CHAPTER III

THE LANGUAGE-MODEL OF INTERACTIVE CREATION OF THE MOMENT, ARTICULATED
CHAPTER III

3.1 Introduction

This chapter has three sections. In section one, I collate the ideas discussed in Chapters I and II, and set out in detail a specific language model as my thesis statement. Work towards this has been done to a very great extent in the previous chapter itself. My job here then, is simple: it is more in the nature of a gathering together of all the strands already established into a manageable model (aided by tables and figures) since in this chapter I proceed to work out the application and extension of the model in the teaching act.

Obviously then, this section ends with tentative reachings towards deriving implications for teaching that the model offers. Syllabus issues such as method and content are raised and the nature of a language syllabus in my model gets partly crystalized. The need for conceptualization of a curriculum/syllabus itself is felt at the end of this section.

In section two I examine some interesting current trends in curriculum and syllabus design and relate them to a few hints for a curriculum conceptualisation that the paradigmatic echoes from the language model in section one suggests. The
discussion here is not only of trends from general curriculum theory but also includes thinking in ELT syllabus design.

In section three I bring together the language model postulated in section one and its suggestions for a language syllabus and the curriculum model derived from pervasive (paradigm) principles of my language thesis which suggests a certain manner of curriculum making, to bear upon a language (teaching/learning) syllabus. I do this in three steps. I initially show how a language model which in itself is derived from a certain paradigm of interactive creation of the moment provides me with a register and a language of discourse for a curriculum/syllabus model, which in its turn has been derived from the paradigm principles. Next, I work out a scheme of syllabus-making-languaging analogy which I intend to use during part of the discussion of the classroom lessons in Chapter V.

At the end of section three I present the actual (English as a second) language syllabus in the light of my thesis about languaging and syllabus making.

I conclude the chapter by raising the question whether a language classroom with its goal as teaching language as a tool as against the goal of grammar construction is justified in its claims to being substantially different. In Chapter IV
I intend to answer this question briefly before I go on to discuss in Chapter V the language project where an attempt was made to teach language in its creative capacity as a tool.

SECTION 1

3.2 The Language Model: A Framework for Arguments Involved

I shall now state my thesis on language and language learning in detail. The arguments revolve mainly around three major points (and their sub-points): 1) The method of acquisition of a language core: a. acquisition as a meaning seeking act; b. the acquisition process as a dynamic act of core creation; c. the importance of the individual in norm or core creation. 2) The nature of the created core: The core is considered dynamic fluid and tentative which same dynamism and tentativeness, a result of language acquisition process (a to c above) being responsible for the status of the accumulated core - as peripheral, or at best a reference point rather than a blueprint in further acts of core or meaning creation; besides being an invitation to further acts of creation. A corresponding notion here is the gap between the given and the circumstances of the execution.

The third point is mainly a derivation from the first two. I explicate the activity of the dynamic act of core
creation itself and assign it a central status as the act of acquisition and also languaging in general; this activity is towards the creation of a norm or core (during the acquisition and later use stage) and a dynamic as against a static norm. The process (of acquisition and use) itself in its explorative and creative rather than conformist nature, contributes to this dynamism. Thus, in 3), I postulate and expatiate on the two dimensions of the explorative creative act of (a) negotiation and (b) exploitation of the negotiative factor, invoked in the process of knowledge or norm or core creation.

Implicit in all these arguments is the notion that language does not reflect a separate reality but in entering a world of language-use, the child enters world-views or a particular reality which is constituted in and through the symbolic tool. Thus establishing a language norm is establishing a reality norm or knowledge norm and a manoeuvring around the given world-view is in and through an effective manoeuvring around the language 'given'. Languaging and language considered as presuppositional as against an invariant and rule based core contributes towards such manoeuvrings for creation of new worlds (Chapters I and II).
3.3 Meaning Constitution and Investment of the Personal - A Review

Let us now take a closer look at languaging as meaning-making or meaning constitution by the individual. The orientation here could either be towards message exploration or referentiality - in the latter case there being a relatively high degree of deference to the contingencies of the context (see Section 2.2, Chapter II). Putting it in another way, meaning exploration could be on the mathetic lines or on the pragmatic lines. Whatever the purpose, it involves the encounter of the subject with the 'other subjects' the personal with the 'other personal' and the establishment of the intersubjective or interpersonal cooperated meaning. That is, the child's personal meaning seeking meets with the caretaker's meanings - which, incidentally, is the 'norm' (socially established core meaning) itself in dialectical relationship with the caretaker's personal meaning-seeking. (Her/his shifting configurations of semantic space demanding or seeking a re-adjustment of the social norm in accordance with the immediate situation of languaging - which includes a new factor in the shape of the interacting and meaning-seeking child.)

Thus consequent upon these several tensions the 'meaning' or norm constituted at that moment is an interpersonal and specific to the particular interlocutors and the (physical)
situation one, negating any kind of a total transplant of One Norm/Core either from the caretaker or the individualistic meaning from the side of the child. \(^1\) In other words, both the Intendeds (the child's and the caretaker's) are not the executed. The former fact points to the flux involved in the social norm (disturbed out of its complacency by the ever-creative individual, i.e., the caretaker as well as the learning child) while the latter fact keeps the effort at meaning pursuit for the child herself alive, which latter fact also being partly responsible for the shifting social norm - note the reference to the child also being the ever-creative individual. In fact, in both the behaviours of the child and the caretaker are intertwined both these factors.

3.3.1 The Dynamic Core

What emerges here is the tentative temporariness of the 'core' and its constantly changing nature. Thus the existence of One Norm or Core (One Meaning) and its transmission becomes fictional in that in any effort at communication (the child's language acquisition also being an effort at communication) the 'subjective' (in the form of the caretaker's subjective and the child's subjective) enters to effect a 'change' and an incompleteness and tentativeness about the changed form or meaning itself, wrought by the tensions between/among the 'subjectives'.

Circumstances of Use and Process Acquisition

In this my model obviously, then, the mode of acquisition of a social norm (in our case the language norm or core) is also the mode of using the code later. That is, the process of meaning-making or the act of employing procedures demanded of the child is in principle demanded later even after the 'code' is seen to have been acquired, in the adult languaging stage. E.g. the caretaker, the adult language user as I have shown, also pursues (new) meanings and employs procedures towards it - the assumption here being that the so-called acquired core is not the end-all and is not for simple implementation, but to act as a reference point to work out changes around (over/between etc.), it.

Firstly, procedural mobilisation is a pre-requisite for the child entering language.\(^2\) Secondly, this kind of experience gained in employing procedures does not exhaust itself after what is called the competence in language is acquired. As Widdowson says (modifying the concept of LAD a bit) this is the language acquisition device which does not fall into disuse (see Widdowson, 1983: "My point is quite simply that this capacity is not used up by conversion into competence, as sometimes seems to be suggested, but remains as an active force for continuing creativity" (26).
Again, later, "My argument would be that capacity (Widdowson's equivalent, more or less, to Chomsky's LAD) never falls into disuse, but continues as a force for the realisation of what Halliday calls the 'meaning potential' of language" (27).

The force which creates meaning rather than language structures (or the linguists' system) retains and refines itself by 1. complying (but not without adding its special personal bit) into 'received' meanings, 2. yet forever trying to find ways to exercise itself through procedures of meaning-making in every language use. As I have tried to point out time and again, it is the underlying fact of deliberate and voluntary constitution of meanings which helps this creativity, which is an invitation to 'try again'.

The employment of procedures during use of language, i.e., the act of the creative force of the LAD seems a matter of playing around with the 'compiled meanings' exploiting the presence of the interstices between what has been said and what has been left unsaid. Thus it is the pre-suppositional nature of language which helps creativity - to go behind the constructed core.

I have pointed out the analogical parallel between presuppositions and the shifting nature of the signifier-signified relationship, i.e., the act of signification. Since in every
act of language use the new set of circumstances induces a
different configuration of semantic space (for both or all
the interlocutors in the languaging event) the signified can
be made to proliferate or differ. Or putting it in another
way, since a new situation and a new experience present them-
selves, new means of capturing these new experiences is made,
and in the effort are constituted new meanings and new schemata
which is part of the core. What I have attempted in talking
about the subjectivity and intersubjectivity above is a closer
look at what is involved in the reactions to these 'new'
situations. Language-use is an attempt to capture through the
said what has been left unsaid and only pre-supposed. Hence
this playing around or employment of procedures are the ones
which 'change' and consequently effect change in the schema
which has the executive function and is an important part of
the core or norm or received meanings. Linguistic competence,
anyway, is at the level of analytic abstractions without,
as Widdowson points out, any executive role to play in
languaging (see Sections 2.7-18.4, Chapter II).

What is crucial is the fact of the deliberate construct-
ion (in cooperation to be sure) of the schemas and even the
abstractions, consequent to the schemas; and later a use of
these compiled constructions not in their implementation, but
in treating them as starting points. All these have been
stated and argued for; yet this section is a necessary
gathering together of these arguments.
A Summing-Up

Let me briefly sum up what has gone into this part of section one till now. The intrusion of the subject and the moment are inevitable in any languaging - meaning-making process. 1. Constitution (structuring which involves deliberateness rather than the existence of the objective per se), 2. immediacy of constitution (every circumstance under which constitution takes place as being new), 3. non-implementational and hence a peripheral status of the pre-constituted core and 4. the mingling of the subjective in the constituted norm of the moment (i.e., meanings are 'common' and personal to me at the same time; the creation of a new meaning which is not sheer compliance/saying the same thing but saying things that are unique to the moment and to me as one of the contributing interlocutors of the moment and in the fact of these uniquenesses being carried into the core as the burden, as the schematic part of it) are four notions propounded so far.

3.4 Negotiation and Exploitation in Language Use

Methodologically the constitution of the tentative (potentially changeable) norm, is through seeking an adjustment between the 'given' and the circumstances of the execution. This is true for the child and the adult both
seen as seeking accomplishment of a meaning intention. This is an oblique acknowledgement of the gap which exists between intention existing as plan/given and the executed.

This seeking an adjustment is characterised by the process of negotiation (i.e., employment of a certain variety of procedures geared towards effecting an adjustment) which leads to the 'new' norm. Thus the act of negotiation with all its implications of the creation of new norm in any meaning-making effort is, I claim, descriptively true. This is not a recommendation for effective communication. To repeat, this is a description of what happens in any act of communication, languaging or meaning-making. Here is the first version of the figure of interactive creation that I propose to suggest.

---

**Fig. 3.** The process of languaging — a tentative model

- The Given (the 'old' norm)
- Circumstances of Execution
- Procedures of negotiation/exploitation
- The Executed (the 'new' norm)
3.4.1 Exploitation - A Clearer Conceptualisation

To the notion of negotiation, I will add here the notion of exploitation. Exploitation is an inseparable other-side-of-the-coin feature of negotiation. The fact of languaging as meaning seeking and for ever involving the process of negotiation in establishing a (tentative) meaning followed to its logical conclusion indicates the inherent process of pushing the boundaries of the norm to their maximum to make them yield totally new and radically different as against the 'repaired' (albeit--new) realities or norms.

Within my model all that is needed for this is a maximum possible tilt towards message exploration with the minimum possible connection or affiliation or a mere gesture towards its contextual moorings. What I am saying is when the function of language is more of a referential nature and inclined towards the context, the other subjectivities in languaging become crucial, or relatively crucial, and the process of languaging is more towards complying, towards institutionalising meanings. Even there, we noticed that the 'same' meanings do not remain or are not reiterated; the norm changes. The process employed during this process of languaging is the process of negotiation. Such strategies of negotiation are one thing. On the other hand, when the tilt is more towards message orientation, when the function
of a particular act of languaging is poetic, when the inclination is not towards context so much as in the first case, I choose to call the strategies or procedures employed, the procedures of exploitation. This is for a valid reason.

In this case, the other subjectivities in languaging, either in the actual physical presence of an interlocutor, or in the form of the structuring principle inherent in any tool use, is not yielded to easily. Rather, the fact of structuring occurring voluntarily and not because of any essentialist truth, or 'rightness' about it, is taken advantage of, by a focussing on the wealth of pre-suppositions that lies behind what is actually said. Thus the signifieds are proliferated and different 'values' assigned to the signifiers and further propositions are built up. (Language if we recall Jakobson here, in its poetic use becomes self-conscious.) The willingness to come to an agreement, to constitute commonality is deferred. The important aim is message pursuit, the exploration of an 'elusive' meaning intention.

The strategies of exploitation, however, are based on the same basic principle as those of negotiation, i.e., 'constitution' or 'ascripting' of meaning, which enables changeableness of norm. The exploitation strategies pay more attention to aspects of this feature of language, and
proliferate meanings by foregrounding what has not yet been spelt out in the wealth of pre-suppositions behind the common core, i.e., what has been said. The motive or the source is the same for negotiation and exploitation. The only difference is, that while the former's (ultimate) objective is to proceed to establish a common core meaning, because there is the shiftingness underlying the language act, in the latter its objective is to create deliberately new worlds because there is shiftingness underlying the language act ... the function of 'because' is different. In the latter case, the because is taken to be an invitation to create.

