

promoting access to White Rose research papers



Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

This is an author produced version of a paper published in **System**.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/4927/>

Published paper

Wedell, M. (2003) *Giving TESOL change a chance: supporting key players in the curriculum change process*, *System*, Volume 31 (4), 439 - 456.

**Dr Martin Wedell
School of Education
University of Leeds
UK**

**Address: School of Education, University of Leeds,
Hillary Place, Leeds LS2 9JT
Phone: 0113 343 4531
Fax: 0113 343 4541
Email: m.wedell@education.leeds.ac.uk**

Abstract

The language of ‘western’ planned and managed TESOL curriculum change aid projects of the 1980s-1990s continues to have a strong influence on the terms in which the objectives of 21st century, nationally planned TESOL curriculum change projects are expressed. Teachers continue to be expected to make the cultural and professional adjustments needed to enable objectives to be achieved.

Many TESOL aid projects achieved their stated objectives only partially. The same remains true now that project planning and management are a local responsibility. An important reason for such limited success, is change planners’ failure to understand what support teachers will need, when, and for how long, if they are to make the above adjustments.

The paper proposes questions that TESOL curriculum change planners might ask, before finally defining their objectives. Answers to such questions will provide them with information about how teachers (those expected to implement change) are likely to experience the change process. Such information may then be used to establish systems that will help teachers feel supported by their immediate and wider environments, during the critical first few years of the change process, and so enable objectives to be more fully achieved.

Key words: TESOL-curriculum change planning- teacher support

GIVING TESOL CHANGE A CHANCE: SUPPORTING KEY PLAYERS IN THE CURRICULUM CHANGE PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

Proficiency in English has, for at least the last 20 years, become an ever more desirable goal for those emerging from state education systems throughout the non-English speaking world. The instrumental benefits that such proficiency is thought to confer, on both individuals and the societies in which they live, have provided an impetus and rationale for numerous English language curriculum change (sometimes called ‘reform’ or development’) projects aiming to improve the language skills of school leavers.

Until the mid 1990s many such projects were jointly or wholly funded as part of British, and to a lesser extent American, Canadian and Australian, development aid programmes, and were frequently managed by donor-government employed change agents. Their experiences of involvement in the planning and implementation of such projects has generated a substantial TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) literature, discussing aspects of the change implementation process, the effect of contextual factors upon it, and the underlying political and economic agendas motivating the aid funding. Some key studies might include Holliday and Cooke 1982, Kennedy 1987/1988, Pennycook 1989, Phillipson 1992, Holliday 1994, Coleman 1996, Markee

1997, Kennedy, Goh and Doyle 1999, Hall and Hewings 2001, and Waters and Vilches 2001.

Since the late 1990s British government aid priorities have moved away from support for English language teaching towards supporting measures more directly linked to its stated objectives of reducing poverty and promoting equitable and sustainable economic growth.(DfID 2000). However elsewhere, English language curriculum change projects, now funded by national governments, continue to be introduced in many parts of the world, currently including countries of the former Soviet Union, East Asia and the Gulf.

A common theme in TESOL curriculum change literature highlights the difficulties experienced by non-native speaker English teachers when trying to implement the unfamiliar classroom practices introduced by curriculum change projects, and the effect of such difficulties on the achievement of stated change objectives. Similar reports come from TESOL change agents working in different cultural contexts, for example Indonesia (Coleman 1987, Tomlinson 1990, Lamb 1995), Egypt (Holliday 1994), Japan, Pakistan, China (DoCastro, Shamin, Cortazzi and Jin respectively in Coleman 1996) South Korea (Li 1998), Hong Kong (Carless 1998) Hungary (Wedell 2000). Ongoing discussions with international Masters TESOL students at Leeds from Africa, the Middle East, the former Soviet Union and East Asia, suggest that such difficulties remain widespread.

The wider educational change literature from the UK and North America is clear both about the complexity of implementing any kind of major educational reform and about the unsuccessfulness of most attempts to do so (Bennett et al 1992, O'Donoghue 1995,

Fullan and Hargreaves 1992, Fullan 1993, 1999, 2001). Most such writers would agree that ‘Teachers of course are the key players in the reform process’ Riley (2000:37). In this paper I suggest that within TESOL curriculum change it is planners’ lack of recognition of this basic fact that contributes critically to the state of affairs outlined below.

