



Exploring the Relevance of Tyler's Rationale to the Lesotho General Certificate of Secondary Education English Syllabus

*Moea Kananelo Sylvester**

Lesotho College of Education, P. O. Box 234, Thaba-Tseka 550, Lesotho

Moeasyvester@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Tyler's curriculum model—which was developed in response to growing concerns around responsibility in education—has dominated curriculum development. This study was set to explore the relevance of Tyler's rationale to the Lesotho General Certificate of Secondary Education English Syllabus. The study was a qualitative content analysis of the LGCSE English syllabus in alignment with Tyler's (1949) rationale of syllabus development. The results revealed that the model is generally applicable in the LGCSE English syllabus through clearly defined aims of the syllabus as well as the assessment objectives, content selection, organisation and evaluation. Notwithstanding that, there appeared to be demerits of the model in the teaching and learning of the LGCSE English. The primary objectives and results that teachers must adhere to may be evident, but they do not provide teachers or learners the freedom to choose how they think learning should occur. Teachers are also deprived of the chance to support alternative teaching strategies. Tyler's model highlights hierarchical power interactions between curriculum key players. Additionally, there are no alternatives for learners' education and no voice for them. It is therefore recommended that teachers can incorporate Tyler's paradigm with contemporary language teaching methodologies by modifying Tyler's Rationale to language learning strategies and curriculum professionals, on the other hand, must acknowledge the Tyler rationale for what it is: Ralph Tyler's interpretation of the ideal curriculum creation process, not the industry standard.

Keywords: Curriculum, Lesotho education system, LGCSE English, syllabus, teaching and learning, Tyler's rationale

1. Introduction

A curriculum arranges all the elements of the intricate educational task. Because of this, a curriculum is the absolute minimum requirement for a successful educational process. Many curricula on a wide range of disciplines have been devised both domestically and internationally in light of this significant characteristic. Modern curricula were required due to the modifications and advancements in the educational system and the government of Lesotho was part of this move. The Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) created the 2009 Curriculum and Assessment Policy (CAP) in Lesotho, which is the most recent and an operational curriculum policy up to date. MOET created this new curriculum policy under which numerous adjustments were made to numerous subjects taught in Lesotho's elementary and secondary education. As asserted in the CAP, the primary and secondary curricula review that bred it was necessitated by the demand of rendering education at such levels accessible, relevant and of best quality (MOET, 2009) in order to reach its *ne plus ultra*.

English is one of the subjects that were the focus of the development of the new curriculum. The following reasons are used to explain why many governments created new Second Language (SL) curricula: Significant developments have occurred in the realm of SL education over time. As well, the aims and methods of SL education have evolved in response to the shifting demands, aspirations, and standards of living in society (Moea, 2023). The idea of foreign language instruction based on the learner has replaced the idea of SL education based on the "authority" (Cullinan, 2016). In addition, the approaches, methods, and strategies of teaching grammar have become less significant as the concept of language as a means of communication has taken centre stage in the processes of second language learning and teaching (SLL and SLT).

First introduced in 1989 as part of the country's educational development, the Cambridge Overseas School Certificate (COSC) was superseded by the Lesotho General Certificate of Secondary Education (LGCSE) (Moea, 2022a, b; NANOPDF, 2018), a nationally developed certification that evolved over a period of years in three or four basic stages. LGCSE appeared to be more pertinent than COSC given the conditions that prevailed at that moment and the projected modifications to Lesotho's educational evaluation system. According to NANOPDF.com (2018) in Moea (2023), the curriculum repute of the LGCSE has improved, meaning that English Language is no longer a passing or failing subject, unlike during the COSC era. Additionally, it varies from the COSC in the manner that each subject's achievement is acknowledged individually, and it identifies achievement below grade E with unambiguous and explicit performance indicators for this lower level (Moea, 2022b).

Candidates who have finished a three-year senior secondary curriculum are intended to be assessed using the LGCSE English Language Syllabus. It is noteworthy to enlighten that English is used as a second language, an official language, and a medium of instruction in Lesotho. Along with Sesotho, the native tongue, it is recognised as an official language (MOET, 2009). CAP states that Sesotho should be taught in the first three years of schooling (Grades One to Three). On the flip side of the coin, English is the medium of instruction in Grades Four to 11 (though initially it was from Grade 4 to 12) as well as in postsecondary institutions (MOET, 2009). Beginning in Grade Four, learners in elementary school start studying English as a subject and as a second language. At the secondary level, English is provided in two phases: as a stand-alone subject of English Language from Grade 9 to 11 (LGCSE level) and in Grade 8 under the Linguistic and Literary English (LLE) (Moea, 2023a).