Some Qualifications to the Notion of Exploitative use of Language

The problem in such message exploration is (having/how) to bring about richness of possibilities through a 'structuring' tool like language, which not only ascribes and so leaves room for other attempts, (such as the current one) but also reduces and reduces to institutionalise meanings.

While negotiative strategies are for voluntary adjustment of the given (my personal meaning plus social other meanings) in the new circumstance, in a major way accommodating another subject, and a resultant changed norm, the exploitative
strategies use the voluntariness involved (if my compliance is voluntary compliance, by the same token, I can choose to withdraw my willingness and decide to strike out on my own). However, this has to be done with the whole background of languaging. Because of the nature of the tool, language, at no stage can any new meaning totally be fulfilled (as it is in and through language that I seek fulfilment) every time I language, I attempt a fulfilment, and only in and through language again.

The orientation of the new meaning ('my' meaning) towards not pragmatic co-operation but mathetic exploration, i.e., without regard to the other's meaning, motivates me to discard the usual plan geared towards reconciliation and create a new plan and attempt its execution but since the new execution has to be contained in language (this is structuring or pruning which the two major devices selection and combination used by a symbolic tool make imperative or falling into established meanings as the law of symbolic tool use) to that extent again, I have to make the plan of only within the laws/structuring or using only the devices used by this tool (i.e., one sense located in time etc.).

The Interactive (Core) Creation of the Moment of Execution

I shall now extend figure 3, which was the beginning version of the figure of "Interactive Creation" I was proposing
to set up, and present this fuller picture of the creative process.

Fig. 4. Interactive (core) Creation of the Moment of Execution.
Key:

\[ \square \square \] = very 'low' influence.

\( A \) = My 'new' configuration of semantic space derived from the 'pockets' of varied configurations already accumulated. See Note Chapter I and Chapter II.

\( B-1 \) = 'Given' brought to bear upon circumstances of execution.

\( B-2 \) = The circumstances of execution using Given as reference-point.

\( B-3 \) = 'Negotiation' strategies employed towards execution of meaning.

\( C \) = 'Exploitation' strategies employed towards execution of meaning.

\( D-1 \) = 'Given' as weak reference-point in execution.

\( D-2 \) = No one-to-one-correspondence between the given and the executed in languaging.

\( I \) = Pragmatic Meaning-Pursuit - The high influence of the 'other' -- negotiation strategies employed.

\( II \) = Mathetic-poetic meaning-pursuit - the 'low' influence of the 'other'; My 'new' configuration of semantic space taking over to a great extent and acting as the main 'Plan' for execution of 'new' meaning.

(Yet this being a product of Given -- see 'A' -- which is itself a mixture of the personal and the public, this new plan and its execution bound by laws of 'structuring')

* (See also Figure 'Competence', 'Capacity' and the 'New Circumstances of Use' in Chapter II)
Leaving the figure to speak for itself, I would merely like to re-state here that these two terms, negotiation and exploitation, are basically the same. They are not two different entities, mutually exclusive; rather they are the two ends of a cline.

3.4.2 The Cline of Negotiation - Exploitation

As a preliminary to a discussion of the nature of this cline, let me explain in more detail the notions of the poetic and referential functions I have already referred to, since it is the nature of meaning-seeking manifested in the extent of its commitment to context that influences the choice of the procedures/strategies used as belonging either to the cadre of negotiation or exploitation.

The Notions of the Pragmatic and the Mathetic in Language Use

Every instance of language use as I have already noted has the two major functions of referentiality or poeticality (pragmatic function or mathetic function) besides a few others in between but not quite relevant here.
I would like to arrange these two functions (firstly)
along a cline, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic-Mathetic</th>
<th>Meaning-Seekings</th>
<th>Associated (CN - PM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a.

I have already shown that all language use are an
intermingling of several functions (see Chapter II)
and that when the language user's orientation is more towards
context, the referential function predominates and when it
is towards message it is the poetic function which predomi-
nates. I extend the characteristics of referential function
to include and be replaced by the pragmatic function. While
the concentration is on the pragmatic interpersonal lines,
the context of the situation, inclusive of the interlocutor
has to be deferred to. And hence the focus is more on
agreement on a common meaning rather than a single-minded pursuit of the message. Thus the pragmatic function would use negotiative strategies to arrive at approximative yet common or common albeit approximative meanings. As the orientation towards context loosens and moves towards more of a message focus and poetic function, the strategies evince more exploitation of the languageness of language, the principle of creation, implicit in its ascriptional nature. Thus,

![Diagram]

Cline of Degrees of Negotiation and Associated Pragmatic–Mathetic Meaning-Seekings (CN–PM)

b. pragmatic (less readiness; more negotiation) mathetic (lesser readiness; more negotiation/exploitation)

(as seen above in the figure)

At this stage, it seems more appropriate to replace poetic with mathetic; the reason is not just whimsical or seeking a terminological consistency— with mathetic going down better with pragmatic. This becomes clearer presently as along with this terminological replacement I initiate one conceptual addition to the cline itself.
In a languaging situation, the more readiness there is to agree, there is less negotiation, i.e., attempt at building. Conversely, the less the readiness to agree (the feeling that you want to pursue a message which message is not yet fully captured) the more the negotiation - the prolonged attempt to build a common meaning to include as much of your intention as possible. This neatly brings in the notion of the phatic function in communication, when the motivation is for establishing contact (see/on Sapir in Chapter II), and hence no elaborate building of bridges to fill in the gaps between schemas and situations or when any amount of clarity of message attempted. In fact, the negotiation here is minimal to the extent of almost not being there. This notion provides an interesting extension and dimension to the cline. And now for more reasons than just to balance the extension on the other side (but to show the degrees of negotiation) I replace 'poetic' with 'mathetic' and beyond the 'mathetic' the 'poetic' is re-introduced this time to show a higher degree of negotiation (and becoming exploitation). Thus while pragmatic and mathetic as two points provide the broad differentiation of more readiness and less negotiation, less readiness and so more negotiation, the extension of the line on either side (to phatic on the pragmatic end, and poetic on the mathetic end) provides
for subtler degrees of adjustment and negotiation, and creation and exploitation.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic - Mathetic Meaning - Seekings (CN - PM) - Fig. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(more readiness; less negotiation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 The 'Creation of the Core' and the Degrees of Meaning-Exploration - A Review

I have attempted to condense the mainstay of my argument on languaging in figures of 'the creation of the core in moment of execution' and 'the degrees of meaning-exploration and associated negotiation and exploitation strategies'.

I have postulated: meaning as a (fresh) creation in interaction, thus mitigating the value of pre-accumulated meaning core; meaning as having a wide range and there being an employment of a wide range of strategies in its pursuit; and finally, I have hinted at the need for the existence of a pursuit of such a wide range of meaning if there is to be a constant employment of a varied range of strategies and such practice strategy use should be recognised as the
most important factor of language use (with the actual resultant core and its accumulation with its mitigated value) if there is to be any highlighting of the inherent creativity in languaging/meaning-making.

Again, importantly, these two figures not only represent normal use or normal languaging but they also reflect the process of initial language(ing) acquisition itself, i.e., they are true of the experienced-in-languaging caretaker and the learning child.

3.6 The Translation of the Model into a Language Teaching Syllabus

This last is significant in a teaching situation where there is a certain relationship between the experienced caretaker-teacher, the former's role as the more concerned for the other's growth, since it is the latter who relatively more importantly, is to engage in meaning-seeking as a beginner. It is to such a 'teaching' situation that I now turn, armed with the language model mainly realised in the two figures with the underlying implication about the core, employment of strategies in meaning pursuit, personal investment in core creation etc.
The questions which I shall ask in this context, obviously are syllabus questions: for a start, let us say, the attitude and responsibilities of the teacher-caretaker and the learner respectively, and the consequent methodology to be followed in the teaching act, and the content in the teaching situation - what forms the 'subject' to be taught. In other words, any act of teaching suggests a content plan and a teacher-learner behaviour plan brought into the classroom from the outside. How do such plans fare in my model?

3.6.1 **Teacher-Pupil Roles - Methodological Issues**

Let me briefly answer the question of respective responsibilities and roles. The teacher, since there is no standard core to dispense, has no special status as a dispenser. He/She herself/himself (whenever I refer to a teacher, learner etc., I use the He/She herself/himself etc., convention in pronoun-use. But when I feel it becomes cumbersome, I stick to one pronoun--'she' whether the reference is to teacher, learner, caretaker, child and so on.) is in pursuit of meaning as a genuine interlocutor in an interactive situation. In this sense there is no 'plan' (meaning or language) that she brings into the classroom to implement. A tentative 'core' is brought in readiness for interaction with the situation - the actual classroom. In
this interaction the teacher mobilises strategies herself to create 'meaning' in co-operation.

Coming to the learner - as the teacher is no dispenser the learner is no receiver. She is an interlocutor herself - seeking meanings. A particular meaning-intention is brought into contact with immediate circumstances of execution. In this what she sets in motion are strategies for realising meanings - pragmatic or mathetic; in the former case building-up a common meaning with an equal investment of the subject and the accommodation of the 'other', and in the latter case, concentrating on fulfilling a higher percentage of the investment of the personal.

Yet the nature of the teacher-learner relationship is such that it is the learner who is to be allowed the freedom of the active meaning-seeker, i.e., given the opportunity to either pragmatic meaning-seek or mathetic meaning-seek. In all, be the initiator of the interaction. This makes the teacher defer his/her own (active) meaning-seeking and give way to the learner's initiation.

Such a giving in to the learner's meanings is not because the learner's is the tyrannical rule in the classroom; more because by a too hasty bringing in of the deference to an interlocutor and the given (in the form of the teacher)
in communication, the teacher could be damming the spontaneous negotiation that is happening - the learner's attempt at finding procedures to give shape to her meaning intentions of the moment and through that the practice of or accumulation of strategies or procedures (which form part of the System and are invaluable as the uniqueness elements of the System) and focussing of the share in assignment of a 'final' meaning (even) if it is ultimately pragmatic meaning; or exploitation (towards proliferating the signifieds) when the learner is attempting articulation to oneself a complex meaning intention and in this 'revelling' in the 'squeezing out' of meaning and new possibilities that open out - in other words, if the learner goes on to pursue mathetic meanings.

In one sense, the teacher is to treat the learners as equal partners, and give them their fair share of responsibilities. In another sense, the teacher is the more experienced partner, and so gives the learner a chance to refine capacity of languaging. (See Chapter II, Section on language acquisition for more on this.) This is the recommended lead-from-behind policy, plus the postulation of languaging as world-creation and hence an integrated world of experiences to interact with, coming into play.
3.6.2 The Teaching Content - A Question of Units for Teaching

Coming to the question of content for teaching, the first point here is that we do not have a language core to be taught. What is important in my scheme is the accumulation and refinement of strategies of negotiation and exploitation. Can we say that one kind of core is being replaced by another - systemic and schematic core by procedures of negotiation? Can these procedures be standardised, categorised and taught?

Let us look at the strategies themselves - what my arguments for them lead me to. Procedures are by definition innovative and changeable - they are immediate and dependent upon the dynamism of the moment. As such, the strategies are not plannable; the choice of strategies, their configurations and sometimes devising of new ones in specific occasions are done at the moment of execution. So the negotiative or the exploitative strategies, I maintain, are constituted in their execution. (The term strategies as I use it from now onwards is inclusive of both negotiating and exploitative strategies and involves the several activities that I have mentioned above, like the choice of strategies, their configurations etc., and when I say strategies are not plannable I mean that all these activities are not plannable.) The strategies employed could be described perhaps, but when any standardisation of them in the form of associating strategies or procedures of
negotiation and exploitation with specific situations and their consequent meaning occurs, then they lose their status as strategies. They become part of the system. They achieve (See Widdowson, especially 1983 in this connectic the status of formulae or rules). It is in this sense that during languaging, i.e., employment of strategies the system gets added to or constructed. Yet other strategies could replace the ones which become part of the system.

This would happen as long as there is the methodological atmosphere (mentioned above as the teacher and learner attitudes and responsibilities) which inspires or encourages the urge to work out meanings, and an atmosphere which accepts the worked-out meanings, instead of attempting to impose an outside static/objective meaning exists. This latter, i.e., the need for an encouragement of non-imposed meaning pursuit for the appearance of strategies is an important point.

The valid aspects of language according to me then, are immediate employment of strategies of meaning-making. These are, as I have said, not fixed and are not plannable. They need for their mobilisation an opportunity for seeking out but or exploring, not static, unique non-imposed individualistic or personal meanings.
Status of a Content Plan in the Model - The 'Plan' for the Teacher

Now let me come to the notion of a syllabus for teaching, the implications of these principles for a syllabus in the sense of a content plan.