We can produce many examples of how educational practices could look different, but we can produce few, if any, examples of large numbers of teachers engaging in these practices in large scale institutions designed to deliver education to most children. (Elmore 1996:11 in Fullan 2000)

Because the planning of curriculum change, in TESOL has usually taken insufficient note of the need to support the ‘*key players*’, few practices introduced by such changes are ever engaged in by ‘*large numbers of teachers in large scale institutions*’. How planners might better support teachers in their development of *different practices* and so enable them to be used in the education of most *children*, is the focus of this paper.

The paper has three main parts. The first two sections highlight fundamental features of TESOL curriculum change that all planners need to understand, if they are to support their key players through the first years of any curriculum change process. The third section proposes a procedure to help planners identify these features in their own context, to consider what they imply for the support that teachers and their institutions will need, and to plan to provide it. The paper concludes with a model of a language curriculum change planning process that by maximising support for key players may assist the dissemination of curriculum change into large-scale institutions designed to deliver education to most children.

1. Culture clash in TESOL curriculum change.

In this part of the paper I consider how twenty years experience of western funded (and frequently managed) language curriculum change projects have affected the language in which the objectives of today's, locally initiated, curriculum changes are couched. One effect is frequently a mismatch between the pedagogic assumptions underlying the language of such objectives and existing cultural realities.

The potential for such a mismatch has long been recognized in the TESOL literature. Writers like Philippon (1992) and Pennycook (1989) point out that the assumption that western approaches to the language learning and teaching process (and teaching methods and learning materials based on these) can and should be exported unchanged to the wider world, is extremely dubious. Others have given specific examples which demonstrate the inappropriacy of such an assumption, (Coleman 1987, Holliday 1994, 1999 Coleman 1996, Kramsch and Sullivan 1996, Thompson 1996). Despite this recognition however, the objectives of locally initiated 21st century language curriculum change projects continue to be expressed in language strongly influenced by what Holliday (1994) calls BANA (British, North America, Australia) thinking, typical of many western change agents during the 'aid decades'.

For example in Japan, new courses of study for secondary schools state that the purpose of the English language training is (my italics throughout)

for students to develop *practical communicative competence* [and so] great emphasis will be placed on *practice in the situations where the target language is actually used* (Ministry of Education-MEXT- <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/news/1998/07/980712.htm> accessed 6/6/02)

and that *The cultivation of fundamental and practical communicative abilities* is being emphasized further. (MEXT 2001: 54)

Similarly in Oman the introduction to the Teachers Book for the English language textbooks developed to support the new Basic Education English curriculum states among the objectives of the course that the materials are

Child-centred, activity based and encourage children to become *active participants in the learning process*. (English for Me 1999:viii)

The assumptions about classroom practices implied by the terms like those in italics above are, it is suggested, frequently inconsistent with existing practices in educational cultures into which curriculum changes are to be introduced. In the following section I consider what such inconsistencies may imply

1.1 Educational cultures

It is possible to conceptualise educational cultures as being positioned along one or more continua. An example from TESOL is offered by Young and Lee (1985). Discussing Hong Kong English teachers' responses to curriculum change, they note that teachers' educational culture, (in the sense of their beliefs about the nature of language and the language learning process, and the classroom behaviours that are consequently considered appropriate), may be placed at any point along a continuum whose extremes they label (after Barnes and Schemilt 1974), 'Transmission based' and 'Interpretation based'. Hofstede (1994), as part of his large-scale study of cultures and organizations, also notes that educational cultures may exist along a number of continua.

To illustrate the extent to which educational cultures may vary, some characteristics of each end of the transmission-interpretation continuum, adapted from Young and Lee and Hofstede are shown in Figure 1 below. Only the extreme positions are shown. It is acknowledged that very few educational cultures are unambiguously situated at either extreme.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

I suggest that the practices implied by the terms italicized in the quotes on pages 6 and 7 represent those more likely to be found in educational cultures towards the interpretation end of the continuum. In the quotes below, evidence from research into language curriculum change in Hungary and more wide ranging OECD research (both in the mid to late 1990s), suggests that across much of the world, including contexts in which language curriculum changes continue to be introduced, transmission based educational cultures remain usual.

People right across society regard education as being the transmission of knowledge. Teachers have a certain amount of knowledge that they have to transmit to their students and learning is determined, can be spotted when the knowledge is tested. So the job of the teacher is to tell facts to students from primary school right the way through to university level, and for those students then to be tested on whether they have managed to retain those facts, and if they manage to reproduce what the teacher has said, they get a top mark. (Wedell 2000: 112)

The prevailing notion of teaching and learning remains one in which, according to an OECD study, knowledge, competencies and values are predefined and stored in curricula, tests and accredited textbooks. (Posch 1996 in Riley 2000:42)

Personal experience and ongoing anecdotal evidence from Masters students from Africa, Central and East Asia and the Middle East, support this

In many 21st century English language curriculum change contexts we thus find senior members of fundamentally transmission based educational cultures planning curriculum

changes whose objectives (*to develop practical communicative competence, to become active participants in the learning process*) imply familiarity and sympathy with classroom practices deriving from more interpretation-based cultures. To be able to achieve even a modified version of the expected outcomes, key players (language teachers) will need to make considerable adjustments to their existing professional beliefs and behaviours.