Language is powerful because it is deeply political. Accordingly, there is a presumption that authority and knowledge are related. According to Pennycook (2010, p. 39), "all knowledge is linked to power." English was thus declared to be a second language, although this was not a neutral political decision. The English language is the preferred option for several reasons: first, it powers capitalism's machinery; second, it's essential for access to knowledge in the modern era of technology; and third, it's a holdover from the days of colonialism (Cullinan, 2016). Thus, it would appear that learning English as a second language is a wise move. Nonetheless, this view highlights the assimilation of prevailing ideology and refutes the English language's predominance.

It is undeniable that foreign language instruction is crucial in developing countries, and within the past 20 years, significant advancements have been made in this area. These modifications all highlight the need for systematic approaches to second language teaching and learning in order to produce successful outcomes. Additionally, a curriculum that is well-organized carries out this systematisation. Ensuring that learners have integrated and pertinent learning experiences that support their learning, development, and growth is the main goal of curriculum creation (Cruikshank, 2018). Curriculum building has never been an easy or quick process in the past; rather, it is a very dynamic and creative process that incorporates knowledge from many different sources (Smith & Lovat, 1995 in Cruikshank, 2018). For example, because there are a range of teaching sites and objectives in mathematics education, there is no one ideal way to approach planning.

For other curriculum areas, the idea of several models fitting various situations is undoubtedly appropriate. Over the past 60 years, a number of models have been proposed with the goal of simplifying this difficult process (Cruikshank, 2018). In order to maximise efficacy and efficiency, orthodox curriculum theory has evolved from a philosophical approach that distinguishes means from aims (Cho & Allen, 2005). The most popular illustration of this is Tyler's (1949) justification, which is still relevant in the field of curriculum development even after all these years.

Since its release, Tyler's curriculum model—which was developed in response to growing concerns around responsibility in education—has dominated curriculum development (Cruikshank, 2018). With its specific and well-defined objectives, the model offered a clear roadmap for the whole curriculum development process, giving teachers a clear idea of what they anticipate their learners would accomplish. It is simple to monitor achieved results when these objectives are controlled appropriately (Brady & Kennedy, 2010). Based on the objective evaluation, Tyler's approach may be adaptable to all subject areas and levels, making it simple to determine whether a subject's content, activities, and teaching techniques are acceptable. The curriculum's contents are presented in a rationale order, and the model helps make final results predictions with ease.

Since its 1949 publication, Tyler's objectives curriculum model has had a significant impact on the subject of curriculum creation. Despite its age, this model continues to have a significant impact, highlighting the significance of the questions Tyler used as the foundation for his model (Hlebowitsh, 2021). According to the Tyler argumentation, learners should be taught by selecting and organising techniques that explain what they should learn, as well as by predetermining what they need to learn and how to evaluate if they have fulfilled each aim (Cruikshank, 2018). It is an extremely methodical technique that places a strong emphasis on guided learning and organisation. In order to assess if a learner was adept at their learning, the method looks for whether each learner exhibits the pre-specified behavioural changes.

Tyler's justification attempts to structure the curriculum around a number of essential tasks, such as: (a) identifying the objectives; (b) organising the instruction related to those objectives; and (c) designing the mechanisms for evaluation that are used to ascertain whether the objectives have been achieved (Hlebowitsh, 2021). The justification was wildly successful and soon became standard practice for curriculum development projects. Dissatisfied with the behaviouristic aspects of the reasoning, several detractors asserted that the reasoning originated in a tradition of social efficiency that produced educational experiences structured and governed by numerous atomized aims (Kliebard, 1970; Wraga, 2016, 2017). A few years later, criticism of the justification reached the core of the curriculum studies community, claiming that the justification had developed into a conceptual dead end for the discipline and represented a perspective on the curriculum that limited the field's potential for significant theoretical advancements.

2. Statement of the problem

The Tyler (1949) rationale is a curriculum development technique that many curriculum scholars tend to love to hate, as every curriculum scholar is aware. The rationale was first presented as "a production model of curriculum and instruction" by Kliebard (1970, p. 270). Despite corrective assessments, this and other unfavourable representations of it have continued to appear in curriculum literature (Wraga, 2017). According to a recent analysis, however, curriculum scholars have essentially defined their favourite ideas by using the Tyler rationale as a straw man (Wraga, 2016). In the meantime, Tyler's reasoning has garnered a lot of attention over the years as a useful method for developing curricula, both domestically and abroad (Wraga, 2017). A large portion of the most recent curricular development has been built upon Tyler's justification. Although many nations have matched their curricula and subjects to Tyler's model, there is not much literature in Lesotho that focuses on determining Tyler's model's applicability to certain individual subjects. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate the applicability of Tyler's reasoning to the LGCSE English syllabus. This will be accomplished by looking at the assessment objectives in addition to the syllabus's overarching goals.