The teacher goes into the classroom with a planned set of content. Let us say the aim is roughly, to encourage exploration of meanings in and through the symbolic tool of language. The form that content specification would take is the issue. In whatever form the content is, i.e., structures (the systemic abstracted side of a System, which in itself is a part of a tentative meaning intention in my scheme) or functions, experiences, discourse or rhetorical maxims, in my terminology pre-association of meanings and strategies (which correspond more or less with Widdowson's schematic part of the System) they form only the System, which is, to repeat, only a static analytic construct, meaning in the making rather than meaning made. Such lists, or plans or intentions elevated to the status of articulation, could be made for both the teachers and students.

Let us look at the part of the plan in the form of the list of components of the system for the teacher first. Only through an employment of strategies of either negotiation or exploitation can such a list become relevant or alive, and
in that moment of being brought alive, it will be in either case, something different, having taken on features that the moment of execution alone could bring forth. Thus the meanings sought by the teacher and 'finally' worked out, are dependent upon the situation and the interlocutors in the situation, namely, the learners. However pre-determined the meanings are, in the end the meanings to become an actualised fact of accomplishment, needs negotiation and the actualised meaning might correspond with the pre-selected meaning (which is only an intention) more or less and the strategies and the systemic part of the System abstracted from this accomplished meaning, would be the result of the immediate situation and different from the pre-planned ones. At least a minimum amount of adjustment to the situation is called for. Thus no act of communication including teaching (which is the teacher interacting with learners in the act of explanation or exposition of a lesson - in the sheer pragmatic sense, see Note 6) implements meanings. Thus the list of structures, (the formal systemic aspect) (function rules) or, the formulaic schemas, which are the combination of associated pre-selected situation, meanings and strategies, could change.
The 'Plan' for the Learner

Before I comment upon the extent of this change, let us look at the plan for learners that has been prepared by the teacher.

These, obviously, the teacher might hope for, anticipate a certain trend about, but not plan or predict. This is the point about the language model I have set up. For one thing, I have shown how in a learning situation, the initiative about the selection of interest area is left to the learners and the teacher adopts a 'lead-from-behind' policy. In other words, the goal is for the learner to build a core by exercising her capacity, more than for the teacher to explore meanings. Hence, the learner(s) in keeping with the principle of wanting to pursue meanings and build up a world-view (and accommodate himself/herself into it with all the limitations that the situation imposes and makes him/her seek conformity) might be choosing and employing strategies of negotiations or exploitation with regard to whatever the meaning intention is, contained in whatever form he or she possesses. In this act of languaging, the process of construction of or constitution of meaning is activated. Whatever 'meaning' is constituted in languaging, this constituted meaning forms his/her system - the schematic and the systemic part potentially changeable, in another
moment of meaning-making. And so, the minimal adjustment in terms of negotiation that the teacher expects to realise her pre-determined schemas (i.e., meanings and associated strategies) for the learner becomes irrelevant when the learner as the active meaning seeking interlocutor just does not demand adjustment of schemas but a more radical change which could throw out not only the teacher's meanings for the learner, but also the teacher's own few pragmatic meanings 'planned' for herself and ask for fresh strategies of interaction from the teacher herself. So what is the status of the plan now?

Instead of spelling it out further, I will draw a more general picture of the language syllabus outside the classroom, and inside the classroom. In my scheme of things, language system (or schemas of formulaic association of meanings and strategies) remains only as a potential composite to be used through negotiation or exploitation. And the actual language or meanings emerge only in the act of employing procedures of negotiation or exploitation. So what is important is the act of negotiation, and not the meanings themselves or the language core as it emerges at the end of an act of languaging or meaning-making, since the value of both is minimal for a syllabus or a plan outside (or before or after) that particular classroom; it does not go beyond its use as a meaning intention for future augmentation within the System for the users.
themselves and the value of the act of employing procedures, lies in the fact of the actual act since this is what makes it innovative and an act of negotiation at all. This model of language we notice, ends up by giving us no content plan whatsoever.

In a language as negotiation/exploitation model there is absolutely no question of teacher giving pre-conceived meanings and associated strategies (i.e., schemas) to the learner. So just on that score of the decisions on methodology syllabus content has to be constituted in the act of execution. The methodology of lead-from-behind, i.e., allowing the moment's interest of the learner to create meanings for learners also makes content in a syllabus unpre-determinable.

I shall not labour this point any further - this comes in for discussion often enough from now onwards directly and indirectly, and in great detail in Chapters IV and VI. (Especially I have to say certain important things about methodology.)

A Summing Up

Speculating upon an application of the language model very briefly in teaching, then, what emerges is a syllabus which cannot be a syllabus in the sense of a pre-conceived plan of action with a packet of content specified as an
ultimate goal or 'some' content picked out as objectives for the class. This cancels out not only any amount of detailed finality about the goal and objectives but also certainty and clarity about 'what' (items) to be taught. Apart from a general goal of wanting to make the learner create a core for herself (what we can call encouragement of use of language as a tool) there cannot be a well drawn-out plan for covering ground for the teacher.

And the model also suggests (only) an overall plan as regards methodology. I should like to reiterate that it is only an overall plan of allowing freedom to the learner.

3.7 The Language Model and its Paradigmatic Implications

At this stage, after I have shown how a syllabus in its plannability looks uncertain, I would like to introduce a second line to the main argument on languaging that I have been proposing. As I have been expounding my languaging model, there have been occasional references to the basic tenet of there being no one universal core having paradigmatic overtones. That is, I have been maintaining that it is not only a language core, that I have been discussing, when I talked of core creativity/dynamism.

These overtones can be picked up for an examination of any activity, to focus on its inherent creativity. I would,
then, like to apply the principles which make languaging an act of interactive creation to our current preoccupation of syllabuses and teaching. In one sentence, this would result in syllabus-making becoming a creative process and a syllabus a dynamic changeable core. I shall expand on this now.

For an expansion, however, we need once again to focus on the salient points of creativity. I have summed these up at different points from different perspectives, resulting in different configurations appropriate to the current discussion. I will do a quick run-through with the main points once again now, this time with a view to demonstrating how syllabus as the core (as against language which has been my pre-occupation till now) looks like in the light of principles of core dynamism.

I have argued so far stating that in my scheme there is no one core (language or meaning or knowledge) for all times; any core of one moment as 'one' interpretation (of reality) is tentative and potentially changeable; such a core is constructed through employment of procedures of negotiation or exploitation; such a process once again of use, which is an explorative process of construction seems to me more relevant and descriptively true of any human act. Underlying all these is the principle of structuring and the consequent principle of non-essentiality of meaning - i.e., meanings constructed do not reflect One Truth or One Objective Reality.
All meanings are constructed meanings and hence open to plurality.

3.7.1 **Syllabus as Interactive Creation of the Moment**

An attempt to draw parallels to these in the process of syllabus-making yield the following:

There is no syllabus which reflects the set goal and becomes The Syllabus. Any syllabus (and the inherent interpretation of a goal) gets constituted in syllabus making. There is no syllabus outside a syllabus statement and all syllabus statements are in actual fact, syllabus-statement making - a process.

In other words, the goal, i.e., of language proficiency or using of language as a tool is not achieved by A syllabus. It is not contained in one monolithic syllabus. A syllabus statement (with its stated objectives, content and method) when implemented is not the One syllabus (with the goal of language as a tool incorporated into it). (See the parallel between language implemented not being The Knowledge or Meaning a 'pure' reflection of reality.)

A syllabus (the parallel here is Meaning) itself is constituted in the moment of execution, i.e., in the moment of syllabus statement making (the parallel here being
languaging). Thus a syllabus statement is a syllabus for all practical purposes. (Meaning is constituted in and through the language that incorporates it and vice versa.) Yet since the syllabus statement presumes more than it says, (the nature of the symbolic tool, being one of signification) the aspects of the goal left out in its saying provide the scope (and urge) to re-interpret (through negotiation or exploitation procedures) goals along the three dimensions of objectives, content and methodology. In other words, the syllabus and syllabus-statement (meaning and the constitutive language core) are tentative and re-interpretable. The conception of the core side of the syllabus and syllabus statement in its objectives content and methodology is only a static analytic construct which has to be 'realised' as a syllabus for the moment through the act/process of syllabus making; the syllabus statement has to be realised as such only in the act of syllabus (statement) making.

Language Model of Meaning-Making - Parallel Notions in Syllabus Creation

Here, my conceptualisation asks for making the syllabus statement and syllabus the parallels of language and meaning respectively; and as language (mis)viewed as a core is only the systemic and schematic side of competence so the syllabus statement viewed as unequivocal statement about objectives (0)
Content (C) and Methodology (M) is only the 'Plan-intended'. As actual languaging has to be engaged in to make the language core, likewise syllabus (statement) making has to be engaged in for creating the O C and M; or as meaning making has to be engaged in to make meanings, likewise syllabus making has to be engaged in to make the syllabus. The syllabus statement and syllabus (language and meaning) again are tentative and changeable and created by the several interlocutors in the situation (in a major way the teacher and the learners).

3.7.2 Pre-Specification and Creativity in Syllabus-Making - A Brief 'Aside'

It should be remembered here however that it is only a conceptualisation of what I have called simply, for a goal of language used as a tool (with all the implications it carries) that a syllabus-plurality and tentativity is released. Does this mean then that any other goal (such as language as grammar construction) denies this kind of freedom of interpretation and according to me, creativity to the moment of execution?

The primary assumption in the latter kind of goal being a standard core to be taught - directly or indirectly makes a plan plannable.

Apart from other implications, very generally the whole model seems to hinge on this question of pre-specification, since a plan or a syllabus implies predominantly, this feature.
Pre-specification, an outside the classroom factor is closely connected to the status of the 'inside' factor, of the classroom, composition of learners and teachers.

And this triggers off a chain reaction - a closer look at other issues involved here, of points such as, moment of execution, interlocutors in the execution of the syllabus (as against planning), process of execution etc.

Such issues in their turn involve a discussion of non-pre-specification in relation to traditional syllabuses and traditional notions of goals of language classroom, in order to spotlight the qualitative difference in a syllabus with a language goal of the dynamic norm. There are other related issues too in need of clarification and discussion.

However these I reserve for the fourth chapter mainly and pick them up for more clarification and discussion there.

Now, going to the second section below, I shall continue looking at my language model in relation to a language syllabus as on its own and adding more arguments towards its building up.
3.8 Paradigm of Interactive Creation of the Moment - Certain Analogical Parallels from Writings in General Curriculum Design

In this, I shall take a look at certain interesting arguments in the area of general curriculum design and curriculum making; they afford useful parallels to the arguments I have been attempting to present coherently at the level of a paradigm of interactive creation of the moment.

3.8.1 Pre- and Post-Specification of Objectives in Curriculum Evaluation - Parlett

Seeking a 'social anthropological' paradigm counter to an 'agricultural botany' one, post-specification of objectives as against pre-specification, an interpretative model of evaluation rather than a testing one, Parlett (1975) comes out with several interesting observations about the nature of the latter category. Evaluation viewed as testing makes the initial demand for clear unequivocal pre-specification of objectives for a programme. This is unrealistic for several reasons - two of them being: 1) language is so imprecise that objectives are too generalised and diffused or too detailed; 2) "actions speak louder than statements of intent." The first defect of this unrealistic pre-specification, the defect of generalisability, results in over-simplification,
a concern with aggregate rather than individual data, deviation from the mean, a natural tendency to make the best of it; to take and use the best available list of objectives as a sort of lowest common denominator; or a tendency to relentlessly pursue a course which leads to a verbal formula that everyone appears to agree upon. In all, the paradigm forces people to over-simplify to the extent of rendering the data meaningless. And all this in the name of objectivity, reliability and the virtues of quantitative and value-free data. In this anxiety what it seems to ignore is the actual field. In any such a paradigm we are faced with the issue of the existent richness of specific single instances and the denudation of this richness in the name of scientism.

The second defect is the non-recognition of the deficiencies of articulation. No teacher has a clear before-the-act-idea about what is going to happen. Intentions by definition are tentative 'mean to do' phenomena and are not actually executed acts. Thus "... beforehand no one has more than a hazy idea of the way in which a new scheme will develop. Even with prior experience to draw on, there are still unpredictable elements relating to individual teachers and class and their inter-reactions (sic.) together" (Parlett, op.cit.:419).
Parlett goes to the extent of saying that the changes demanded by unique classrooms might spark off "major tactical changes" to the extent that the teachers (in an imaginary situation that he describes) might actually feel embarrassed when they are confronted with their objective statements and asked to measure/evaluate programmes in the light of these pre-set objectives. These objectives might have become totally irrelevant - the actual situation having given rise to other questions and problems. Yet tests are conducted and results computed willy-nilly in relation to the objectives.

A programme conducted in this way is considered within the best 'scientific' paradigm.

What has happened (in action) in the classroom is overlooked in favour of what has been 'objectively' pre-specified. Intentions occupy the centre-field as executed to the exclusion of the actions (see quote above). The untidiness of the classroom, with its hidden curriculum, and multidimensionality is not taken into consideration.