Two extracts from a draft language curriculum change document from China outline clearly the extent of the adjustments that planners may expect of teachers. The first describes existing teacher/learner behaviour in English language classrooms and again suggests an existing educational culture towards the transmission-based end of the continuum (see italics).

Many teachers still put more emphasis on the *delivery of knowledge about the language*, while *ignoring the development of students' language abilities*. Classroom teaching continues to be largely *teacher centred*, which does not foster student interest or motivation for learning or develop their individuality. *Students are learning passively* only for passing examinations. (Wang and Wang 2000:4)

The second extract summarises what the proposed new curriculum expects of its classroom teachers of English. They are required to move towards practices more typical of the interpretation-based end of the continuum (see italics), incidentally picking up technological skills en route.

Teachers should *adjust their views on language and language teaching* and use a more *student-centred approach*. It requires that teachers should talk no more than one third of class time. *Language input should be authentic, interesting and practical*. Teachers are encouraged to use modern teaching technology to create a better learning environment and develop teaching resources. (Wang and Wang 2000:8)

1.2 The implications of cultural shifts for planners.

Again there is no shortage of literature outlining the difficulties of making such cultural shifts. Many adjustments TESOL teachers are likely to have to make; altered perceptions of language and language learning, learner and teacher roles and appropriate classroom management techniques, are clearly outlined by Nunan and Lamb (1996). The difficulty of making them in practice has been well documented, (Hutchinson 1991, Holliday 1994, Hyde 1994, Luxon 1994, Lamb 1995, Coleman 1996, Markee 1997, Li 1998). The complexity of planning to support them has also been widely considered in the more general educational and organisational change literature (Fullan 1993, 1999, 2000, 2001, Louis and Miles 1992, Hatch 1997, Hayes 2002).

There seem to be two connected reasons why, within TESOL we find so few examples of *'large numbers of teachers engaging in these different practices'*. One is that planners seem to be unaware of the extent of the cultural shift that they are requiring teachers to make. The second is that they fail to consider factors that will influence how teachers experience the proposed changes. The results of such lack of imagination were noted by Fullan more than 10 years ago and continue to ring profoundly true today.

Neglect of the phenomenology of change- that is how people experience change as distinct from how it might have been intended- is at the heart of the spectacular lack of success of most social reforms. (1991:4)

It might be argued that that the language of curriculum change documents can be, and in practice is, interpreted by planners in ways that recognize teachers' difficulties. This may be done by interpreting phrases like *'student centred'* and *'authentic'* in the above

extracts in a manner that tries to maximize the 'cultural continuity' between the existing language teaching culture and the demands of the new curriculum. Holliday (1999:169) defines this term as follows.

Cultural continuity is achieved when meaningful bridges are built between the culture of the innovation and the traditional expectations of the people with whom we work.

In the above Chinese example therefore, planners' awareness of the need for cultural continuity might mean that they tacitly ignore many of the classroom-behaviour implications of a concept like 'student centred', to take account of the existing 'teacher centred' Chinese TESOL tradition, and so lessen the changes in practice demanded of classroom teachers.

However, if curriculum change is genuinely being introduced to bring about significantly different learning outcomes for school leavers, for example the development of spoken language skills, then the extent of desirable cultural continuity will need to be balanced against those desired outcomes. Stoller (1994) in her study of the diffusion of innovation in Intensive English Programmes in the USA, points out that too little expectation of real change to the status quo will ultimately be unproductive, in terms of achieving real diffusion of new practices. Major, national level curriculum change projects, which usually represent substantial investments of money, time and energy, cannot therefore afford to be too timid if they are to be worth embarking on in the first place.

The problem of how curriculum change planners can support teachers in making the necessary adjustments remains. Such support is particularly important in the many TESOL contexts where the language curriculum change project is not part of a more

general curriculum reform. Here the immediate institutional environment and wider educational culture in which language teachers work remains unchanged. Unless planners intervene, institutional leaders, colleagues, learners and parents have no immediate reason to be either interested in or supportive of the professional adjustments that English teachers will need to make, so further lessening the likelihood that new practices will become firmly established.