3. Literature review

3.1 Definition of curriculum

Numerous definitions exist for the term "curriculum." The vague nature of the phrase stems from varying perspectives among stakeholders, including administrators, researchers, teachers, learners, and evaluators, each of whom places a distinct emphasis in the discourse surrounding education. The inconsistency is a reflection of how complicated the word "curriculum" is by definition. It could be required to define the term "curriculum" before starting any curriculum-related undertakings, such as curriculum development, implementation, evaluation, and empirical investigations conducted by administrators, teachers, researchers, and evaluators.

A curriculum is a work in progress that starts with the learner's present experience and works its way outward to the formalised bodies of truth known as studies (Danner & Ofuani, 2022). School subjects are taught according to a curriculum. A curriculum is, in other words, an assortment of subjects (Mulenga, 2018). Because of this, the term "school curriculum" is often used in a wide sense to refer to the range of subjects offered and the duration of instruction in each subject, expressed in hours or minutes. Marsh (2009) also called light to the definition's assumption that the same material is taught and examined. Another widely accepted approach of conceptualising a curriculum is as content. A fascinating subject that challenges terminology like "syllabus" and "course outline" is curriculum as content. Generally speaking, a "syllabus" is a condensed summary of the content that will be presented in a subject, course, or unit (OECD, 2020). It is typically a list of subjects or content areas covered in the subject matter. Unquestionably, a syllabus or course plan is a component of a curriculum and, as such, comes within the broader term.

Many studies are echoes of the experiences of the curriculum (Mizan, 2022). Thus, to ensure that every learner has access to challenging academic experiences, teachers ought to utilise the curriculum as their main source of guidance when evaluating what is required for successful instruction and learning (Mulenga, 2018). A curriculum's organisation, structure, and subjects are all designed to help learners learn effectively and quickly. For the curriculum to support instruction and learning, it must have the appropriate goals, techniques, materials, and assessments. As a result, a curriculum is an assortment of standards-based activities that help learners apply and become proficient in their knowledge and skills. The content to be taught must be heavily stressed in a syllabus, but a curriculum transcends past this. Another widely accepted approach of conceptualising a curriculum is as content. Distinct countries employ distinct curricula to provide high-quality education in their particular situations. The Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS), for instance, is the name of the curriculum in South Africa. Lesotho also has its own, known as the Curriculum and Assessment Policy (CAP), which acts as a guide for the country's educational system.

3.2 Background of Tyler's rationale

The Tyler rationale was developed in response to significant historical developments that occurred in US education in the first half of the 20th century. These developments included the expansion of teacher training, the growth in school enrolment, the development of curriculum development as a specialised professional role, and the development of educational assessment (Wraga, 2017). Tyler's model developed in the 1920s and 1930s as a result of his work with university faculty and school teachers in the field, his attempts to define the goals of education, the techniques he developed for creating tests, and his creation of educational evaluation as a substitute for educational measurement (Tyler, 1986). The syllabus Tyler published for his learners was meant to serve as a study guide. Tyler created the course Education 360 to involve his learners in the process of creating curriculum and instruction for specific learners in specific educational contexts (Wraga, 2017). Tyler's model is noteworthy when considered in the context of its historical development. It embraces three curriculum sources, views education as essentially an experience, views assessment as an evaluation rather than a measurement, views curriculum development as a process of solving problems, and is dedicated to teacher involvement in curriculum and instruction development (Tyler, 1987). In other words, Tyler's reasoning goes much beyond the four queries he raised.

The curriculum and instruction development method that Tyler outlined in *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* was unquestioned for twenty years from its publication in 1950 until Herbert Kliebard's (1970) critical reassessment of several of Tyler's claims. Tyler's utilisation of a trio of sources for educational reasons was denounced by Kliebard as simple ecumenism and Tyler's representation of the Committee of Ten's curriculum recommendations was rejected. Tyler's model was deemed to be value neutral, and it was linked to Franklin Bobbitt's (1918, 1924) approach to activity analysis. Tyler's call for employing philosophy as a canvas for preliminary objectives was described as "trivial, almost vacuous" (p. 266), and Tyler's rationale was characterised as uncompromisingly step-wise (p. 267). Finally, Tyler's definition of education was implied to be barely behaviouristic (Kliebard, 1970). Kliebard came to the conclusion that Tyler's model will always serve as the standard for curriculum development for people who see the curriculum as a sophisticated machine that turns the unfinished, unusable materials that learners bring to school into a polished and functional product. In the end, Tyler's model constituted a curriculum and instruction production paradigm, according to Kliebard.