A model which does not fall into such bare generalisations but retains the 'untidiness' and a model which does not ignore the crucial classroom context has to depend not on pre-specifications of problems or objectives but a post-specification of them. "Research should not stem from objectives; objectives
should stem from research" (ibid.:423). Parlett elsewhere (1972) (in association with Hamilton) develops the notion of 'illuminative research' - where research problems emerge from research - as against pre-specification of variables, control of variables before the 'treatment' etc. A researcher engaged in this would "have framed only general research concerns, in chapter heading terms; and nothing like the orderly research design of his counterpart in the other paradigm" (Parlett, 1975:421).

Such attempts to illuminate issues arising from executed programmes, rather than attempt to 'test' programmes, calls for not quantitative test scores but other qualitative models of discussion or descriptions. We turn to these now.

3.8.2 Qualitative Forms of Inquiry in Curriculum Design and Evaluation

Qualitative forms of inquiry in education (not confined only to educational evaluation) as Eisner (1979) points out, "aims to explore and exploit a fundamentally different set of assumptions about the nature of knowledge, than the view that has dominated in education ..."(6) The motives for such methods "eminate" from three sources: 1) political: where there is a desire to 'expose' or unearth inside the classroom, the 'hidden curriculum' which in its turn would pave the way for education which is not indoctrination. This motive
has basically a reformist ring to it. 2) methodological: where, an attempt is made to get a "fuller picture" of what goes on in classrooms, in order to understand it better and which understanding could draw more valid theories; the motive here is not reformist. 3) epistemological: it is this third one which is of most interest here.

Here also the interest veers towards actual classrooms, but in this case, the suspicion about pre-stated objectives and a statement of outcomes in terms of these objectives in the form of 'single scores' would be due to a concern about what this system ratifies as valuable knowledge. Will it be the process, or the objectified product-oriented outcomes - in correspondence with objectives in behavioural terms? In evincing an interest in the former, in the motives behind behaviours the why and what fors of behaviour, a different epistemological value system is hoped to be upheld.

Pre-stated objectives shorn of sensitivity to concrete unique cases in their generic orientation, and single scores about achievement on these objectives, which reiterate these objectives, as test outcomes - leaving out the actual functioning of the programmes in-between, is viewing knowledge as an objective 'core' while a focus on the process in-between seems more of a concern for the accomplishment aspect of an act, and the strategies used for accomplishment, as
epistemologically worthwhile - the core to be implemented and the 'core' acquired stand 'outside' as quantitative constructs. Their peripherality and irrelevance is emphasised by the 'richness' of the specific situation capable of only qualitative expression and placed 'inside' classroom, the quality of the richness decided by the actual moment in which it is constructed.

Reduction vs Richness of Immediate Situations of Use

Thus an emphasis on what happens in classroom, asks for 1) no pre-statement of behavioural objectives; 2) retrospective capturing of what happens inside the particular classroom.

Also importantly, thirdly, is the plea for a language to capture the happening in the classroom. The nature of 'statements' made thus retrospectively is to be descriptive and "expressive" (the term is borrowed from Eisner).

"... what is equally as important as perceiving the qualities that constitute classroom life is the ability to convey these qualities to others. For this to occur the methods used must be artistically critical. The educational critic must be able to create, render, portray, and disclose in such a way that the reader will be able to empathetically participate in the events described. The language of the critic using qualitative method capitalises on the role of emotion ..."

(Eisner, op.cit.:7)
What is seen as harmful here, as in Parlett's criticism of the agriculture-botany paradigm is the denudation of 'richness' in objectifying data through categorical pre-statements and scientific testing. "Rather than reduce the human mind to a single score, qualitative inquiries attempt to adumbrate its complexities, its potential, and its idiosyncracies" (ibid.:9).

No reductionist plan and no reductionist activity of testing (confirmations) of the plan is acceptable. The points here are: a) any 'core' is arrived through reduction or idealisation (see Widdowson's contrast between analytic models and user's model. Also my thesis that language code is conceptualised/conventionalised common meanings); b) A whole lot of implications echo through this rejection of generalisations. A rejection of the concept of action seen as rule implementation - and hence transmission; the importance of the concrete moment of realisation, the dynamism involved in accomplishment - mode of accomplishment as valuable. If anything is to be captured it is this as a post-hoc description.

Even this description, however, cannot be used as objective for all situations or another situation - since this is a description with the idiosyncracies of that particular class and set of students (as much as possible) intact, and this will have to be replaced by the idiosyncracies of another class, (another moment, another teacher
and another set of students). And it is the factor of the as much as possible which makes other descriptions of the same class also possible.

3.8.3 Theory as Reductionist: Joseph Schwab

It is this reducing tendency of theory which Joseph Schwab (1969, 1971 and 1973) picks out as demanding an "imaginative" filling-up (Eisner's term again) by the practitioner. (The imaginative filling-up is crucial. I shall come to this presently, when I discuss art and the curriculum.)

To come to Schwab and his statement about theories:

"All theories, even the best of them in the simplest sciences, necessarily neglect some aspects and facets of the facts of the case. A theory covers and formulates the regularities among the things and events it subsumes. It abstracts a general, or ideal case."

(Joseph Schwab, 1969:11)

It not only leaves behind "the non-uniformities, the particularities which characterise each concrete instance of the facts subsumed" it also often "leaves out of consideration conspicuous facts of all cases because its substantive principles of enquiry or its methods cannot handle them" (Ibid.).

Yet since curriculum is brought to bear upon not abstract idealised situations but concrete ones with all their
specificities and particularities intact - no theory really helps such cases since theory is silent on crucial particularities. They blur crucial differences among concrete cases and so stand incomplete as against the complete situations.

The differences of concrete curriculum situations are differences engendered by their not being an archetypal situation but unique ones with their unique "locus in time and space with smells and shadows, seats and conditions outside its walls which may have much to do with what is achieved inside" (ibid.:12). And the differences pertain to the unique child (as against the generic child) in such unique situations and the unique teacher.

The argument that the general since it is derived from particulars has to basically include the particular does not hold quite well since the "omissions affect what remains" (emphasis mine).

"The specific not only adds to the generic, it also modulates it" (Ibid. - emphasis mine). Hence the generic is not only an incomplete construct it is a 'false' distorted construct if taken up for an implementation in specific situations. By a simple making the theory comprehensible it cannot be corrected, either. The practical is ineluctably concrete and particular, while the strength of theory lies in its generality, system and economy.
Dynamisation of Theory

Hence the theory has to be made something else — to make it useful in the context of curriculum. Like the procedures or strategies of negotiation or processes of accomplishment which make the static System in language come alive in modifications and/or changes wrought to it during the search for particular meanings, likewise theories need methods to search and pick out the particularities of each practical context. The methods enabling the search would be guided by resources richer than any that theory can afford. Theory thus without being presumptuous acknowledges its (limited) role and in this changed role and status, it becomes a framework which does not demand implementation and which enables creative mobilisation of the methods of filling in. Theory can be substituted for the term plan or vice versa. Since a plan is a generic construct it can only act as a framework which actively invites creativity (see Michael Breen discussed below). Schwab calls the methods the arts of the practical.

Yet, Schwab makes this important point, that these methods by which these ends are effected, cannot be made into generally applicable rules. "Rather in each instance of their application, they must be modified and adjusted to the case in hand" (1971:495). Hence Schwab calls them the arts.
Note the parallel between these methods that have to bring curriculum theory alive in curriculum execution and the other kinds of 'procedures' (in language use) we have been discussing.

The source of these methods, being the moment of execution, they are made thereby, innovative and peculiar to the situation. They create and add to and modify the core, i.e., theory. At the moment of the theory's practical application then there is the 'richness' present in its deference to the moment's idiosyncratic demands; through the 'arts' (procedures employed) "we discover and take practical account of the disparities and limited perspective which a theory imposes on its subject," and create a core (theory here seems conceptually confusing) for the moment.

I will end this section with a rather longish quotation from Schwab appealing for the arts of the practical to dynamise theory in practice.

"The stuff of theory is abstract or idealised representations of real things. But curriculum in action treats real things: real acts, real teachers, real children, things richer and different from their theoretical representations. Curriculum will deal badly with its real things if it treats them merely as replicas of their theoretic representations. If, then, theory is to be used well in the determination of curricular practice, it requires a supplement. It requires
arts which bring a theory to its application: first, arts which identify the disparities between real thing and theoretic representation; second, arts which modify the theory in the course of its application, in the light of the discrepancies; and third, arts which devise ways of taking account of the many aspects of the real thing which the theory does not take into account."

(Joseph Schwab, 1969:12)

I shall leave Schwab here and come back to a more detailed analysis of the parallel between Schwab's theory and the arts of the practical and my model further below.

3.8.4 Curriculum and the Aesthetic Arts - An Analogy

Now before I turn to one more point besides uniqueness, richness, immediacy of the actual concrete context which asks for a concentration on matters of execution (arts of the practical) rather than a priori or generalised core(s) and a 'language' expressive enough to describe the particular context of execution rather than reduce the context to a regularised (and hence shorn of the 'colour' that particularity lends to it) generality, I would like to talk about an interesting current trend in curriculum conceptualisation - viz., its resort to the arts and the aesthetic for model-making in the field.
The aesthetic affords a "more sensitive mode of discourse" (Maclure as quoted by Oram, 1979) with fewer gestures to spurious scientism and more room for keeping the issue high on value expressions. Secondly the aesthetic approach is sensitive to the particular rather than the general, and gives importance to the context. We have discussed the implications of this at length so I will not further elaborate on this in this context. Thirdly, the language of the aesthetic conveys more intensity and immediacy. The "moment of knowing" is considered all important. Fourthly and finally the "quality of art as the experience of a moment of consummation" or the aesthetic moment as that moment "when a sense of unrealised but realisable possibilities floods our consciousness ..." (Oram, 1979:40-41) makes for the retention of richness in the act.

Thus it is the quality of the experience realised in its language, in its conveyance or making possible a sense of a special intensity and immediacy in its creation of multifaceted levels of interactions, the experience of the moment of consummation made available, and finally the focus on the unique singularity of cases that make the aesthetic a favourite field for emulation for curriculum conceptualisation of the kind that accepts the concrete unique.
Drama as an Art Form and the Curriculum: Rex Oram

One such derivation from aesthetic models is Rex Oram's (op.cit.) analogy between drama and the curriculum. Oram, however, contributes an extra dimension to the advantages that the aesthetic models offer.

This is my next point too:

Oram proposes to treat curriculum not only as an aesthetic object - with all its implications of rejection of value, neutrality, generalisibility and acceptance of expressive qualitative dimensions - but also as an aesthetic phenomenon in action. This leads to a recognition that "curriculum is not art object but art activity, and might best be viewed in terms of music or drama" (Oram, op.cit.:41).

The important fact that stands focussed here is that curriculum along its artistic aspects, has to be viewed in terms of "human action in social settings." Oram seeks a "register for curriculum discourse based both on the arts and on human action in a social setting." To me, this attempt seems to contribute the fourth factor to the nature of curriculum - i.e., curriculum as an interactive process of building up of interpretation, of the additional feature of the individual interlocutors in action - i.e., interlocutors responding to the concrete situation and creating something out of these human (interactive) tensions.
Curriculum, to recapitulate, is not ruled by a priori objective statements and testing of these objectives and expressing them in test scores after the event.

The unique context is worthy of scrutiny on its own (and a post-context description of the employed strategies might be descriptively valid).

What is of value however are not pre-specified objectives and outcome statements or even descriptions after the event for more comprehensive capturing of objectives purposes, but the actual employment of mobilisation strategies within a context - and the creation of a specific curriculum in and for the specific context.

The specificity of the context - the employment of mobilisation strategies in the context and the creation of the curriculum in and for the context, underlying all these, is the 'action' of the interlocutors involved in the context. This implied factor is brought out for focussing in Oram's treatment of curriculum as action-oriented and a 'creation' born out of interactive tensions of the human interlocutors.

The Metaphor Applied

The metaphor, as stated already, for Oram is the drama. Let us look at the co-opted creative process that drama itself
functions as. Drama in the first place "does not have objectives in any hierarchical order, but it does have coherence - a line of intention" (Oram, op.cit.:45). Or it could be just "perspective, a distinct path related to the over-arching purpose" (Ibid). The actual meanings which flesh out this line of intention objectives are not the author's meanings pre-specified in the drama. As the line of intention is not a final unequivocal one but just a perspective, a part related to the overarching purpose, actual meanings have to emerge as interpretations from this author's script which is nothing more than a framework, "by the producer, the actor, and reinterpreted by the audience." Note the several interlocutors in the situation of meaning making, and the possibility of plural interpretations, as the chemistry of the different combination of these interlocutors works.

This is the first point.

Secondly, the meanings exist in a pattern of relationships among the characters and the events portrayed (see Chapter I - the differential meanings in language) and then are not stated explicitly, but emerge in particular action (as Parlett, discussed above, says, actions speak louder than statements of intentions). The meaning that matters is
the meaning of the current treatment of the characters and the events.