This section has identified one important feature of language curriculum change – the need to provide support for the professional adjustments that will be required of teachers- that planners need to consider before finalizing their plans. The following section discusses a second, equally important, feature that needs to be understood by planners if teachers are to feel supported during the first years of the change process.

2. The language curriculum at the core of an interdependent language education system.

Almost 15 years ago Kennedy (1988, acknowledging Bowers, 1983) pointed out that the implementation of curriculum change within any given institution will be influenced by a wider environment of interacting systems within which it is situated. Since then our appreciation of the unpredictable complexity of the interactions between and within the components of such systems has developed immensely, thanks to the work of educational change researchers like Fullan.

Take an education policy or problem and start listing all the forces that could figure in the solution and that would need to be influenced to make for productive change. Then take the unplanned factors that are inevitable. [...] Finally realize that every new

variable that enters the equation produces ten other ramifications, which in turn produce tens of other reactions and so on... (Fullan 1993:19)

Acknowledgement of such complexity clearly requires planners to recognise that a single, inflexible, detailed, linear, blueprint plan for curriculum change implementation at a national level, will not be fruitful. However, unless the proposed changes are being introduced purely as an example of 'triumphalist symbolic action' (Goodson 2001:53), recognition of complexity does not absolve planners from all responsibility for planning. They must still try to ensure that, as far as possible, any major changes that they propose are consistent with those aspects of both the language education system and the wider environment over which they **can** exercise control.

There is, for example, little excuse for the introduction of curriculum changes whose expressed outcomes bear little resemblance to what will be assessed in high stakes examinations governing entry to secondary school or university. Similarly it is clear from the previous section, that where the curriculum changes do represent a significant cultural shift, the embedding of new practices in teachers' existing professional culture will not be completed solely by the provision of a single brief in-service programme. Nor will any changes last long without appropriate readjustment to the processes and content of initial language teacher training. Furthermore if the language curriculum change is taking place in isolation, with the remainder of the school curriculum remaining unchanged, the culturally different notions of concepts like 'teaching' and 'learning' that it carries will at the very least need to be clearly explained, to members of both the educational community; local administrators, principals, colleagues and learners and the wider community, especially to parents.

Since English language curriculum change is often introduced with stated objectives representing a cultural orientation different to that of the prevailing educational culture, it is clearly the responsibility of planners to consider how teachers may be supported in making the necessary professional adjustments. In order to do so, planners themselves need to be clear about what the proposed changes involve. The following section suggests a process through which such clarity might begin to be achieved.

3. Planning to support curriculum change in classrooms.

In this section I suggest that in order to be able to support teachers through the curriculum change process TESOL curriculum change, planners need to go through a stage during which they explicitly consider the implications of their plans from two interdependent points of view. Firstly they need to try and identify how great a cultural shift the practices implied by the proposed changes will represent for most teachers, and so what sort of support will be needed by whom for how long, to help teachers make the transition. Secondly, they need to consider what imbalances the proposed curriculum changes may introduce among other influential components of the language education system, and so what adjustments will be required, when, to restore balance and support the introduction of new practices.

How might such consideration be structured? What questions might language curriculum change planners ask to obtain answers to inform supportive planning? I propose that two main sets of questions would be useful, each focusing on one theme.

The first set aims to answer two connected questions:

- *what degree of cultural shift do the project objectives as initially articulated imply, and/or what fundamental cultural values might the objectives threaten?*
- *what specific support might teachers need, to be able/willing to accommodate such a shift?*

These questions may involve consideration of the context beyond the immediate education system itself, where this will influence the implementation process. Relevant examples here might be the degree to which there has been previous experience of change within education or society at large and how such experiences have been perceived, or the existing socio-economic status of English teachers, and how both of these may affect their ability and/or willingness to spend time and energy on developing new practices.

The second set tries to answer the questions:

- *how can teachers' work in the changed TESOL classroom be supported by other factors which, influence teachers' working environments?*
- *what will providing such support imply for the funding, timing and sequencing of the curriculum change process?*

Questions here will examine the degree to which the proposed changes, when actually implemented in classrooms may be supported or undermined by other significant components of the education context that influence practices in language classrooms. Such components may be part of the immediate TESOL context, for example materials

and examinations. They may also be part of the wider educational/institutional context, for example the likely attitudes of learners, colleagues, leaders, or parents. Examples of the sort of questions in each group that might be asked, and answered, albeit probably in outline terms, are given below.