However, Antonelli (1972) disproved Kliebard. Antonelli disagreed with Kliebard's comparison of Tyler's rationale to Bobbitt's method of job analysis, arguing that although job analysis primarily drew its educational objectives from society, Tyler (1949) also took into account the characteristics of the learner along with the subject matter when determining his educational goals. About twenty years after Kliebard's (1970) critique was published, Hlebowitsh (1992) examined the growing body of criticism of Tyler's rationale in US curriculum literature. Hlebowitsh focused on the claims that Tyler advocated extremely particular objectives, that his reasoning was associated with Bobbitt's activity analysis, and that Tyler's model was behaviouristic, irrefragably linear, and conceptually neutral. Hlebowitsh further discovered that these claims were problematic primarily because they were based on misrepresentations of Tyler's actual writings, findings that Kliebard (1995) rejected. Despite being contested, Tyler's approach is still

relevant in the twenty-first century since instructional methods, objectives, and content must all be properly aligned (Kurata, Selialia & Mokhets'engoane, 2022; Moea, 2023). This claim is based on the previously stated reasoning from Antonelli (1972).

3.3 Tyler's Rationale Overview

Tyler put forth a four-step methodology for developing curricula that includes setting goals, choosing material, organising content, and evaluating it. Tyler (1949) raises four crucial issues that are consistent with the concept. First, what goals should the school aim to achieve in terms of education? This establishes the demands of the learners as well as the proper objectives, which need to be specified and demonstrate the program's aims. What educational experiences—that is, what teaching strategies allow learners to be taught content—can be offered in a way that is likely to accomplish the desired educational goals is the second question. How can the educational experiences be arranged successfully is the third question. In other words, one must be able to assess the experiences' applicability and figure out how to best integrate all of the material. What techniques, for example, can be used to improve effective teaching? Teaching strategies that improve topic coverage are required. The last question is: How can one tell if the objectives of education are being met? This implies that an assessment of the goal is required. As a result, it is necessary to evaluate the stated goals, and this evaluation can assist teachers in determining whether or not they have met the goals. Aligning instructional techniques with educational goals is the aim of this methodical approach.

The questions listed above can be converted into a linear framework that begins with the objectives and proceeds to the selection of learning opportunities according to the predetermined objectives. Two criteria—the philosophical and psychological selections—are used to choose the learning experiences (Kliebard, 1995). The professional philosophy should provide the standards by which the curriculum planner can assess an objective's significance in connection to the philosophy (Forgaty, 1976). Consequently, the goal should be stressed if it is essential to the philosophy; else, it should be eliminated entirely. The most thought-provoking aspect of Tyler's concept is the learning psychology section. According to Tyler (1951), a precise specification of these aims would best support his focus on apparent conduct that results from teaching. As such, Tyler contends that the objectives should encompass learnable behavioural patterns. According to Tyler, it is essential to clearly identify these goals in relation to behaviour and content in order for them to be most beneficial in creating a functional curriculum.

3.4 Applicability of Tyler's rationale in Lesotho

Tyler (1949) argues that if the school believes that its primary function is to teach people to adjust to society it will strongly emphasize obedience to present authorities, loyalty to the present forms and traditions, skills in carrying on the present techniques of life; whereas if it emphasizes the revolutionary function of the school, it will be more concerned with critical analysis, ability to meet new problems, independence and self-direction, freedom, and self-discipline. In Lesotho, the relevance of this model becomes apparent in shaping subject-specific curriculum frameworks. Looking at the model's alignment with Lesotho's educational goals Lesotho's education system, like many others, seeks to equip learners with skills and knowledge relevant to societal needs (Moea, 2022a, b; MOET, 2009; Raselimo & Mahao, 2015). Tyler's emphasis on clear objectives aligns with Lesotho's goal of fostering a workforce prepared for the country's socio-economic challenges. Also, the model can be used in subject-specific application through the definition of the objectives. Tyler's model encourages teachers to articulate clear learning objectives for each subject. In Lesotho, this means tailoring objectives to address the nation's cultural, economic, and developmental priorities. The model can also form the base for the selection of content. Tyler advocates for content selection based on meeting objectives.

Tyler spoke of two forms of integration within the curriculum: vertical and horizontal (Smith & Lovat, 1995). Vertical integration is concerned with experiences in earlier years which are then built upon in later years. This means that the knowledge and skills learners had learned in previous years should be deliberately used and extended upon in succeeding years. Alternatively, horizontal integration is concerned with the deliberate linking of subject content from one subject to another (Tyler, 1949). This is one way of trying to break down the invisible walls, separating knowledge between subjects. A common approach is for learners to study a theme across multiple subjects simultaneously.