The next two points, i.e., drama generating its meaning in the several tensions between the action and interactions created (this point providing for intensity and immediacy of meanings) and its impact as the impact of the moment a general cooperativity (from all the participants) and as experienced consummation of emotions make Oram's metaphor fit snugly into the four-fold advantages of aesthetic models as enumerated earlier: the drama is an aesthetic model fulfilling all the conditions.

Let me explain the way drama as an example from the aesthetic art and as an analogy to curriculum in action operates:

The value-sensitive 'language' or discourse of the arts is seen in description of the objective (the meaning intended) of a drama as a line of intention which is a perspective which relates to the over-all purpose of the dramatist; and in the description of the 'act' as the enactment which progresses in and through the tensions of interpretations created by the several participants of the action and the meanings as negotiations and re-negotiations which emerge plurally.
This is the first characteristic of (this) art.

And curriculum is seen to function thus - with a line of intention objective negotiated and re-negotiated by the participants in the moment of enactment - and the tensions producing a plural and differential meaning of the moment.

The second feature dealing in singularities and particularities does not need comment here. A drama has several unique enactments - and each one is 'true' in its own terms; and likewise curricula operating in unique particular classroom.

Thirdly, the immediacy and intensity of conveyance of experience demanded of artistic action is true once again of drama (and the curriculum) in its dynamic progress of action accelerated by the constant human tensions present.

Finally, both drama and curriculum achieve artistic consummation in the 'shared experience' of the interlocutors in the moment of execution.

"The application to curriculum suggests that curriculum enactment should be an aesthetic experience, the quality of which will depend upon the way curriculum is recreated in its enactment setting. A 'happy atmosphere' thus understood, will indeed be a legitimate educational aim."

(Oram, op.cit., 47)
What is most interesting here is not only the elaboration of the analogy that Oram draws between these briefly summarised characteristics of the drama, an action-oriented aesthetic experience and curriculum with reference to its objectives, classroom and participants, but also the paradigmatic implications of such an analogy. To start with one example of such an implication:

The status of meaning-intended, is at best contributory and at worst peripheral and negligible.

"Arguably, intentions are of no consequence whatever ... It is the relationships rather than the content, the content-in-action which gives the quality of curriculum experience."

(ibid.: 48)

What is the script (of the drama and the curriculum) is only a meaning potential and it is ripe for a) several interpretations; b) coopted interpretations; c) in the moment and in the setting of its d) enactment. This is the basic framework for viewing curriculum, not "as art object, but as enacted drama."

Within this framework Oram elaborates the analogy with the help of diagram developed by Styan about the interactively enacted drama. I will not go into a discussion of this with any amount of detail. I shall instead present the evolved
diagram that Styan presents and let it speak for itself: the analogical implications with curriculum are obvious. See my diagram below about curriculum theory - curriculum-making/maker, teachers and learners in the classroom; theory - curriculum and teaching.

![Diagram of Styan's Model of the Drama]

Fig. 8. Styan's Model of the Drama

However, I will present a few insightful remarks from Styan (1960) (as quoted by Oram) to draw attention to the parallels I am interested in further below:

Thus Styan asserts that "the study of the drama is the study of how the stage compels its audience to be involved in its actual process" (Styan, as quoted in Oram, op.cit.:47).
The script is a "coded pattern of signals to the actor and the performance a further coded pattern of signal to the spectator" (Ibid.)

Thus there are interstices at each stage of handing over and receiving the signals, and it is the fact of these interstices and what exists within them that engenders the "truly mercurial" relationships among the three basic interlocutors in the process. (See the conceptualisation of languaging as the filling up of the interstices or gaps between the said and the unsaid, Chapter I.)

This is a metaphor of curriculum which operates at several levels, with multi-faceted nuances. Let us hear Oram himself on this: He claims that his metaphor "advocates that curriculum be viewed as an irreducibly human activity, of which the focus of attention is people communicating in significant action as individuals and groups in idiosyncratic settings and on unique occasions" (Oram, op.cit.:50). Again, "the enactment metaphor sees curriculum not as a 'structured series of intended learning outcomes' but, like a play, as a series of creations and re-creations" (Ibid). (1) We have the status of intentions, its non-definiteness (not a priori) and (2) its creation and recreation through negotiation and re-negotiation. (3) The importance of the interlocutors
as creators as responsible for a 'new' interpretation through the process of negotiation and re-negotiation. (4) The uniqueness of classroom in terms of location and time.

3.8.5 Derived Implications for a Syllabus Model in Language

The curriculum insights relevant for my model are these four points, and its over-arching epistemological implications - the scoring of the creative capacity over core possession.

Parlett I have indicated in the notion of 'illuminative research' and along with others (like Eisner) in the notion of the value of the qualitative in curriculum enquiry contributes obliquely to certain root-principles in my thesis. Schwab's writing, again, in its critique of the theoretical in curriculum design and his arts of the practical, is supportive of the concrete and the innovative in educational application, and the process as more worthwhile than the generalisations. All such attempts, I pointed out, fall within trends in curriculum to borrow for significant reasons of principles and creation of new paradigms from the aesthetic arts.

Such trends find complete realisation in Oram's analogy between curriculum and the concept of drama in action. This metaphorical analogy, provides Oram with a model of curriculum
as enactment which to me, seems a fitting culmination for the search for incorporation of the concrete, immediate innovative and personal that the various new attempts at curriculum conceptualisation that I have been picking out for discussion reveal. Whatever views of curriculum that various trends obliquely endorse Oram brings to a fullness of articulation in the form of a model through his analogy.

3.9 Parallel Concepts in Syllabus Designing in ELT

I now pick up these four facts and relate them to recent thinking about curriculum design in English Language Teaching. As has been the practice till now, I do not trace the development historically, instead I take up ideas prevalent in current literature and practice in the field and offer them as parallels to my model of interactive interpretational syllabus-construction.

At this stage in the main argument proferred in the thesis it should be obvious that what is at issue is the pre-specification of objectives in terms of definite units of knowledge (acting as content) to be mastered. This assumes that there is one knowledge core to be acquired or learnt; intentions are executed (as against not executed); and a successful way of teaching could be (not not, but) transmission teaching; or even when learners are invited to interact, they interact in order to get at pre-determined
fixed accepted knowledge core; (as against the notion that interaction is what is valuable as Knowledge which is exploration of Knowledge; the core knowledge acquired is incidental - a pointer this, to a different epistemology).¹³ (See above, in Section 3.7.2 doubts, questions raised about an emergent syllabus being a more fitting model for my language model alone; I intend to connect this up in the next Chapter.)

3.9.1 The Notion of Pre-Specification in Language Syllabuses - Christopher Candlin

Candlin (1984) looking critically at pre-specification of objectives and content implied in any traditional syllabus design wonders whether the assumptions behind pre-specification, i.e., knowledge as itemisable and exhaustible and a general core as suitable for all situations, are in any way justifiable. The whole question of an objective core syllabus is at issue. No syllabus is value neutral. On the other hand, the paradigm of pre-specification with its confidence about One Objective Knowledge, implies a view of for all time, one right society one right knowledge and a desire to pass on that one truth. Thus reality here is seen as static as against a dynamic process and this syllabus
"acts to sustain some social order, the view of the world whence the syllabus came, through this unchallengeable selection and organisation of content done on behalf of rather than by the learner," rather than (acting) "to engage and challenge this world-view, through a praxis of action and reflection by all the participants to question its content and organisation" (Candlin, 1984:30). Besides, this passing on proposes a method which reveals its attitude to the role of the learner and the teacher. The teacher is a vehicle for transfer and the learner's role is that of a receiver of pre-selected and pre-digested knowledge. This denies the individual (the teacher and the learner) any active role; it does not allow for any kind of a dialogue or negotiation about Truth - since Truth is what the syllabus has pre-specified as such - and it is supposed to be accepted. Thus as Candlin points out, Handeln, an act of the learner in which he conforms to the values preferred rather than Diskurs, a readiness to negotiate value, a critical non-conformity in given cases to transmitted principle is in operation. (Or in my terminology this questioning of meaning, Diskurs, could be characterised as negotiation and exploitation.)

Such a syllabus Candlin sees as running counter to the natural tendency for differences across individuals and situations and change over time. Monolithic syllabuses
ignore the reality of the disparity between 'general' intended and a 'particular' executed.

In actuality syllabuses handed down as monolithic constructs are modified during practice to yield "other content, alternative experiences, different modes of evaluation ..." (Candlin, op.cit.:32). Yet if a syllabus insists (as it usually does) on pre-specification in the continued persistence of textbooks and materials and syllabus policies about evaluation this leads to "both teachers and learners (becoming) alienated and incapacitated servants of a set of requirements at odds with their individuality and with the realities of the classroom" (Ibid). (See Parlett - curriculum objectives as being 'outside' the classrooms.)

This kind of a generalised pre-specified syllabus cannot be 'improved' in any way with making a syllabus 'more sensitive' or by setting up a series of parallel syllabuses to compensate for the deficiencies of one syllabus. However, many sub­syllabuses of this sort are, all of them would be, as Candlin points out, grounded in the same principles; what I have been calling the principles of pre-specification. It is more a paradigmatic change which is needed, a change which incorporates the specific time (immediacy) the specific learners and teachers' rights to build their own syllabus, which will do the opposite of what the pre-specified syllabus
does i.e., views reality as in process, and the responsibility and contribution of the individual (teacher and learners) towards this 'changing' reality.

This sort of 'individual's' investment of personal explorations/questionings (negotiation and exploitation), this process, contributes to the content attained itself. Thus in one sense, as Candlin says, the process determines content. We should be able to make

"... purposes, content, methods (or better, learning experiences), and evaluation, inter-dependent, with a particular focus on the integration of content and experience. A syllabus would then avoid the mistake of regarding knowledge as information and would expect to be concerned as much with the learning experiences it offered to learners as with the subject-matter content of those experiences. Indeed one might assert that the content of any experience is necessarily bound up with the process of experience itself. In Postman and Weignartner's (1969) words, 'the critical content of any learning experience is the method or process through which the learning occurs'. Certainly it is possible to argue that the view of content we have is closely connected with our view of how this content is to be communicated in classrooms, and moreover, the roles to be adopted in this process by teacher and learner ... Furthermore, in stressing, as I have done, how content is not value-free we imply that to know content is to explore its values, and that it is this exploration of values which implies a methodology where content cannot reasonably be seen to exist independently of its interpretation".

(Candlin, op.cit.:33, emphasis mine)
(Note, that my language model claims, that there is a possibility that the way a 'code' is used with varying degrees of negotiation and exploitation strategies brought to bear upon it, decides the kind of language mastered; and similarly a method of transmission, implies a (value-loaded) stand of one inflexible core knowledge.)

A Negotiated Syllabus - A Retrospective Record: Candlin (contd.)

Candlin considers his discussion about investment of individuality through negotiation for the creation of a syllabus-in-action, not only pertinent to syllabus design, but also to language teaching (especially) language as communication teaching. He pleads for a language model which is interactive and interpersonal when the process decides content and an individual's vested interests are crucial for learning communicative use. 15

"... such a praxis-oriented model would be appropriately realised through a series of problem-solving tasks ... focussing both on what is to be learned and on how and why it is to be learned. In the carrying out of these tasks, and indeed, in the selection and evaluation of these there would be a natural reason for a dialogue between the contributions of the learner and those of the teacher. In such a way ... Diskurs could be applied to the process of syllabus design and implementation itself and not be confined mainly to the realm of interpersonal communication."

( Ibid.:34)
Thus the elements of Diskurs or questioning or negotiation for a reality keeps reality flowing and innovative, maintains syllabus creativity and is conducive to the use of language as communication which is again a creative activity.

Coming back to syllabus creation in general an elaboration of Diskurs (or negotiation) in syllabus making is the productive tension between "curriculum guidelines and classroom action." Curriculum guidelines here are in no way the definitively laid out pre-defined plan - the status that syllabuses occupy traditionally. They, in their laying-out itself, anticipate negotiated selection from the "open-ended banks of items" that they offer at the classroom level, a negotiation which would result in syllabuses of "joint-constructs of teachers and learners".

Such syllabuses then, produced through the tensions between curriculum guidelines (a line of intention alone, as we can infer from the tone of Candlin's paper) and the classroom action\(^{16}\) can only be an account, "a retrospective record" of the classroom (an after-the-event phenomenon) as against the usual "prospective plan", of the 'pre-specification' model. Again it remains only as an inference for us that Candlin regards this "retrospective record" not as a valid 'generalisation' (a more worthy generalisation) which can be
taken as a prospective plan for another class by the same teacher or the same learners. This retrospective record is an account of that particular instance of syllabus-making and remains true to that instant and later as a tentative one interpretation among many possible ones. The record is not to replace a pre-existent core as a more comprehensive core fit for implementation now, due to its accrued comprehensiveness. The whole point of the notion of syllabus as retrospective record is, that it implies a record which has an in-built throbbingly dynamic changeableness that rejects standardisation and invites innovation.