3.1 What degree of cultural shift do the project objectives represent?

At the first level useful questions will be those that help identify the major features of any 'gap(s)' between existing institutional and language teacher strengths and skills and the classroom practices demanded by the proposed changes. At a second level, information gathered above will pose further questions about what such a shift is likely to imply for the change planning process. These, when answered, will provide a basis for final planning decisions. Examples are given in table 2 below

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

3.2 How can change in TESOL classroom practices be supported by other components of, and actors in, teachers' working environments?

These questions are concerned with how best to try and ensure that language teachers trying to implement change in their classrooms are broadly supported by those with whom they most frequently interact (colleagues and learners), and those to whom they are immediately responsible (institutional leaders, local educational administrators, parents). Such support will be far more likely to be forthcoming, if the most influential components of national TESOL contexts; curriculum/syllabus, materials, examinations and teacher education, are broadly in harmony.

Examples of questions that might be asked here are given in Table 3 below. Although they may seem obvious questions to ask, the lack of consistency between these components in the language teaching systems of some countries today (for example, Japan, Saudi Arabia, Russia) suggests that planners still do not sufficiently consider them.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

It is possible that change planners at national level will be reluctant to greatly extend the time devoted to initial planning. However, assuming that the whole curriculum change process is entered into genuinely, to achieve outcomes that are seen as important, then the time needed to frame and answer questions similar to those above will be time well spent. Even if answered only quickly and in outline, the information gathered can provide planners with an understanding of important features within the change context that will require adjustment if classroom teachers are to experience project implementation positively. Such information ought to helpfully inform final planning decisions about objectives, time scales, and the need for and use of funds to provide necessary support mechanisms.

Figure 1 below, which should be read chronologically from top to bottom, suggests an outline for a language curriculum change planning process that tries to maximise support for its *key players*. It takes as its guiding principle the desirability of ensuring that the main components of the educational system referred to earlier, and those people with

whom teachers most frequently interact in their professional lives, all, as far as possible, support the language teachers' efforts to implement new practices during the crucial early years of the curriculum change process.

Clearly the planning model suggested in Figure 1 represents an example of a Power-Coercive strategy (Chin and Benne 1970) for introducing change. This paper makes no effort to comment on the desirability or otherwise of such strategies. In my experience however, such strategies remain the norm in most national level educational change contexts. Figure 1 thus represents an attempt to work within such existing realities.

A further point to note is the crucial role played by high stakes tests in achieving a supportive environment for curriculum change. In my view, lack of harmony between expected curriculum outcomes and the content of such tests is a factor likely to compromise the success of the whole process.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

Conclusion

Quite astonishing amounts of time and money have been, and continue to be, invested in trying to implement language curriculum change projects throughout the world. In many cases the changes have been introduced with minimal consideration of how the key players charged with their implementation might be supported. Consequently over the last 20 plus years, many tens of thousands of English teachers worldwide have been expected to deal, largely unsupported, with the stress of the professional adjustments and new classroom practices implied by a new curriculum, whose objectives are based on

assumptions deriving from different educational cultures. Inevitably their learners' language classroom experiences have been affected by how easily their English teachers have been able to deal with such expectations.

If matters are to improve, I suggest that planners need to ask and try to answer two groups of questions before finalizing their plans. Doing so may help them to introduce their changes in a manner that provides as much support as possible to those who they expect to put their plans into action in language classrooms.

In principle there seems little reason for language curriculum change planning to continue to be as incoherent as it so frequently appears to be. In practice however, it seems that internal or external political and/or economic factors often severely limit planners' freedom of manoeuvre. Where this is so, and teachers continue to have to try to deal with the introduction of new practices in their classrooms unsupported, it is very likely that most will sooner or later either actively resist the changes or just ignore them altogether. The outcomes expected from the curriculum change process will thus be actively subverted or quietly forgotten, so providing yet another example of the message carried by the quote with which this paper began.

We can produce many examples of how educational practices could look different, but we can produce few, if any, examples of large numbers of teachers engaging in these practices in large scale institutions designed to deliver education to most children. (Elmore 1996:11 in Fullan 2000)