In Lesotho, this involves integrating local context, history, and cultural elements into subjects, fostering a sense of identity and relevance for learners. The organization of subject matter under Tyler's model emphasizes linear progression. In Lesotho, this may involve structuring subjects to build foundational knowledge before delving into more complex concepts. As well, Tyler's rationale underscores continuous assessment to ensure objectives are met. In Lesotho, this aligns with the need for a robust evaluation system to gauge learners' understanding and adapt teaching strategies accordingly. While Tyler's rationale provides a structured framework, challenges may arise in adapting it to Lesotho's unique context. Cultural nuances, resource constraints, and evolving societal needs must be considered in implementing this model. In conclusion, Tyler's rationale offers valuable insights for shaping subjects within the Lesotho education system. By aligning educational goals with subject-specific objectives, Lesotho can enhance the effectiveness of its curriculum, ultimately contributing to the development of well-rounded and informed citizens.

4. Methodology

The research used in this study was qualitative. The researcher employed Tyler's model and the LGCSE English syllabus to assess whether words, themes, or concepts were present in some supplied qualitative data (i.e., text) by using content analysis (Rathore & Patwa, 2020). The researcher employed content analysis to measure and examine the frequency, significance, and connections between specific terms, topics, or ideas in the document.

5. Results analysis and discussion

A curriculum can be created using Tyler's well-known four steps, which are: defining objectives, choosing experiences, organising experiences, and evaluating. These phases are substantially expanded upon and explained in the Tyler reasoning. Since all subsequent steps in this theory start with and rely on the statement of aims, the first step is undoubtedly the most important. According to Tyler, curriculum planners and designers must first be certain of the educational objectives targeted in order to examine an educational programme methodically and intelligently. The analysis done in this line is shown below.

5.1 Defining Objectives in English Language Teaching

In his section on educational objectives, Tyler describes the three sources of objectives: research on learners, research on modern life, and recommendations from subject-matter experts. He also describes how information from these sources is to be screened through psychological and philosophical filters (Kliebard, 1995). Tyler uses philosophy as a way to make up for his shortcomings. This implies that Tyler's goals ultimately stem from philosophy and that the three sources listed above are merely decorative. The key to comprehending Tyler's reasoning, at least in terms of outlining the goals, is to pay close attention to how he employs the idea of a philosophical screen. The curriculum field's traditional ideas are encapsulated in the three sources of educational objectives. Tyler's focus on precise goals is in line with the communicative objectives of English language instruction. The fact that there is clarity regarding the outcomes that educators are supposed to teach is one advantage of this strategy. Hersh and Cohen (1971) solidify this by showing how behavioural objectives bridge the gap between vague educational aims and practical training. The objectives were subsequently developed by Mager (1962) into clear phrases that precisely outlined the behaviour required of the learners. In order to determine the gaps or needs of the learners, it is necessary to ascertain the current state of the learners and compare it with the accepted norms. Teachers are given a clear and comprehensive explanation of what they are expected to teach, how to teach it, and how to evaluate learners' learning because of this approach's high degree of organisation (Tyler, 1949). Teachers benefit greatly from this in terms of time savings and ease of class planning.

According to National Curriculum Development Centre [NCDC] and Examinations Council of Lesotho [ECOL] (2019) the LGCSE English syllabus has four objectives. The syllabus aims to equip the candidates with the ability and skills to:

1. Communicate effectively with clarity, relevance and accuracy using standard English,
2. use language, experience, imagination and creativity to respond to new situations relevantly, create original ideas and make a positive impact,
3. apply critical skills that will afford opportunity to scan, filter and analyse different forms of information and
4. to develop cross-cultural awareness by engaging with issues inside and outside their own communities (NCDC & ECOL, 2019, 1).

To ensure that learners have a well-rounded language learning experience, the aforementioned objectives are designed to help them improve their speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills. These steps provide insightful guidance on how to create a comprehensive and effective language curriculum for LGCSE English instruction. Regarding the communicative component of language learning, the objectives are evident. However, it's important to note that since speaking and listening are essential components of learning and teaching across the curriculum, they are not evaluated externally in this syllabus and instead "need to be developed and assessed internally" (NCDC & ECOL, 2019). This is due to the fact that reading and writing are used to teach objectives one, two, and four (NCDC & ECOL, 2019). Writing is the primary method used to teach aim two. This indicates that the curriculum addresses each of the four language skills, both explicitly and implicitly.

