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LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in the present study:

the FC of 1994  The framework curriculum for senior secondary school of 1994

the MEC of 1987  The case school’s municipal English A1-language curriculum of 1987

the SBEC  The case school’s school-based English A1-language curriculum in general

the SBEC of 1994  The case school’s school-based English A1-language curriculum of 1994


1 INTRODUCTION

For many decades, curriculum planning has been an essential aspect of the Finnish educational system. A lot of time and effort has been spent in order to draft detailed plans on what students in general education should learn and in what way they should learn it. However, a central problem in educational planning has been the gap between the theoretical plans and the practical implementation of these plans in classrooms. To narrow this gap, Finnish educational administrators have brought the theoretical planning process closer to the practical implementation at schools by introducing school-based curriculum planning.

The decentralisation of curriculum planning was launched by the Finnish government in the 1980s. The first step was to delegate curriculum planning from the national level to municipalities in 1987, and then to individual schools in 1994. Since then, every school has designed a curriculum of its own along the lines of the national framework curriculum.

So far, curriculum renewal has been studied from the point of view of the planning process. Most of the studies concentrate on describing the opinions and experiences of teachers, principals, and students during and after the process. No studies have been conducted on the changes in the curricula of a single subject, such as the English language.

The present study concentrates on the changes the decentralisation of curriculum planning has caused in curriculum documents. The research frame for this study is the division of the curriculum into three different levels: the intended (written), the implemented (classroom practice), and the attained curriculum (what is learned by students) (Takala 1998:11). The present study focuses entirely on the intended curriculum, i.e. the written curriculum document.

The subject of the study is curriculum change in the English A1-language curriculum of one senior secondary school in Central Finland over a period of 11 years, from 1987 to 1998. Three curriculum documents, the municipal curriculum of 1987 and the school-based curricula of 1994 and 1998, are analysed in order to
find out whether there have been any changes in the curricula during this time and what the reasons for the possible changes are.

The present study concentrates on a senior secondary school because only a few studies on curriculum change have been carried out at senior secondary school level. When school-based curriculum planning was made nation-wide in 1994, senior secondary schools were the first ones to finish their curriculum planning. Moreover, senior secondary school has a very important role in the Finnish educational system. In 1991, some 50 per cent of junior secondary school graduates continued their studies in senior secondary school (Tilastokeskus 1993:84). Furthermore, the English language dominates language teaching at senior secondary school: over 92 per cent of students studied English as A-language in 1992 (the National Board of Education as quoted by Ojala 1994).

The research questions of the present study are: 1) How similar or different are the English A1-language curricula of the case school from years 1987, 1994, and 1998?, 2) What factors can explain the development of the English A1-language curriculum, as shown in the documents from these three years?, 3) To what extent and for what reasons has the case school used or not used its opportunity for individual solutions in designing its own English A1-language curriculum? These problems are examined by a content analysis on the written curriculum documents. The school-based curricula of 1994 and 1998 are also compared with relevant written sources, such as the framework curriculum of 1994, to see how they may have been influenced by them. Additionally, two English teachers and the principal of the case school are interviewed.

In the present study, chapter two presents the concept of curriculum as described by different authors. Additionally, the theoretical foundation for curriculum planning and different approaches to curriculum renewal are discussed. At the end of the chapter, foreign language curriculum planning is reviewed. Chapter three introduces the history of Finnish curriculum and curriculum development projects. The decentralisation of Finnish curriculum planning, the school-based curriculum, and the framework for the foreign language curriculum for senior secondary school are also discussed. Chapter four reports the main findings of previous studies on the school-based curriculum.
Chapter five proceeds to the research questions and the research method of the present study. Chapter six covers the description and analysis of the curriculum documents under study, and chapter seven describes the interviews. Finally, chapter eight discusses the main findings of the present study and suggests possible topics for further studies.
2 CURRICULUM PLANNING

This section presents the concept of curriculum as described by different authors. Additionally, the theoretical foundation for curriculum planning and approaches to curriculum renewal are described. Finally, foreign language curriculum planning is reviewed at the end of this section.