Moreover, the syllabus as account has an important role to play, in curriculum change. It is only from the tensions between classroom action and curriculum guidelines, recorded as syllabuses, that we can expect innovation. "It is this tension which can drive curricula forward, maintaining their relevance to the society of the classroom and that of the world outside." This, from Candlin (op.cit.:36) justifies the implications of fluid records-syllabuses as accounts rather than guidelines that I drew above.

What then do we have here? A Syllabus which is "a dynamic and negotiated concept rather than one which is static and imposed" (Candlin, op.cit.:33). As such, it is in turn better positioned to forestall the "incipient
likelihood of a painful fracture of intention and reality that ... (is) common ..." (Ibid). Since reality is accepted as more natural and worthy of attention and so even the fracture (see Silverman and Torode quoted in Chapter I) different status, not as a handicap but as a natural occurrence. Though there might be "institutional demands for a clear statement of forward planning ... there (being) major objections, ideological, social, psychological and pedagogical against the imposition of a step-by-step programme on teachers and learners which all must follow" (Ibid.:35) what is needed is that we should take decisions on objectives, content and their sequencing out of teachers' control, "and set about offering the conditions in terms of which experimentation about the possibilities of sequencing content and experience precisely can take place" (Ibid.). And that is where in practical terms the planning at several levels of curriculum/syllabus making seen in the terms of frameworks for innovation, line of intentions, ready for creative interpretations, meaning potential, comes in. This is, we come back to the refrain, the status of the given factor, the so-called 'core' in situations of use; pre-specification if at all should anticipate re-creation in not attempting to centralise them and incorporate them but by being skeletal and accommodate re-creation consciously.
3.9.2 Syllabus Plan as Meaning Potential - Michael Breen's Process Syllabuses

"Process syllabuses" as alternatives to traditional content syllabuses that Breen (1984) offers seems to me a reiteration of this principle - i.e., syllabus or Plan as a meaning potential rather than pre-stated meaning ready for transplantation into a situation.

Breen's model, like Candlin's, emerges out of a consciousness that however carefully designed a syllabus may be - any syllabus has to be "continually re-interpreted" and re-created by teacher and learners when it is actually used in a classroom. A look at the following quote from Breen shows how what he is saying could be an exact extension of Candlin:

"Although, as teachers, we may follow a pre-designed syllabus, every teacher inevitably interprets and reconstructs that syllabus so that it becomes possible to implement it in his or her classroom. Similarly, learners create individual learning syllabuses from their own particular starting points and their own perception of the language, learning, and the classroom. We may regard learners either as people who are trying to re-draw the pre-designed plan (a plan which is mediated through the teacher), or we may see learners as uncovering the route for the first time - in a sense, discovering the new language as if it had never been explored before. A learner's individual version of the route may harmonize with the teacher's version, which, in turn - may harmonize with the pre-designed plan. The classroom is therefore the meeting place or point of interaction between the pre-designed syllabus and individual
learner syllabuses. This interaction will generate the real syllabus - or the syllabus in action - which is jointly constructed by teacher and learners together. The pre-designed syllabus is therefore something of a paradox, for it serves to gradually render itself redundant. It is always replaced in its implementation by that syllabus which is jointly discovered and created in the classroom... In the lesson-to-lesson reality of language teaching, we are continually concerned with three syllabuses: the teacher's version of the pre-designed plan, the individual learner syllabus, and the unfolding syllabus of the classroom - this last being the synthesis of the other two."

(Breen, 1984:50 - emphasis mine)

(See in this context my model of the process of language learning and use, in Section 1 of this chapter where I discuss the clash of society's language, the caretaker's assimilation of it, the caretaker's momentary shifting meaning configuration, and the learner 'subjective', and finally the 'new' situational meaning - a concerted 'final' effort of the interlocutors.)

When "process" (of creation/re-interpretation) thus always intervenes and modifies content (along with its implied process of acquisition which is transmission and reception) - a plan would do better to let this content modification through the process of intervention occur (by simply not acting as if it does not happen) and concentrate on the process of reinterpretation itself (by actively facilitating recreation). 17 Again here, such facilitating cannot occur
in listing the processes and pre-stating them but providing a framework for their emergence as "decisions for classroom language learning" relating to "participation procedure and subject matter". Thus, "we can view a process syllabus as a framework of questions requiring joint decisions and an index of possible alternatives requiring agreed choices" (Breen op.cit.:56). Breen claims that these processes are the mobilisation of learner's strategies for learning a new language (an ability of meaning-seeking which the learner already has and in having learnt a L₁ and uses for an L₂ also), what he/she brings (inevitably) into learning. This mobilisation of process which is also the skills for communicating (capacity for communication) which a mature language user exhibits entails within it a "knowledge of target language use and usage". Similarly processes of syllabus creation are the individual's (learner's) learning processes and the social and pedagogic processes of classroom (teacher's teaching process) which are the ones responsible for the re-interpretation of pre-determined objectives and pre-organised content.

Thus Knowledge of language, Breen implies is a corollary of skills of communication and the skills of learning a new language¹⁸ and the pre-specified content is willy-nilly re-interpreted by the (actual/existent) processes of syllabus-making in the classroom.
Breen relates this advocacy for the alternative (i.e., the process syllabus) to a content syllabus with a need for the replacement of the aim in teaching communicative repertoire in language teaching by capacity for communication; and a pre-specified content and aim in syllabus-making (which is external to the situation) to a focus on the process of creation of content internal to the classroom. It is this process which has to be elaborated at this stage. As capacity for communication involves employment of procedures or strategies to create - process of syllabus-making involves employment of strategies of negotiation and exploitation for creation of a syllabus.

Status of Pre-Specified Syllabus Plan (contd.)

The status of the Plan (i.e., the syllabus) then changes. Instead of a pre-specification of content (as Breen puts it - a communicative repertoire - a list I would like to stress) the plan is for

"... the gradual creation of the real syllabus of the classroom, jointly and explicitly undertaken by teachers and learners. Such a plan would be about designing a syllabus and therefore, a guide and servant for the (syllabus-creating) capacities of its users. Primarily it would be a plan for the activity of learning within the classroom group."

(ibid.:52)
This activity of learning I would like to submit is the capacity of creation in any activity - syllabus-making, knowledge-making or any meaning-making and language code making - the most relevant part of the activity as against the monolithic code itself.

Pre-specification might seem to have advantages:

"Thus content syllabus may be pre-designed and later 'applied to' and 'followed by' the teaching/learning process in the classroom. However this apparent advantage is undermined by reality. The genuine priority for the participants in the classroom is that knowledge be worked upon in ways which facilitate its teaching and learning. Subject-matter consequently becomes subsumed within - and changed by - the pedagogic and social process of the classroom."

(ibid.:53 - emphasis mine)

Breen claims that either of two things might happen to a pre-determined plan. A plan which is a guide and servant to the actual process of reinterpretation (this reinterpretation, Breen time and again stresses is already present and is only raised by a process syllabus as "an explicit and shared undertaking") "... provides the framework within which either a pre-designed content syllabus would be publicly analysed and evaluated by the classroom group, or an emerging content syllabus would be designed (and similarly evaluated) in an on-going way" (ibid.:55). These processes then, could
modify the plan or suggest a discarding of the plan for a different one. And the strategies employed could then be, either negotiation for adjustment or negotiation for an innovation. (I in my terminology make the distinction between these two and call this latter, exploitation.) In either case, the initial plan stands corrected and as such what happens in the process is creation. (See also Allwright's negotiation and navigation in the enterprise of classroom management below.)

Breen: A Summing Up

Let me summarise Breen now:

The reality about communication and about syllabuses is one of constitution and innovation of meaning and syllabus in the moment of execution through a process of re-interpretation (negotiation and exploitation). Hence the status of a plan can only be that of a fluid construct.

"... a good pre-designed syllabus is one which is positively amenable to alternative interpretations and open to re-construction through interaction in the classroom. Perhaps the most meaningful and accessible syllabus will be one which deliberately provokes the shared creation of the real syllabus by the classroom group."

(Breen, op.cit.:50)
This construct with its components of objectives, content and methodology might act as a checklist, in which case, the process/strategy of action during execution is a process of negotiation, or adjustment with the plan acting as a reference point. This same construct in other circumstances might be discarded to give place to new and very different (from the plan) objectives, content and method. Breen anticipates this happening and the plan becoming redundant.

The implications for a paradigm here are the syllabus plan being considered as a framework and hence without the implementational overtones of a defined code. Rather it is a framework, with principles of change inherent. Syllabus meaning is considered unique to a specific context and plural across several cases. The moment of accomplishment is the most meaningful locus in space and time, for meaning creation. And the nature of the meaning is a coopted synthesis born out of the communicative, creative tensions among all the participants concerned. In other word, all individualities contribute to create a unique synthesis. Process of reinterpretation or negotiation/exploitation refutes transmission and reception of a plan, and ratifies creation of a syllabus. In all, capacity and not the core becomes the most relevant in any action.
Both Candlin and Breen, though the particular papers quoted from indicate a discussion mainly of general syllabus models, are concerned about the language teaching goals and a compatible model of syllabus design. And that has been the focus of my thesis also till now. Ultimately, though not explicitly (and Candlin more explicitly than Breen) both seem to me to be working towards a larger paradigm of participant involvement/investment in knowledge, and creativity of the moment of execution.

3.10 A Discussion of Learner Involvement in a Negotiated Syllabus

Active participant involvement in the classroom in the shape of learners is obviously related to questions of learner autonomy. In order to take a profitable look at insightful writings on this score, at this point, I would like to examine in more detail the question of learner intervention and taking responsibility as a participant in syllabus-making and learning.

Let me briefly trace the movement of the arguments discussed so far, a kind of stock-taking activity. An explication of what language communication means leads to the principle of participant investment. This same principle
whose undercurrents could be that language communication is basically a personal and innovative/creative act points to the momentary act of creation as a valuable aspect of any activity as there is always a gap between intention and execution due to the immediate forces operating in such executions. Candlin and Breen discuss the ideological and psychological implications of viewing action in this way. These principles discussed in relation to syllabus design give rise to the notion of a 'creative' process syllabus.

As I have pointed out before (and as I shall later) there are several paradigmatic repercussions to this which neither Breen nor Candlin work out completely.

3.10.1 Learner Autonomy - Dick Allwright

Before I set them out, I would like to diverge for an 'aside' regarding learner/participant investment in acts of creation. This is a necessary 'aside' since it is about some very prominent current trends in ELT which demand more than just a mention in this context.

I, however, do not incorporate them later, in the body of my argument for reasons which become obvious below.
I refer to the notions of learner autonomy, individualisation, learner needs etc. There have been several studies and insightful research findings and practical application of them in language curricula (see Holec, 1980, for instance). To the line of argument I have been pursuing however, the work of Dick Allwright emerges as the most relevant.

Allwright (1982a) in his investigation of interaction in classrooms argues that interaction could be viewed as in terms of practice in preparation for communication outside the classroom, means to the end of learning language code or provision of intrinsic motivation and involvement in learning. All these reasons for introducing interaction in the classroom make interaction optional. But Allwright would like to look at interaction as a descriptive fact of any learning situation. Learners and teachers in the management of classroom learning, willy-nilly interact and that is how a classroom is kept going.

"Bluntly, classroom interaction is important because interaction is the 'sine qua non' of classroom pedagogy. Teaching (and therefore learning) is only possible, in the classroom, where there is person-to-person communication. Interaction, in this sense, is the process whereby lessons are 'accomplished' ... If no person-to-person interaction had occurred in a classroom, we would probably be unwilling to accept that a lesson had taken place at all. From this point of view, then, there is no point in being 'for' or 'against' interaction, since it is an inescapably crucial aspect of classroom life."

(Allwright, 1982a:6)
Allwright goes on to say at this point how for him interaction is not the communicative interaction of language, but interaction which general pedagogy demands in terms of general pedagogy itself. Teaching and learning cannot proceed without 'exchanges', 'sharing'. In parenthesis, I would like to stress that this is an important point. While interaction in general pedagogy as a descriptive fact, is an advantageous notion, at the same time dissociating such perceptual notion from communication itself, in other words by not seeing the implication of interaction or joint management as an undeniable aspect of communication itself, which is what Candlin and Breen hint at in their 1980 paper and I have tried to establish in my arguments about languaging, Allwright by-passes the fact of process being the crux of languaging itself; not a means (methodological expediency) or practice activity (the classical separation of performance from competence, seeing performance as rule code implementation/application); the non-optionality of interaction is present in language activity itself. It is a co-operative interactive, jointly managed act. I shall come back to this point more fully below. Now let us continue with Allwright.

The next point that Allwright makes is that these immediate spontaneous interactions specific to any particular classroom, and to specific learners and teachers of that classroom indicate that a Plan for learning (content and
method, the pedagogy decided upon) is never totally stuck to in any classroom.

"It is one thing to have plan, of course, and quite another to be able to implement them. The language teacher has to interact with the learners to implement any plans, as we have seen, and this inevitably means that we must expect even the most detailed and carefully prepared plans to be modified, through the interaction process."