Since the Tyler justification was designed to give learners the particular knowledge and abilities needed to function as adults and engage in the workforce in the future, it may also be advantageous to them. Since learners frequently inquire about how or when they will apply the stuff they are learning in "real life," teaching approaches that emphasise imparting the knowledge and skills necessary for success in the job are more likely to be adopted by them. In response to this, the LGCSE English syllabus is very clear from the aims of the syllabus and the assessment objectives it intends to equip learners with; communicative skills through effective and appropriate communication, instrumentalization of language in different situation, analytical skills and critical skills in scanning and filtering different forms of information as well as developing cross-cultural awareness in engaging with internal and external issues in their communities.

5.2 Selecting Relevant Content

Once the crucial first step of stating objectives is accomplished, the rationale proceeds relentlessly through the steps of the selection of learning experiences as the means for achieving the ends. The selection of content in English language teaching must align with both linguistic and cultural objectives. This is evident in aim one 'communicate effectively, with... relevance' ensuring the linguistic appropriateness in communication; aim two 'use language... to respond to new situations relevantly... and make a positive impact' echoing the contextualisation of language as a response to different situations and cultural relevance and also develop a learner as an individual who is matured and can '...scan, filter and analyse different forms of information' as stipulated by aim three hence making '... a positive impact' as emphasised by aim two. The aspect of culture awareness is loud in aim four 'develop cross-cultural awareness' allowing engagement with challenges within and outside their own societies. Tyler's model encourages teachers to choose materials that resonate with learners while incorporating diverse perspectives to enhance cultural awareness and language appreciation.

5.3 Organizing Content in Language Lessons

Tyler maintains that the teacher can control the learning experience through the manipulation of the environment in such a way as to set up stimulating situations—situations that will evoke the kind of behaviour desired (Tyler, 1949). The four LGCSE English aims are very clear and they help a teacher to help a learner develop the abilities and skills to communicate effectively, use language imaginatively and relevantly, critically analyse and filter information and develop cross-cultural awareness so as such a learner may be relevant locally and globally based on the cross-cultural awareness and accuracy in the use of standard English. Tyler's organizational principles are particularly relevant to the sequential development of language skills; listening- speaking- reading- writing. English language teaching can benefit from a structured progression, starting with foundational language elements and gradually incorporating more complex linguistic structures.

5.4 Evaluation in English Language Learning

According to Tyler, the evaluation process is basically figuring out how much the curriculum and teaching programme is truly achieving the educational objectives (Tyler, 1949). Put another way, the objectives statement acts as both the benchmark for evaluating the programme and the foundation for choosing and planning the learning activities. According to Tyler, evaluation is the process of matching results with original aspirations in the shape of behavioural objectives. Continuous assessment is crucial in language education, and Tyler's model advocates for ongoing evaluation to ensure objectives are met. In English language learning, this involves assessing not only linguistic proficiency but also the application of language skills in real-life contexts. This is evident in the LGCSE English syllabus. The syllabus assessment objectives under 'writing' states that a learner must 'communicate appropriately with a clear awareness of purpose, audience and register' (NCDC & ECOL, 2019, 3). This covers the four language skills; listening by being able to determine register and purpose, speaking by knowing the audience and using appropriate register and the purpose as well as reading and writing as stipulated above. These skills are further assessed by assessment objective two 'communicate clearly and develop ideas coherently, at word level, at sentence level and at whole text level' (NCDC & ECOL, 2019, 3). Reading portrays language in use which one can use in speaking and writing. Thus, the assessment objectives draw from the main aims of the syllabus.

As well, behavioural objectives serve an analytical function of determining specifically where the learner's skill abilities are (Hersh and Cohen, 1971). Looking prior into the behaviours of the learners that need to be changed and improved, that is identifying changes in behaviour patterns of the learners. The LGCSE English assessment assesses the competencies expected of the learner as outlined above to ensure the communicative behaviour expected of a learner who has engaged with this syllabus.

5.5 Limitations of Tyler's rationale on the LGCSE English syllabus

There are obviously significant drawbacks to the Tyler argument, notwithstanding any potential advantages. The primary objectives and results that teachers must adhere to may be evident, but they do not provide teachers or learners the freedom to choose how they think learning should occur. When applied alone, Tyler's approach is curriculum-oriented and prioritises meeting the needs of a specific teaching scenario over the needs of scientific knowledge of measurement (Echols, 1973). Evaluation limits learners' discovery by evaluating behaviour as it relates to educational objectives rather than looking at a wider spectrum.