2.1 The concept of curriculum

The terms curriculum and syllabus are defined in a variety of ways in literature, depending on author, context, and time. In many cases they are also used interchangeably to describe the same phenomenon. In the American context, usually only the term curriculum is used, but the British tend to favour the term syllabus (Richards 1990:8). The word curriculum can also be used as a hyponym which covers a variety of syllabi. This matter of definition is further complicated by the fact that the Finnish word *opetussuunnitelma*, which is a central term of the present study, is used both to refer to an overall plan of everything which is being taught at school and to the teaching plans for individual school subjects.

One possible way of differentiating between a curriculum and a syllabus is presented by Dubin and Ohlstein (1986:34-35). According to them, a curriculum contains a broad description of general goals by indicating an overall educational-cultural philosophy, which is applied to all subjects, and it also reflects national and political trends. A syllabus is “a more detailed and operational statement of teaching and learning elements which translates the philosophy of the curriculum into a series of planned steps leading towards more narrowly defined objectives at each level”. A single curriculum can be the basis for developing a variety of different syllabi depending on the specific purpose or audience in question. In the Finnish context, the definition of curriculum by Dubin and Ohlstein could be applied to the framework curriculum, and their definition of syllabus could be applied to an individual school’s curriculum.
Johnson (1989:1) gives a very broad definition for the term curriculum. In his definition, a curriculum is a process which includes all the relevant decision making processes of all participants. The products of these decision-making processes can be, for example, policy documents, syllabi, teacher-training programmes, teaching materials and resources, and teaching and learning acts. In the context of the present study, Johnson's definition is too wide and so it needs to be narrowed down.

Widdowson (1990:127) uses the term syllabus instead of curriculum and describes it as an "idealised schematic construct which serves as reference for teaching". Furthermore, a syllabus is also an instrument of educational policy, and therefore it has not only a pedagogical function but also an ideological function. Lehtisalo (1991:87) points out that even though a curriculum creates a close relationship between a school and a society and its culture, it could also be seen as a vision which is not bound by the social limitations of its time.

Malinen (1994:35-36) sees a curriculum as a public document which presents a school's work to parents and other visitors. It is more important to get social acceptance for the school's curriculum within the school than to get administrative endorsement for the document in a municipal board. On the other hand, a curriculum also functions as a framework for teachers' own work plans which are more frequently updated than the actual curriculum document. This kind of an approach to make schools' curricula more public has got more emphasis in the 1990s, partly due to the increased competition for students among different schools.

It is possible to identify different levels of curriculum. Takala (1998:11) divides the curriculum into three different levels: the intended (written), the implemented (classroom practice), and the attained curriculum (what is learned by the students) (see also Bartlett and Butler as quoted by Nunan 1988:35-36, and Hutchinson and Waters 1987:80-85). Nonetheless, Nunan (1988:35-36) criticises the common assumption that there is a one-to-one relationship between the planned (intended), implemented and assessed (attained) curriculum. In his opinion, by assuming that "planning equals teaching equals learning", curriculum designers have focused on the planned, and, to a certain extent, the assessed
curriculum, and have tended to ignore the implemented curriculum. Therefore, he advocates classroom-based research which could reveal the complex nature of the curriculum in action. However, as the present study is concerned with written curriculum documents only, the area of research is limited to the planned curriculum.

Finnish educational authorities have also expressed their opinion on what a curriculum should be. In the curriculum board’s decision (Komiteanmietintö 1975:33,193), a curriculum is defined as a programme which controls teaching and defines the aims, contents, and forms of teaching and education, and students’ development. Thus, the curriculum can be seen as a link between the internal functions of the school and the society. The National Board of Education (1994:22) states the function of the senior secondary school curriculum in the framework curriculum as follows:

The curriculum of the senior secondary school provides students and their homes with information on, for example, the objectives, ways of activity, and options that are available to the students. The students, their homes, and other reference groups may have an important role in the planning of the curriculum. The students must be given the opportunity to study the curriculum or a study guide based on the curriculum when they make their personal study programme.