References

- Barnes, D., and Schemilt, B., 1974 Transmission and Interpretation Education Review 26/3: 213-228
- Bennett, N., Crawford, M., and Riches, C., (Eds) 1992. Managing Change in Education: Individual and Organisational Perspectives. Paul Chapman, London.
- Buchanan, D., and Boddy, D., 1992. The Expertise of the Change Agent. Prentice Hall Carless. D., 1999. Large-scale curriculum change in Hong Kong. In Kennedy, C., Doyle, P., and Goh, C. (Eds.). 1999. Exploring Change in English Language Teaching: . Macmillan/Heinemann, Oxford. pp19-28..
- Chin, R., and Benne, K.. 1970 General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems. In Bennis, W., Benne, K., and. Chin, R. (Eds.) The Planning of Change. Holt Reinhart and Wilson, London.
- Coleman, H., 1987. Teaching spectacles and learning festivals. English Language Teaching Journal 41/2: 97-103
- Coleman, H. (Ed.) 1996. Society and the Language Classroom. CUP, Cambridge.
- Department for International Development., 2000. Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor. HMSO, London.
- Elmore, P., 1995. Getting to Scale with Good Educational Practice. Harvard Educational Review 66/1: 1-26
- English Language Curriculum Department., 1999. English for Me. Grade 3. Teacher's Book B. ELCD. Muscat, Sultanate of Oman
- Fullan, M.G., 1992 Causes and processes of implementation and continuation. In Bennett, N., Crawford, M., and Riches, C. (Eds.) Managing change in education: Individual and organisational perspectives. Paul Chapman, London. pp109-131
- Fullan, M.G., 1993. Change Forces. Probing the Depths of Educational Reform Falmer Press, London.
- Fullan, M.G., 1999. Change Forces the Sequel. Falmer Press, London.
- Fullan, M.G., 2000 The Return of Large-Scale Reform. Journal of Educational Change 1: 5-28
- Fullan, M.G., 2001. The New Meaning of Educational Change. (3rd edition) Cassell, London.

- Fullan, M.G., and Hargreaves, A. (Eds.) 1992. *Teacher Development and Educational Change*. Falmer Press. Lewes.
- Goh, C. 1999. Nationwide curriculum innovation: how do we manage? In Kennedy, C., Doyle, P., and Goh, C. (Eds.). 1999 *Exploring Change in English Language Teaching*. Macmillan/Heinemann, Oxford. pp 5-18
- Goodson, I., 2001. Social Histories of Educational Change. *Journal of Educational Change* 2: 45-63
- Hall, D.R., and Hewings, A. (Eds.) 2001. *Innovation in English Language Teaching*. Routledge, London.
- Hatch, M. J., 1997. *Organisational Theory*. OUP, Oxford.
- Hayes, J., 2002. *The Theory and Practice of Change Management*. Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Henry, J., and Walker, D. (Eds.) 1991. *Managing Innovation*. Sage, London
- Hofstede, G., 1994. *Cultures and Organisations*. Harper Collins, London.
- Holliday, A., and Cooke, T. 1982. An Ecological Approach to ESP. In Waters, A. (Ed.) *Issues in ESP*. Pergamon, Oxford.
- Holliday, A., 1994. *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. CUP, Cambridge.
- Holliday, A., 1999. Achieving Cultural Continuity in Curriculum Innovation. In Hall, D.R., and Hewings, A. (Eds.) 2001. *Innovation in English Language Teaching*. Routledge, London. pp169-177.
- Hutchinson, T., 1991. The management of change. *Teacher Trainer*. 5/3:19-21
- Hyde, B., 1994. Albanian babies and bathwater. *Teacher Trainer* 8/1: 10-13.
- Jacob, G., 1996. The CDS Co-ordinator. Unpublished paper. Department of English. University of Pune. India
- Kennedy, C., 1987. Innovation for a Change: Teacher Development and Innovation. *English Language Teaching Journal* 41/3.
- Kennedy, C., 1988. Evaluating the Management of Change *Applied Linguistics* 9/4: 329-342
- Kennedy, C., Doyle, P., and Goh, C. (Eds.). 1999 *Exploring Change in English Language Teaching*. Macmillan/Heinemann, Oxford.
- Kramsch, C., and Sullivan, P., 1996. Appropriate Pedagogy *English Language Teaching Journal* 50/3: 199-211