In addition to having little autonomy in the classroom, teachers are also deprived of the chance to support alternative teaching strategies. This method views teachers less as intelligent individuals who can adjust to the requirements of their learners and make decisions that are in their greatest interests and more as machines that can be programmed to follow commands. Furthermore, teacher-centred approaches predominate in education; the teacher is the one who enables the technical expertise used for instruction (Showalter, 2017). This contradicts the results of a research conducted by Moea in 2023, which found that the LGCSE English syllabus is learner-centred ideologically. Additionally, it departs from the learner-centred goals of studying English. Tyler's reasoning is therefore linked to the idea of education in banking. The teacher is the knowledge provider, and the learners are like cups—knowledge absorbers—waiting to be filled with information that they will subsequently repeat. This paradigm states that teachers provide the majority of the content rather than having learners find it on their own. Because the teacher performs the majority of the labour, this inhibits the learners' potential to explore and develop their abilities.

Curriculum designers, teachers, and learners are the key players in the education sector, and Tyler's model highlights hierarchical power interactions between them (Wraga, 2017). Curriculum developers define the goals and provide them to teachers, who then implement them for the learners. The fact that the curriculum is created centrally, is heavily exam-oriented, and holds teachers accountable for learners' performance essentially dehumanises the teachers. While they are active, learners are not engaged at the same time.

Additionally, there are no alternatives for learners' education and no voice for them. As noted by Hyman (1972), because learners are informed what they need to learn and how to achieve it, this approach places a great deal of emphasis on predetermined procedures and outcomes. School can seem like a hassle when learners aren't given a voice. When learners believe their voices will be heard, they are significantly more inclined to be actively involved in their education and to give it their all. Giving learners options about how to conduct research on a subject, for example, makes them more motivated, enthusiastic, and involved in their studies. The absence of any room for learner choice also stifles uniqueness. The Tyler model restricts learners' freedom of expression and inventiveness in this way.

This curriculum approach's complete lack of adjustments and presumption that every learner will learn best from the same manner constitutes another serious flaw. Naturally, this is really difficult. Learners who do not pick up on the techniques used in this approach are bound to get lost in the system. Even if these learners might have learned the content just fine if it had been presented in a different method, it will be noted during evaluation that they did not meet the intended objectives. The Tyler rationale disadvantages learners by not helping anyone who fails to attain the targeted objectives by putting all learners through the identical process. It completely disregards the value of any additional learning that might occur in the classroom and only values these pre-established learning outcomes.

6. Conclusion and recommendations

This study investigated Tyler's rationale's applicability to the LGCSE English curriculum. The focus of analysis was the general syllabus aims and the assessment objectives. The results showed that, as indicated by the syllabus's general aims and assessment objectives, the reasoning is, for the most part, pertinent to the curriculum. The rationale appears to support the syllabus's objectives, which are organised in a linear fashion to support both the assessment of language proficiency and competency goals as well as the selection and organisation of content in accordance with learners' experiences. All the same, the model seemed to have some issues with the LGCSE English syllabus, albeit not significantly. There are no options for teachers or learners to choose how they think learning should be done because of the objectives. Teachers also do not have a lot of freedom in the classroom and aren't given the chance to support alternative teaching strategies. Tyler's model also highlights the hierarchical power dynamics among curriculum developers, teachers, and learners—the stakeholders in the education system. Once more, learners have no say in their education and are not offered any options. Furthermore, it makes no accommodations of any kind and presumes that every learner will be able to study using the same approach.

Teachers can incorporate Tyler's paradigm with contemporary language teaching methodologies by modifying Tyler's Rationale to Language Learning Strategies. For example, communicative language instruction, which emphasises language use and engagement in real-life situations, is consistent with Tyler's goal-oriented approach. Tyler's model offers a strong foundation, but implementing English language curricula will present issues include accommodating a range of learner requirements, integrating technology, and keeping up with changing linguistic trends. Tyler's reasoning, in summary, provides an organised framework that has the potential to greatly improve English language instruction and acquisition. Teachers can design dynamic and culturally compatible language programmes that provide learners with good communication skills by coordinating objectives, content, organisation, and evaluation.

The Tyler model's very reasonableness is one factor in its success. It is a perfectly reasonable foundation for creating a curriculum that avoids the traps that the doctrine is prone to and appropriately strikes a balance between opposing extremes. The Tyler reasoning is unbreakable in a certain sense. For those who see the curriculum as a sophisticated machine that turns the unfinished raw materials that learners bring to school into a final and usable product, it will forever serve as a model for developing curricula. The curriculum and instruction creation process, by definition, starts with a design for the learner's future self when we have finished working with him. Tyler's model bypasses the patent ridiculousness of, example, Mager's by depicting the blueprint in general terms as opposed to specifics. Ralph Tyler should be recognised for his influence, wisdom, and moderation in whatever hall of fame that the educational community decides to create. Curriculum professionals, on the other hand, must acknowledge the Tyler rationale for what it is: Ralph Tyler's interpretation of the ideal curriculum creation process, not the industry standard.