Furthermore, the National Board of Education (1994:22) indicates that the purpose of the curriculum is to “create a unified view of the functions of the school and to ensure a continuity of teaching even in the case of changes in the staff”. The curriculum is seen as an officially approved document which expresses the educational policy of the local authorities along the lines of the national educational policy. The elements of the curriculum are defined in the framework curriculum (the National Board of Education 1994:22) as follows:

The curriculum must state the mission of the school, the allocation of lessons, the objectives of instruction, and the objectives and contents of all the courses that are included in the teaching programme of the school, the organisation of work, the guidelines for the implementation and assessment of the courses, and the plans for the self-assessment and continuous development of the school. Cooperation with other educational institutions and working life is also stated in the curriculum.
This definition identifies all the practical elements that should be included in a curriculum document. It gives the general guidelines for the persons planning curriculum documents.

2.2 Approaches to curriculum planning

For the success of any educational programme it is essential that a curriculum is examined and developed within the relevant political context (Rodgers 1989:24). It is impossible to separate curriculum planning from its theoretical and ideological background because they give rise to a particular type of a curriculum. The three main factors that influence curriculum planning and the outcome - usually a curriculum document - are the conception of knowledge, the society’s set of educational values and theories of learning.

The first factor influencing curriculum planning is the conception of knowledge which has to do with our perceptions of the way knowledge is constructed, acquired and transferred as well as the way in which the knowledge forms the reality that surrounds us. In Finland, the curricula in the 1980s emphasised detailed contents of learning which - according to educational research - has been proven to over-emphasise learning by memorising, as well as the superficial and fragmented nature of information (Apajalahti 1994:9). The tremendous increase in information flow since the 1980s has forced educational planners, too, to concentrate on finding the essential in all information and to develop more integrated contents of studying.

The second factor which plays a very important role in determining curriculum planning is the prevailing set of educational values. Schools have to state their aims and set of values clearly so that they can successfully develop the means to face and pedagogically take advantage of the ever-changing world that surrounds them. As Välijärvi (1993:105) suggests, it is very important that schools make it very clear why they need the curriculum and what aims it should serve before they start selecting the contents for different subjects.

According to Clark (1987:6, 91-92), the design of a curriculum depends on the way in which objectives, content, and methodology are interrelated, and upon
the emphasis that is placed upon each of them. As classical humanism places the emphasis on content, reconstructionism on objectives and progressivism on methodology, the result is three very different types of curriculum. Classical humanism gives rise to a content-driven curriculum, in which knowledge is sequenced from simple to complex. Assessment is norm-referenced and concerned with the selection of an elite for the next stage of education. Reconstructionism gives rise to a goal-driven curriculum, in which the content is derived from an analysis of the learners’ objective needs in terms of behaviour. Content is sequenced from part skills to whole skills, and from simple to complex. The methodology lays stress especially on the rehearsal of goals and the mastery of predetermined criteria. Assessment is criterion-referenced and concerned with showing what learners have mastered and at what levels. Progressivism gives rise to a process-driven curriculum governed by principles of procedure. These procedures are designed to allow learners to negotiate goals, content and methods. Learning is experiential. Assessment is concerned with both processes and products, and it is negotiated with individuals.

All these approaches have their equivalents in the history of Finnish curriculum design. The methods and approaches of both classical humanism and reconstructionism seemed to prevail until the late 1980s and early 1990s when the progressivist approach to curriculum planning started to get more support.

The third main factor in curriculum planning is learning theories. Raustevon Wright and von Wright (1994:146-160) divide learning theories into empirical-behaviourist and cognitive-constructive theories. According to the behaviourist learning theory, learning is based on stimulus-reaction associations. The purpose of teaching is to provide the appropriate stimuli and enforce the reactions which aim at the predetermined objectives. A curriculum based on a behaviourist theory is planned in advance and in great detail. A teacher’s task is to present the contents of teaching according to the plan and to make sure that students react the way the objectives require. The process is controlled by the teacher and students are targets of the teacher’s actions. In contrast, the humanistic-empirical theory emphasises reflection of learning experiences and the growth into a self-directing person. This theory does not favour far-stretching
planning. Instead, the emphasis is on learning processes in which a teacher is a facilitator and a student has a central role. The cognitive-constructive theory is based on an idea of a human being as a selective constructor of his own reality. This selection is always context specific, and social interaction is a very important context for learning. Subsequently, this theory questions the meaningfulness of a pre-planned, detailed, written curriculum.