(Allwright, op.cit.:15)

The changed plan is due to the interaction between teacher and learners. It is only through such interaction that content is made into the actual input regulated in terms of samples and guidance and the latter in the three forms of explanations, clues and feedback; the method planned by the teacher is realised as the actually occurring practice opportunities and the affective 'tone' pre-planned becomes the receptivity aspect of the classroom. Interaction which actualises plans, is conceptualised by Allwright as having four dimensions: compliance, direction, navigation and negotiation. All four activities involve both the teachers and the learners. A classroom functions with a mixture of these four and is managed and progresses with their aid.

3.10.2 Negotiation and Navigation in Syllabus-Making - Negotiation and Exploitation in Languaging

It is at this point that I would like to come in with the role of the notion of shared management or interaction in my thesis.
One tentative parallel that I can draw to start with is that between Allwright's negotiation and navigation in interaction and my notions of negotiation and exploitation in a creative act. (As a preliminary to Allwright's expansion on his categories, see the diagram of the Cline of negotiation in Section 1.)

"Compliance (simply doing whatever is required or expected of you) is the likely response of cooperative learners to Direction from the teacher. Between these two extremes are Negotiation and Navigation. Negotiation refers, as it does outside the classroom, to any attempts to reach decisions by consensus rather than by unilateral decision-making.

(Allwright, op.cit.:8)

"Navigation ... refers to attempts to steer a course between round, or over the obstacles that the lesson represents for the participants."

(ibid.:9)

In my model, negotiation occurs when the Plan is adjusted to the current demands without totally asking for a replacement. And Allwright's navigation is such "steering the course round, over etc. ..." Again, in my model exploitation is when there is a demand for replacing Plan by an 'originally new' emergent plan (Allwright's negotiation being more or less such a replacement).

Also as in my model exploitation which is associated with mathetic or poetic (non-conformist) meaning-seeking and hence as less prevalent than the negotiation associated.
with pragmatic meaning-seeking, Allwright in commenting upon the classroom data studied, points out that "negotiation, as one might expect, occurs very rarely."

The point here is not just the parallel. It is such interactional implications of languaging itself as my thesis. I shall connect this and the earlier point about Allwright's interaction in terms of pedagogy and not in terms of communication presently.

3.10.3 The Notion of Interaction as a Pervasive Principle - A Departure from Allwright

Leaving this for a minute let me turn to the three important points that Allwright claims to be making:

"I have presented this alternative perspective on interaction in the classroom as a set of descriptive facts about classroom pedagogy, as a set of unalterable facts of classroom life. Classroom pedagogy, I have argued, can only proceed via interaction, that interaction can only be jointly managed, and the management of that interaction, in the classroom, necessarily also constitutes the management of language learning itself."

(ibid.:17)

It is when elaborating this third that I see Allwright's pre-occupation is not with clarifying the concept of the notion of language as communication itself. Since for me however, the issue is about language used as a tool (when I claim language is meaning-making or as forming a world-view)
interaction or sharing (which is investment of participant's individuality in creation) is an important aspect of meaning-making (and through that languaging) itself.

This perspective raised interactive activity to the level of principles in an overall model of creative action - which is found to operate in meaning-making, languaging (and syllabus-making also) - all activities where the learner is a vital party.

So it is not a question of learner's choosing from the linguistic core syllabus for profiting in language learning, regulating the relevant language knowledge input for her/himself, or in interacting to make pedagogic decisions, providing himself or herself with communicative practice, but a question of learners making active decisions about choices from areas of experience they would like to deal in and the particular meanings they would like to explore (and in that the language capacity they would mobilise and the incidental 'meaning' or 'linguistic core' they generate). (See figure below)
At one level the activity that learners engage in can be characterised by the process - all equivalent processes - viz., meaning exploration, capacity mobilisation, and syllabus-making. At another level they can be characterised by the 'product' viz., meanings, language, or syllabus.

Pursuit of meanings, mobilisation of capacity in employing negotiative and exploitative strategies and engaging in syllabus-making, all three are involved in the notion of interaction for me - the sharing and managing and creating meanings, language core and syllabus.

And, I agree with Allwright, that these "do not represent the studied reaction to a pedagogic injunction to 'get them talking to each other,' or to 'get them communicating'. It represents normal state of affairs. It is a conceptual proposal, not a methodological one. As such it is not a perspective that necessarily leads to value judgements, since there is little point in trying to decide whether you like something that is inevitably the case."

(Allwright, op.cit.:17-18)

What Allwright does not do then, is raise these issues, i.e., the issue of 1) plan not being executed reality (since), 2) the perceptual/conceptual validity of interaction in classroom, involving all the participants - the learners especially, 3) the conceptualisation of interaction along
the four parameters of compliance, direction, negotiation and navigation to the level of a pervasive paradigm.

The problem for Allwright is not the clarification about creativity in action - or creative aspect of languaging - or syllabus making or building up world-views. It is just a management question he is looking at. He hits on the relevant first level (see figure above) but does not pursue it to repeat, for paradigm extensions.20

For Allwright the nature of the content of a syllabus other than in core terms is not at issue. (I acknowledge that this is only by implication - Allwright simply does not deal with these questions in any elaborate way, since he does not set out to do it; he has other concerns.)

There is no question of the core being differential and innovative as a quantum of knowledge for the learner (for instance, Candlin's work could lead to speculation on this score). And even within the classroom-management discussion, Allwright is not interested in deriving the macro-question of principles of syllabus with any amount of detailedness. Though this could easily be a logical extension of his argument (see his content-input method-practice opportunities, affective level-receptivity contrasts, contrasts which are a plan-executed ones).
For all this lack of articulation on the model-making level Allwright's insight here about teacher as learner-trainer (to train the learner to profit from this interactive situation, and make responsible decisions about managing his/her learning) is an important contribution to the notion of learner investment in creation of personal inputs. (I pick this point up briefly later when I discuss my classroom, when I talk about initial learner reluctance to accept this responsibility and the teacher's covert insistence and training for them to do it successfully.)

3.11 Insights from ELT Syllabus Design (contd.)

We will leave Allwright and the 'aside' I engaged in here and return to ELT syllabus. This 'aside', however, though apparently makes a trivial point of giving additional support to creation inside the classroom, becomes central to my thesis, which strives to see paradigm implications in the notion of creative construction of the moment when I discuss my model in relation to other models in interaction in the next chapter. Now, to repeat, we shall turn to ELT syllabus once again.

What is the connection between trends there, and curriculum making as we have seen it?

In ELT, the syllabus making models, for obvious reasons cannot (and do not) get away from the issue of teaching
language as communication. The model making here is subject/discipline specific. Yet in all of them, (more in perhaps Candlin and Breen than in Allwright) we see the basic idea of a rejection of the notion of pre-specification in syllabus construction and the possibility of uniqueness of syllabus in their moment of execution - a uniqueness wrought not only by the physical setting but also the idiosyncratic interaction among the participants in the setting. That this kind of emergence in the field could be extended to a view of language as communication in a clearer conceptualisation of it, the point hinted at by Candlin and Breen is a point I will come to presently.

Section III

3.12 An Overall Assessment of Insights for the Model of Interactive Syllabus Creation Derived from the field of Curriculum Design

Before I do that it would seem appropriate for me briefly to return to currents in curriculum-design and gather together the principles of qualitative enquiry in curriculum making and the same kind of principles in the field of arts which makes the drawing of an analogy between curriculum making and one specific aesthetic art in action, i.e., drama, possible, (and thus demonstrating the paradigmatic implications/overtones) in order to demonstrate in my turn how these fit into my paradigm of interactive interpretation.
The three pivotal terms used in my model are "before the act core", "procedures/strategies" and "after the act core (tentative end-product)."

I now propose to apply analogically the concepts in curriculum design and evaluation that I have analysed so far to this model.21

3.12.1 **Interlocutor Interaction and Syllabus/Curriculum Creation of the Moment**

I shall take up the two notions of the interaction between interlocutors in specific situation and core creation of the moment. The interlocutors in the activity of curriculum/syllabus could be curriculum theorists, curriculum makers, teachers, and learners at several levels.

When it comes to curriculum theory one of the interlocutors in the enterprise would be obviously the curriculum theorist - but for the theory to be created at all it has to come into contact with the specific case in the moment of execution. Thus the curriculum theorist for me instead of being an analyst becomes a theorist of the practical (see Schwab above); a theorist who interacts with the curriculum maker who is his/her immediate interlocutor and in the interaction creates a theory of the moment. (Figure ICC-a below)
But my model of curriculum making does not end here. When it comes to a theory, I am asking for the analyst-theorist to become a user-theorist, and allow the 'theory' to be created in the moment of interaction with the situational demands - which include the 'other' interlocutor. Likewise, when it comes to the next stage of curriculum making, the curriculum maker is in danger of becoming the analyst (abstract) theorist - unless he/she also defers to the situation (and does not pre-specify) but allows the curriculum to be made in collusion with the situational demands (which include the teacher as the second interlocutor here) at the moment of execution. (Figure b below)
But yet this is not the curriculum in the classroom. It has to go through the final stage when the curriculum is in fact created - when the teacher brings in this plan to the classroom tentatively and allows it to be actually created in the interaction with the specific learner(s) inside the specific classroom. (Figure C below)

Collating all these we could say the situation looks like the following:
In this way, according to this final figure, of Non-specification in Curriculum Design and execution my model of curriculum accedes to the paradigm principles of interactive interpretation in immediate contexts of action.

3.13 An Analogical Parallel Between Syllabus-Design and the Language Mode - the Notion of Mathetic and Pragmatic Functions

I would like to elaborate on this basic syllabus model to draw it closer to its analogical resemblance to the language model I have set up in the first section of this chapter. (At this point, I would recommend, that the two figures there in the first section, viz., the figure of interactive creation of the moment and the cline of interaction be kept in the background for making better sense of my arguments which follow.)

In language I have indicated 1) that there are interlocutors in an act of languaging, e.g., the caretaker and the child; 2) that the tensions are between the personal meaning seeking of each interlocutor and the pressure to conform and co-operatively work towards 'commonality' that the other interlocutor (in the physical presence of a caretaker the hearer/listener/reader or the law of structuring I have been referring to) brings to bear on the languaging act.
When the influence of the co-operation with the other interlocutor is what pre-dominates the pursuit of a certain type of meaning, i.e., a pragmatic/referential act is called for in languaging and in syllabus making a pragmatic syllabus is sought. On the other hand, if it is the law of structuring as I call it, i.e., having to uniselect and combine in space and time (the law of having to express in and through language) then in our syllabus idiom, this would be having to act within the 'form' of a 'lesson' with a beginning, middle and an end, (an introduction, a progress and a tying up) which is the 'limitation' - then a mathetic or even poetic meaning is pursued in languaging, and mathetic or poetic class or syllabus in teaching and syllabus making.

So a class can be a pragmatic class or a mathetic class - straining as much as possible towards the totally creative act where a totally innovative meaning or lesson with minimum regard for the Plan or the given is sought. This, to keep with my paradigm terminology, is, exploitation as against negotiation.

Here, I would like to draw attention to the importance of the language model itself for drawing out implications and also as providing a register for discussing syllabus construction and teaching.
Thus a particular stand about languaging being a creative process-act confers certain principles for application in any field of action.

I choose to apply it to syllabus-making since syllabus-making is a step that classroom teaching makes necessary. Yet the root analogy for me even in syllabus making is from the language model that I have set up. The register in other words for describing the syllabus-making comes to me from the language model. Hence 'interlocutors', 'tensions of meaning-making' etc.

After having mentioned the pragmatic-mathetic in meaning-making and analogically, in lessons, I now proceed to work out this analogy more completely. This has a purpose. Later, when I review the language syllabus that I taught - I analyse the classroom within the framework set up in these figures in the light of the analogy.

The parallels that have already emerged are, the fact of structuring in languaging, and syllabus-making; the cline of pragmatic to mathetic/poetic in communication, and in teaching or syllabus-making. Thus we have already seen that a lesson or a syllabus can be wholly referential, as much as possible conforming to the given or the plan outside the particular course. This kind of a referential syllabus
would veer more towards maintaining commonality with other syllabuses while mathetic lessons or courses would move more towards deviation from the 'norm'. The parallels can be easily worked out for other languaging terms like employment of strategies, employment of negotiative strategies, exploitative strategies etc.

Let me sum up what I have said so far in a figure:

The Impact of the Model of Meaning-Making on 'Syllabuses' - Fig. 14

The Language Model

(Language as)
An Act of: Reality Construction/ Meaning-Making

(covers: aspects of
i) languaging in general;
ii) language acquisition process)

inherent paradigm principles
a. creativity of the moment in interlocutor co-operation;
b. all activities as core meaning-making

Syllabuses in general- as line of intention, and syllabus-making as creative construction of the moment

Register for Discourse

C-1 C-2
3.13.1 Respective Roles and Influences of Interlocutors in Co-Operative Creation

As the figure shows, in my language model is also contained aspects of language acquisition. Then, for an analogical application of the principles therein: in the actitivity of syllabus-making, curriculum theory etc., also is involved the necessary balance of the interlocutors that a languaging acquisition aspect of the language model calls for. This needs an answer to the question, what is the activity (of syllabus-making) intended for? The concentration here is not goal-achievement (e.g., the goal of language as a tool) for its own sake on the part of the curriculum maker or the teacher which is the focus but goal achievement crucially for the learner. Thus as in the act of languaging acquisition it is the caretaker who takes the back seat, in curriculum making it will be the curriculum maker and the teacher taking the back seat to the learner.

