hidden curriculum here? What are the operable objectives in the curriculum, to what extent are the balances between the different forces involved in the curriculum, factors in the difference between stated and operable aims; to what extent are these differences conducive to the development of ER skills in the curriculum? In other words what are the resistances to change, to the implementation of stated objectives, what does actual classroom data yield? The sources for such information will come from the questionnaire and classroom analysis.

This part concerns actual classroom practice. Here we see 'is' factors that reflect the actual negotiation being made between the learner's agenda, and the control exerted over it by the curriculum forces in operation and by the formal, stated claims and syllabus. It reflects the tension between the 'outer' and 'inner' syllabus.

The study therefore, has reference to several theoretical areas: Curriculum and Educational Theory, Sociolinguistics, Ethnomethodological Analysis, Psychology and Psycholinguistics, and History of Language Teaching.
The only area not really covered, but which is mentioned in all the models described, in Stern (1983) is General or Theoretical Linguistics - but with Spolsky (1980) we take the relationship between Linguistics and Classroom Teaching as quite distant in nature. The reasons for this are fundamental; not only is General Linguistics not directly involved in instructional problems (Chomsky, 1980), the scientific paradigm and idealistic base on which theoretical linguistics stands is in direct opposition to the particularity of a case study that is undertaken with an ethnomethodological focus.

The procedure of analysis of data therefore will be one where contrasts will be made between three areas: Theory I, Theory II and Operations. This contrast is essentially one between the 'Is-Ought' factors of the curriculum. The Is-Ought question in our research can be visualised in the following way:
The relationship between the three parts is shown in the diagram, represented as a cline indicating the tension between the larger question of what happens in the curriculum (the *is* factor) and what theory says should be taught in the curriculum (the *ought* factor). It indicates a tension, similar to that between the needs of the learner and requirements of the curriculum – between the personal and flexible, and the formed, impersonal and inflexible.
Again, as with the question of personal needs and the requirements of the curriculum, we are examining, the extent to which the needs of one area distort or pull out of focus the needs of another - in this case we will examine how operable aims limit the implementation of ER within the curriculum. We can elaborate the above in the following way:

What we will be examining in other words will be the contrast between:

A. Theory I

1. The theory of Extensive Reading

What Extensive Reading is - the skill of ER

B. Theory II

The operational/theoretical constructs of ER in the curriculum as a course of study. The formal system.

and the contrast between

2. B. Theory II

The operational/theoretical constructs of ER in the curriculum as a course of study. The formal system.

C. Practice

The implementation of the course of ER - the hidden curriculum - the factors that give shape to the course.

Figure 1.3: Main Contrasts of the Study

The hidden curriculum, or the analysis of what we gather happens in implementation, will be examined to see its congruence or contradiction to stated claims, or held beliefs. The discussion will examine the relationship
between the 'is' and 'ought' factors in ER - by *is* we mean what happens in ER and by *ought*, what is held to be important in ER - theoretically speaking inside and outside the curriculum. The syllabus has the ambivalent position of being both an operational construct - an instrument to be used (an 'ought' factor) and (an 'is' factor), a document concretising the abstract requirements of a syllabus.

Theory I therefore falls strictly within theory - or 'ought' areas, Theory II within both 'is' + 'ought' (because it is both theory and operations) and Operations where the actual hidden curriculum reflects the contradiction between the inner and outer syllabuses in implementation, within the 'is' area.

The contrastive analysis of the three parts are described in a way that tries to retain the holistic nature of the phenomenon under study. The analysis does not therefore, follow in a linear fashion examining first one contrast, then another and so on.

We do establish Theory I separately, however, in Chapter II, and we indicate in Chapter III exactly which sources are being used for Theory II and Operations in order to illuminate the procedure of analysis.
The data examines the two central questions of the study, which are examined using the contrastive analysis already described. From this examination of data, several ideas not previously considered, a priori to the field study, 'emerged' as it were, and have been described in the last chapter.

The 'emerging' of concepts not previously envisaged (in specific terms at least), is characteristic of the 'reflexive' nature of the case. Several 'reformulations' of analysis, categorisation, of data collection of specific hypothesis construction, and details of ER pedagogy emerged through the analysis. All these will be described in the study. The reflexivity of the case is an indication of the open nature of the study and the sense of negotiation that are crucial to it.

Another aspect of the contrastive analysis used in the study, is the contrast between A, B and C streams, since our focus is on the C stream students. One reformulation made in this part of the analysis, is that instead of contrasting A and B streams to C stream, a lack of adequate coverage of B stream data, made the contrast result in A stream against C stream, with B stream being used intermittently, wherever available, to develop the 'ecology' of the case.
1.5 The Chapters

Chapter II will discuss the body of concepts that constitutes Theory I, or the theory of ER, drawing on findings of psychological, reading and pedagogic principles that operate in the inner syllabus during ER activity.

Chapter III: In this chapter, we will begin the qualitative analysis of the outer syllabus, and Theory II, by describing the Case Study within historical, national and educational settings. This chapter also includes a description of the field work undertaken.

Chapter IV: In this chapter the contrast between the inner and outer syllabus, to yield the hidden curriculum begins. Here, the first of our 'micro analysis' of data is undertaken (see 4.0 for details). The first Central Question of the study is examined against the data in this chapter to yield Hypothesis A of the study. The question is: How does ER 'work' in the curriculum?

Chapter V: The second Central Question of the study, 'What value does ER have for the low achiever in English?' is examined to yield Hypothesis B of this study. This completes the 'micro-analysis' of the data.
Chapter VI: Looks at larger curriculum questions that come up through the data. It serves as a 'macro-analysis' of the data. The Case as a model of change in the curriculum is discussed, followed by implications for research methodology. Suggestions for further research are made before the conclusion.

...
1. Paulston (1976) makes a distinction in his survey between equilibrium and conflict theories of change. Though his distinctions clarify the general trends of change prevalent in educational systems, our study cannot fall neatly into one or the other category, since our understanding of the curriculum involves both the concepts of equilibrium and change, and the tension between the two. We refer to our understanding of the curriculum as 'conservative' because we do not espouse conflict theories totally (cf. Apple, 1971, 1975, 1980; Giroux, 1981; Musgrave, 1980 etc.), if we did we would be discussing a totally different perspective of the curriculum. (See Chapter VI for further discussion.)

2. Early curriculum research which depend on the questionnaire alone or strict observation schedules generally give us information that is authoritarian in structure.

3. The Cambridge Conference of 1972 and 1975 articulated the basic philosophical leanings and conduct of research of the case study (Simons, 1980, gives reports of the proceedings).

4. Ethically, giving anonymity to a case is essential hence the college studied has not been referred to by name. (Simons, 1980).


***