- Lamb, M.V., 1995. The Consequences of INSET. *English Language Teaching Journal* 49/1: 72-79.
- Li, Defeng, 1998. It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea . In Hall, D.R., and Hewings, A. (Eds.) 2001. *Innovation in English Language Teaching*: Routledge, London. pp149-166
- Luxon, T., 1994. The Psychological risk for teachers at a time of methodological change. *Teacher Trainer* 8/1 :6-9
- Markee, N., 1997. *Managing Curricular Innovation* . CUP, Cambridge..
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Handbook. 2001. Tokyo
- Nunan, D., and Lamb, C. 1996. *Managing the Learning Process*. In Hall, D.R., and Hewings, A. (Eds.) 2001. *Innovation in English Language Teaching* . Routledge, London. 27-45.
- O'Donoghue, D., 1995. The Implementation of Change: A Case Study of a Convent Primary School in the West of Ireland. *Compare* 25/1:
- Pennycook, A., 1989. The Concept of Method, Interested Knowledge and the Politics of Language Teaching . *TESOL Quarterly* 23/4: 589-618
- Riley, K., 2000. Leadership, Learning and Systemic Reform. *Journal of Educational Change* 1: 39-55
- Stoller, F.A., 1994. The Diffusion of Innovations in Intensive ESL Programmes. *Applied Linguistics* 15/3: 300-327
- Tomlinson, B., 1990. Managing change in Indonesian High Schools. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 44/1
- Wang, Q., and Wang, L. 2000.. English Language Curriculum Developments for Schools in China. Paper presented at the ILEC conference. Hong kong. December 2000
- Waters, A., and Vilches, M. 2001. Implementing ELT innovations: A Needs Analysis Framework. *English Language Teaching Journal* 55/2: 133-141
- Wedell, M., 2000. *Managing Change in a Turbulent Environment: The ELTSUP project in Hungary 1991-1998*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Glamorgan Business School
- Whitaker, P., 1993. Changes in professional development: the personal dimension. In

- Kydd, L., Crawford, M., and Riches, C. (Eds.) 1997. Professional development for educational management. Open University Press, Buckingham.. pp11-25.
- Young, R., & Lee, S. 1985. EFL curriculum innovation and teachers' attitudes. In Larson, P., Judd, E., & Messerschmidt, D. (Eds.) On TESOL 84: A Brave new world for TESOL. TESOL, Alexandria Virginia.

Vitae

Dr Martin Wedell is Head of International Development, School of Education, University of Leeds, UK. He is a member of the TESOL group within the School, and before returning to the UK in 1998 had spent almost 20 years working overseas in Kenya, Saudi Arabia, China and Hungary.....often on curriculum change projects. Research interests are educational change management and the pedagogy of online teacher education.

Figure 1. Planning language development projects to support their Key Players

BEFORE FINALLY DECIDING ON CHANGE OBJECTIVES Curriculum change planners consider:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications of cultural shift entailed by different degrees of curriculum change. • which aspects of the wider TESOL context, in which order, will require adjustment, to support implementation of proposed objectives and necessary practices • How and when to 'publicise' change to whom. 		
	ON THE BASIS OF WHICH THEY FINALISE OBJECTIVES AND TIME SCALES AND MAKE COMMITMENTS TO	
adequate funding support throughout the agreed time scales	.	on-going, active flexible participation in planning throughout the agreed time-scales
	AND PLAN TO ENSURE THAT WHEN IMPLEMENTATION BEGINS	
There are easily available, and well publicised, supplies of appropriate, materials available for teachers to use in the classroom, and/or for learners to borrow or buy.	Priorities and emphases in INSET and PRESET language teacher education have been adjusted to reflect the need for different classroom practices. An ongoing programme of INSET support over the first few years of the implementation process has been set in place.	The content of high stakes English language examinations has been adjusted, to assess learners according to the desired outcomes of the proposed changes. Adjustments and reasons for their introduction have been widely publicised.
	SO THAT WHEN CLASSROOM TEACHING BEGINS	
Leaders within the institution and/or local government area know that exam adjustments will soon measure learners according to new criteria, and so require new teaching approaches.		Colleagues in other subjects understand that English teachers have to develop different classroom practices, if their learners are to pass new exams
	Existing language teachers, feel supported by their schools, their communities and the education system as a whole.	
Parents understand that the nature of the language work their children need to do for homework and in class has to change, to reflect different knowledge and skills combinations that will be tested in the high-stakes exams that their children face.		Learners understand that in order to 'succeed' at English they will now need to be able to show a different combination of knowledge and skills, and that this will probably require them to adapt the way that they behave in the language classroom.

Table 1. Some fundamental differences between educational cultures

Young and Lee (1984)		
Transmission based		Interpretation based
Language proficiency involves knowledge of a stable, finite, body of mostly factual content		Language proficiency represents a learner's ability to appropriately organize their thoughts and their existing language knowledge, to express and understand meanings for their own purposes
All learners need the same knowledge.		What people need to learn depends on their purposes for learning.
The teacher's role is to be the expert and to transmit knowledge to the learners and test whether they have learned it		The teacher's role is to devise and manage opportunities for learners to refine and develop their language knowledge and ability to use it through interaction with others
The learner's role is to learn the knowledge transmitted by the teacher and demonstrate such learning when tested.		The learner's role is to participate in, and contribute to decisions about, the opportunities to develop language knowledge and skill that the teacher makes available
Hofstede 1994		
Knowledge is clearly defined and there is one right answer to almost any question		Knowledge has to be constructed and is arrived at through discussion
The purpose of education is to learn how to do things		The purpose of education is to learn how to learn
Learners are members of a group and speak only when spoken to.		Learners are a collection of individuals who are expected to express themselves
Teachers are the initiators of all classroom activity and should know all the answers		Teachers are facilitators of learners' participation in the learning process and can admit ignorance.