I shall add another figure to that of the one on "Communication as Interactive Creation of the Moment" (p. 115), a languaging model to show more clearly the balance of the caretaker-interlocutor's attitude towards the learner-interlocutor. I shall subsequently 'apply' this to the syllabus creation figure also and extend it this time to show similar balancing of interlocutors in the syllabus-creation act.
Fig. 15. Interactive Creation - the Interlocutors

The child/ classroom learners (meaning given) new meaning intention

Circumstances of use

Interaction

New meaning intention

A 'common' meaning of the moment

Fig. 16. Learner-Caretaker Interaction: Balance of Interlocutors

Learner

'New' meaning intentions (for the moment)

Negotiation/exploitation strategies

Caretaker

'New' meaning intentions (for the moment)

'New' meaning (mainly for the learner)

 Dominating influence

Less dominating - 'low-key' influence
Now, this basic explanation of the balance of decision-making responsibility applied to syllabus creation would look like the following:

Curriculum/Syllabus Design - Balance of Interlocutors

Fig. 17

Outside Classroom/School Syllabus Creation

(Course) → (Curriculum)
CT → CM

→

Theor of the practical

(Course) → (Teacher)
CM → TP

Outside Classroom(School?)

Syllabus Creation

Classroom Syllabus Creation

(Teacher) → (Learner)

Lesson Plan

Curriculum

Lesson Plan

Curriculum

→ = predominating influence

→ = low-key influence

T = teacher

L = learner
We work either from the outer box or the inner box. The parallels between syllabus-making here and languaging are only too obvious to warrant comment.

3.14 Application of Paradigm Principles and Discourse Register of a Language Model - A Summing Up

So much for the application of paradigmatic principle of creativity (derived from a language model which is ultimately a reality-construction model) to general syllabus-making as an activity and some interesting dimensions to the teaching act when using the register of languaging to syllabus making in general.

What has emerged stated briefly is: syllabuses are not pre-specifiable; they are actualised inside the field of action. Syllabuses are changeable and dynamic; and depending upon the 'freedom' allowed to the learner-interlocutor there can be degrees of change.

I shall now seek a connection between these general syllabus principles/model and the language syllabus that emerged when a languaging as a reality construction meaning making activity was applied towards articulating a syllabus in that field.
To recall what I postulated as a language syllabus which resulted from the implications for teaching derived from the model of language - which turned out to be a basically reality construction model - the postulated syllabus suggested non-pre-specification of content and objectives and an overall rough approach of action inside the classroom which could be called the bare outlines of a methodology.

Thus in the interactive-creation-of-the-moment language model there is absolutely no question of teacher giving pre-conceived meanings and associated strategies to the learner. So just on that score, the syllabus has to be constituted in the act of execution. That was the first point. The next one here is, that the principle of creativity which operates there when applied to the activity of syllabus construction also yields a model of the syllabus as a creative process. Thus emerges an interesting extension of figure 14.
The Impact of The Model of Meaning-Making on 'Syllabuses' and Language-Teaching Syllabuses - Fig. 18

The Language Model

(Languaging as)
An Act of: Reality Construction/Meaning-Making

inherent paradigm principles
a. creativity of the moment in interlocutor co-operation;
b. all activities as 'core'-meaning-making

(covers: aspects of
i) languaging in general;
ii) language acquisition process)

Syllabuses in general as line of intention, and syllabus-making as creative construction of the moment
Language (core) syllabus as line of intention....

Key:
Movement
A: Underlying paradigm principles
B: Analogical connection/application to syllabuses
C-1 & C-2: Register for discourse for a discussion of 'syllabuses' from model, languaging-terminology
D: Logical connection/application to syllabuses
Since one of the main lines of the argument is not only creative construction of the moment (point A of the figure) but also all acts (including language use and learning) as meaning-making acts, this makes for a plan for teaching (syllabus) any subject (inclusive of language) unplannable - this connection which realises an unplanned (or tentative) syllabus (in our case for the subject English as a second language) is very important.

For the teacher, the teaching act (making a syllabus) is a meaning seeking act (meaning seeking here is used in an analogical sense). But since such a syllabus (of any school subject) is also the concern of the learner and more a concern of the learner - it becomes a (language or any other) syllabus construction act (analogically, a meaning-seeking act) for the learner also.

Over and above this, is the point about there being nothing like a language core (grammar or words/vocabulary items). Everything is a meaning-seeking act in the more basic sense of the term. Hence the (language again or any other subject) syllabus which emerges logically through the filter of this notion of meaning seeking in the sense of reality construction calls for creation of notions and a world-view.
3.15 **Analogical and Logical Application of Models - A Reiteration**

This point, I shall pick up more elaborately for a discussion in the next chapter. There is a double line which produces the English as a second language syllabus for me (and carried to its logical conclusion, I should extend tentatively, a syllabus for any other subject such as History, Geography etc. This is also briefly touched upon in the next chapter.) This double line comprises an analogical line and a logical line. The activity of syllabus making is not a creation together of a standard (pre)established core, that specific interactions of a situation calls for. 'Creation' in that sense is limited for me. Syllabus making and emergent syllabuses in any discipline is also influenced by the notion of all acts as basic meaning-making and reality construction activity.

Thus, this logical connection with the language model - one of reality construction - along with the analogical one of meaning making (teaching and syllabus making activities like meaning making activities) is what finally makes for creativity. The two influences are set out in the above figure (Fig. 18), which is an extension and completed version of the one on page 195.
3.16 Conclusion

These claims, however, raise questions. If the syllabus model of "Interactive Interpretation of the Moment of Execution" (a model developed analogically in relation to the language model used to make a language syllabus) does demand only a particular model of language, viz., a model of language as a tool of reality constitution.

Secondly, how different is this model of language as a tool that I have postulated?

Do current practices of encouraging interaction (usage through use) models in language teaching do the same as my model?

I intend to examine these questions in the next chapter, the before in Chapter V, I continue with the main line of thesis, and illustrate the model of English as a second language syllabus in an analysis of actual classroom lessons.
NOTES

1. This latter is the law of structuring I have been discussing. Once the child has entered language (which it does in its meaning making efforts itself in cooperation with the 'others' around) and is engaged in the constitution of meaning (in and through language) willy-nilly stabilisation is called for, which stabilisation is reduction of personal meanings and assimilation of 'established' or 'institutionalised' meanings. The additional point I am making is that this institutionalised meanings that the child enters, bear the very personal contributions of the language-acquiring and later, language-using child and in as much as they do this, are a 'shifting' institutionalisation.

2. For instance, Bruner (1975b) goes on to argue for a case of learning languages as in the first place learning to execute a set of procedures which are action-related. It is the resemblance between these learnt action-related sets of procedures and language meaning that enables the child to 'discover' meanings in words and sentences which are also action-related. A combination of action-related 'one-word-sentences' and gestures and actions is what eases a child into a language. And scope for such combination is necessary for language acquisition. It is this requirement of combination that makes appropriate prelinguistic experience necessary in early language acquisition.
3. The abstraction of this receivedness about the meaning built-up is the systemic system. (See Chapter II). This systemic system though predominantly shows only the social commonality, yet bears traces of its acquisition mode in its functional arrangement and the uniqueness in its remaining a 'meaning potential' as Halliday (1975) says. Again this common systemic system is only part of the accumulated code. The individual contribution is seen in the relatively (i.e., relative to the systemic side) unique traces of acquisition viz., the schemas. Yet even the schemas are relatively more bound to commonality in relation to the unique procedures or strategies used in their accumulation, which leave their mark as undercurrents of semantic configurations to these schemas themselves.

4. At the moment I am using the term in the general sense in which I indicated Jakobson using it in the previous chapter.

5. The figure of "The Cline of Degrees of Negotiation" provides interesting parallels among the several notions that have been discussed in various parts of the thesis up till now. Diagrammatically it would look like the following:
Parallel Concepts to the Cline of Negotiation

Fig. 19

- Phatic (more readiness; less negotiation)
- Pragmatic (less readiness; more .........)
- Mathetic
- Poetic (exploitation)

Communicative-competence (B)

Analytic-competence (B)

'parroting' 'cliche' Small talk

No gap between schema and procedures of negotiation/exploitation (formulae) (W)

Training (W)

Education (W)

B = Bruner
W = Widdowson (1983)
6. The teacher's own meanings are almost nearly all pragmatic meaning intentions. In the usual run, since it is the learner who is in need of acquiring language capacity, all meanings are left to the learner-initiation - except certain pragmatic meanings necessary for the functioning of the classroom. See discussion on methodology above.

7. What I am saying is, that even the experienced caretaker does not have ready-made meanings pragmatic or mathetic to convey. The meanings have to be constructed in the moment of execution and the tentative, already present norm has to change.

8. In the language model two terms to distinguish language and **languaging** and meaning and **meaning-making** have been employed. In the parallel here in teaching though I have devised the terminological difference between syllabus statements and syllabuses for the second part the same **syllabus making** is used for **syllabus statement making**, and syllabus making. Initially in the use, as above I indicate the distinction by putting 'statement' in parenthesis, but from now onwards **syllabus making** as a cover term for both activities is seen to be sufficient.

9. See discussion of Widdowson in Chapter II — the different purposes of the analyst's model and the user's model, and how the one has to be replaced totally by the other rather than **repaired** to be useful as the user's model. As Widdowson says, even the attempt in linguistics to incorporate the elements that the user's model asks for proves ineffectual here. What 'defeats' all these attempts, is the underlying notion of **a priori** ness. Also in my discussion of Candlin below, note his
objection to Brumfit and others suggesting several syllabuses to compensate for the non-comprehensibility of one pre-specified syllabus. Here once again, it is a replacement rather than addition which we need. The replaced model asks for a framework type of pre-specified if at all (a status change for core) - 'hazy' ideas as Parlett calls it, and retrospectve descriptions - not theories made more comprehensible and remaining as 'final' and definitive as theories do tend to be.

10. I am not going into any great detail about the discussion in Schwab of the two types of arts itself since it is not quite germane to the body of my argument.

11. 'Plural', it must be obvious from the way I use it, operates at two levels: a) different from other 'previous' interpretations - the seemingly agreed upon 'common' meanings; b) different for different participants in the same act.

12. "Curriculum enactment proposes that the curriculum be seen not as a process of development, diffusion and implementation but as ... 'creative treason', whereby authors' conceptions and intentions are deliberately and legitimately distorted, re-interpreted to make the work of art carry significant meaning to different people in different settings and at different times" (Oram, op.cit.:50)(my emphasis here). This points to the act of creation, the quality of negotiation and re-negotiation.

13. I am aware that this could be considered a crude and unfair way of treatment meted out to recent trends in language teaching and conceptual distinctions among several schools of language teaching such as Structural,
Communicative, Communicational etc. Acknowledging the trends and the distinctions among these several language teaching trends still I would like to submit that all of them as they are in practice now, still belong to the paradigm of the handing over of a core in their avowed goal statements, content specification methodology and stands on learner interaction. I propose to offer fuller arguments on this score in the next chapter. At this stage, this has to be accepted at my word, to let me proceed with arguments about more general factors such as syllabus model making.

14. See discussion of Schwab above and his rejection of the notion of 'improving theories'. Instead, it is a theory of the practical that is needed.

15. Candlin in collaboration with Breen develops this line of argument about language and communicative ability in a 1980 paper: "The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching".

16. See my figure below on page 191 on theory, curriculum-making and teaching, which seems to me a more detailed account of the role of the participants involved in curriculum making and the way theory or the line of intention tentativity functions there.

17. Thus instead of content (method of transmission) process - the process of re-created content.

18. See a) Candlin's process as determining content; b) Widdowson saying that the circumstances of acquisition and the skills of use are the same.
19. Though I would also like to suggest as in communication there are levels of parroting, talking in cliches, so in management of learning also; Allwright too seems to notice this point, since this is what prompts him to say: "Nevertheless the perspective does prompt reflection on current classroom practice, and this reflection suggests a whole range of potential implications ... far-reaching ..." (Allwright, 1982:18).

20. See also Allwright (1982b): "Communicative Curricula in Language Teaching".

21. This application works at several levels. In parenthesis, as an indication of the manner of this analogical working I would go back to a reference to Oram (op.cit.). In a model which is not scientific (but analogical) the application of concepts, need not evince a "one-to-one correspondence of terms". And even in the case of an analogical application there could be a distinction between an analogy where "correspondences are specific as in allegory, and one where they are much more open to a variety of interpretation and nuance as in metaphor". "A metaphor does not force any one fixed interpretation; it simply presents allusive possibilities" (Oram, op.cit.: 48).