Acknowledgements

N/A

REFERENCES

- Antonelli, G. A. (1972). Ralph W. Tyler: The man and his work. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 50(1), 68-74.
- Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum*. Boston. Houghton Mifflin.
- Bobbitt, F. (1924). *How to make a curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Brady, L., & Kennedy, K. (2010). *Curriculum construction*. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson. Centre for University Teaching. (2009). *Curriculum*. Retrieved from <http://www.flinders.edu.au/teaching/teaching-strategies/curriculum-development/curriculum.cfm>
- Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2005). Backward design: What goes around comes around, or haven't we seen this before? *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 9(2), 105-122.
- Cruikshank, V. (2018). Considering Tyler's Curriculum Model in Health and Physical Education. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(1), 207- 220
- Cullinan, M. (2016). Critical review of ESL curriculum: Practical application to the UAE context. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 8(1), 54-68
- Danner, R. B. & Ofuani, F. N. (2022). The Influence of Educational Philosophies and Learning Theories on Language Teaching and Learning in English as a Second Learning Context. *Rivers State University Journal of Education*, 25(1), pp. 69-81
- Echols, J. P. (1973). *The rise of the evaluation movement*. Stanford: Stanford University.

- Hersch, R. & Cohen, S. (1971). A case against behavioural objectives. *Comparative Education Review*, 16(3),529-543.
- Hlebowitsh, P. S. (1992). Amid behavioural and behaviouristic objectives: Reappraising appraisals of the Tyler rationale. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 24(6), 533-547.
- Hlebowitsh, P. S. (2021). *Ralph Tyler, the Tyler Rationale, and the Idea of Educational Evaluation*. Oxford University Press.
- Hyman, R. T. (1972). Mean-ends reasoning and curriculum. New York. Teachers College Record.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1970). Reappraisal: The Tyler rationale. *School Review*, 78, 259- 272.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1995). The Tyler Rationale revisited. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 27(1), 81-88.
- Mager, R. F. (1962). *Preparing instructional objectives*. Fearon Publishers: California.
- Marsh, C. (2009). Key Concepts for Understanding Curriculum. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242414025_Key_Concepts_for_Understanding_Curriculum/citation/download
- Mizan, M. M. R. (2022, March 25). What is curriculum? Definition and importance of curriculum. Domain of Mizanur R. Mizan. <https://www.mizanurmizan.info/what-is-curriculum-definition-and-importance-of-curriculum/>. Accessed 15 Sept 2022.
- Moea, K. S. (2022a). Problems faced by Lesotho piloting high school teachers in implementing the 2009 curriculum and assessment policy. *Merit Research Journal of Education and Review*, 10(4), 69–73. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6801136>
- Moea, K. S. (2022b). Curriculum ideology of the Lesotho general certificate of secondary education literature in English. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 1(4), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v1i4.703>
- Moea, K. S. (2023a). An Analysis of the Curriculum Ideology in the Lesotho General Certificate of Secondary Education English Language Syllabus. *Innovare Journal of Education*, 11(1), 42–46. <https://doi.org/10.22159/ijoe.2023v11i1.47112>
- MOET. (2009). *Curriculum and assessment policy: Education for individual and social development*. Maseru: MOET.
- Mulenga, I. M. (2018). Conceptualization and Definition of a Curriculum. *Journal of Lexicography and Terminology*, 2(2), 1-23.
- NANOPDF.com. (2018). Lesotho localised curriculum and assessment in senior secondary education: Collaboration between the Examinations Council of Lesotho and Cambridge International Examinations. ECOL
- NCDC, & ECOL. (2019). *The Lesotho general certificate of secondary education: English Language syllabus*. MOET.
- OECD. (2020). *Curriculum (re)design: A series of thematic reports from the OECD Education 2030 project*. OECD
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Rathore, M. & Patwa, A. (2020). Content Analysis and Its Uses in Research. *SDES International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research 2020*, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3843529>
- Showalter, E. (1997). *Feminisms: An anthology of literacy theory and criticism*. University of Vermont Press.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R. W. (1986). Recollections of fifty years of work in curriculum. *Journal of Thought*, 21(1), 70-74.
- Tyler, R. W. (1987). *Education: Curriculum development and evaluation: Oral history transcript*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Regional Oral History Office.
- Wraga, W. G. (2016). Arresting the decline of integrity in curriculum studies in the United States: The policy of [sic] opportunity. In Paraskeva, Joao M., & Steinberg, Shirley R. (Eds.), *Curriculum: Decanonising the field* (pp. 99-110). NY: Peter Lang.
- Wraga, W. G. (2017). Understanding the Tyler rationale: Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction in historical context. *Espacio, Tiempo y Educación*, 4(2), 227-252.