Table 2: Questions for planners 1: Extent and implications of the cultural shift that curriculum change represents

<p style="text-align: center;">LEVEL 1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Identification of degree of cultural shift</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">LEVEL 2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Possible implications for language curriculum change planning</p>
<p>1) What are the main characteristics of existing language classrooms in terms of the most common practices and teacher-learner roles?</p> <p>a) What are the most important New practices and teacher-learner roles implied by the objectives of the Curriculum change?</p> <p>b) What gaps between existing and Desired practice is apparent?</p>	<p>1) On the basis of answers at Level 1, what support systems would be required to bridge the gap(s)? Are proposed curriculum objectives feasible in the light of (1) above, or do they need to allow for greater cultural continuity?</p> <p>In the light of any adjustments to change objectives, what systems must be provided to support teachers and institutions?</p> <p>a) When should they be introduced? b) What should they focus on? c) How long will they be needed for?</p>
<p>2) What previous experience of professional and/or organisational change have English teachers and institutional leaders had?</p> <p>a) Have any previous experiences been generally positive or not? b) How is the idea of participating in the further changes likely to be viewed?</p>	<p>2) How can the planning content and/or process try and ensure that language teachers' / institutions' initial responses to the changes will be positive?</p> <p>a) What, apart from systems already considered at (1) above, can be done to highlight potential 'gains' of change?</p>
<p>3) Are there any well-known and respected figures in the profession (<i>key leaders</i>, Henry and Walker 1991) already working with and/or aware of the changes, or broadly sympathetic to them?</p>	<p>3) What roles could they usefully play in publicizing and/or planning and/or implementing the changes?</p>
<p>4) (in EFL contexts especially) How good is most English language Teacher's oral proficiency, and to what Extent does the educational culture expect Them to be 'expert'?</p> <p>a) What demands on teachers' oral proficiency will the proposed changes make? b) Can these demands be met with existing levels of proficiency?</p>	<p>4)What do any new demands on teachers oral proficiency imply for</p> <p>a) the type(s) of support that would be helpful? b) how long such support will be needed for? c) the number of teachers for whom such support will need to be provided? d) who should get what support, when?</p>
<p>5) To what extent does the existing Organizational culture promote free flows of information between individuals and institutions at all levels?</p>	<p>5) Which participants in the change process will need to know what, when?</p> <p>a) Will existing systems ensure that</p>

<p>a) Do existing systems encourage free flows of information between all levels of institution involved in the changes and between colleagues within them?</p> <p>b) Is important information normally committed to paper or transmitted orally?</p>	<p>change information is disseminated to all at (5) above</p> <p>b) What further support might institutions need to ensure such dissemination?</p>
<p>6) What is the existing socio-economic status of English language teachers?</p> <p>a) What does this imply for the effort they are likely to be willing to put into developing new practices?</p>	<p>6) What will need to be done to incorporate tangible '<i>gains</i>' (Kennedy 1988) into the implementation process, and so encourage teachers to feel that it is worth spending time and energy on developing new practices?</p>

**Table 3. Questions for planners 2:
Establishing support for change within the wider context.**

<p align="center">LEVEL 1</p> <p align="center">Identification of the degree of harmony between the components of the TESOL context</p>	<p align="center">LEVEL 2</p> <p align="center">Possible implications for language curriculum change planning</p>
<p>1) Are the curriculum changes consistent with the existing syllabus, language teaching materials, language examinations and language teacher education?</p> <p>If not, what imbalances between them do the curriculum changes introduce?</p>	<p>1) What adjustments will need to be made to restore balance between these components?</p> <p>a) at what chronological point in the process will such adjustments need to be made if they are to support the introduction of new practices into language classrooms?</p> <p>b) What do any such adjustments imply for project time-scales and funding?</p>
<p>2) To what extent do individuals within the wider education system and society at large understand and/or share the values that the change is trying to bring about? What information about the curriculum changes will need to be communicated to whom, outside the immediate TESOL profession, in order to support teachers when they try to introduce change to the language classroom?</p>	<p>2) To whom do the proposed changes need to be explained, at what point, in order to support their introduction in language classrooms</p> <p>a) in what terms can any adjustments at (1) above most positively be publicised?</p>