The 1994 framework curriculum for the Finnish senior secondary school is, in Jaakkola’s (1997:12) opinion, clearly based on a cognitive learning theory: it mentions the cumulative language learning process (new substance is combined with previous knowledge), acquisition of language skills as an active process, and students’ responsibility for their learning. Furthermore, learning a foreign language is to learn cognitive skills, because it requires a lot of versatile practice to make the skills automatic.

2.3 Curriculum renewal

The aim of curriculum renewal is to develop an improved curriculum. The need for renewal usually originates from factors outside the school system. The society and its structure may have changed so that it is necessary to alter the curriculum to better meet its demands. New theories of knowledge, learning and teaching, and the set of educational values may also motivate curriculum renewal. Clark (1987:xiii) compares curriculum renewal to a “never-ending jigsaw puzzle, in which the various pieces are cut and re-cut to fit together into a whole that is itself evolving to respond to changing insights and values”. Therefore, any change made in one of the pieces affects the others. If the change is introduced by outside planners, it cannot be implemented in the classroom unless teachers are provided with enough support to create the necessary resources and teaching strategies.

Clark (1987:11,13,92) reviews three theoretical bases which all have different approaches to curriculum renewal. Classical humanism adopts a policy in which change is to be brought about slowly by reforming examinations. Reconstructionism leads to a top-down approach, in which a committee of experts imposes a new curriculum on schools, which are then trained to adopt
them. Progressivism leads to a bottom-up approach, in which teachers are assisted in observing their own classrooms, analysing their own problems, and devising and evaluating strategies for overcoming them in a mutually supportive but critical climate. In foreign language curriculum renewals, classical humanism in curriculum design has been criticised for the fact that the linguistic competence built up by grammar-translation courses has not resulted in the expected by-product, a communicative ability. Furthermore, being a top-down renewal, it has failed to get the support of teachers.

Clark (1987:49-53,80) goes on to say that according to the progressivist renewal theory, teachers do not act as instructors but as creators of an environment in which learners learn and learn how to learn. Knowledge is not seen as a static set of fixed facts, but as a capacity of creative problem-solving. In curriculum design, progressivism emphasises methodology and the need for principles to govern the teaching/learning process. Furthermore, it emphasises classroom inquiry, activity, discussion, reflection and open-ended personal interpretations, as well as peer evaluation and self-evaluation. A progressivist curriculum renewal is both teacher-based and school-based.

Moreover, curriculum renewal can be seen as one aspect of social change and, subsequently as a change in ideology. Curriculum renewal shares the tendency of all institutions to resist any attempts to change the existing system and therefore accepts only relatively minor modifications. Curriculum innovation should not be totally revolutionary and it is recommended that the new curriculum should develop from what there already is. This is partly due to the fact that many teachers are not willing to adopt completely new approaches to teaching. The education system also has to respond to the changes in the economic needs of the society. (See Downey and Kelly 1979:199 and Kelly 1982:175-176.)

At the beginning of the 1990s the Finnish educational system faced new challenges. Information had become an ever-changing and ever-increasing flood, with which the relatively rigid, centrally controlled school system had difficulties in coping. Though it is claimed that educational planning has to come to terms with a new conception of knowledge, Pystynen (1992:20) argues that the question
is not so much of a whole new conception of knowledge, but more of a search for a new way of thinking about what information schools are supposed to provide students with and how should it be provided. Therefore, the problem is how to teach students the abilities to search, acquire, understand, adopt, apply, and use knowledge. Also, the aim is to encourage students to think independently.

Another central problem in both curriculum planning and curriculum renewal is the gap between theory and practice, which results in the difficulty of implementing educational plans at a classroom level. To decrease this gap, Taba (1962:441-442) suggests that the learning-teaching units should be used as a basis for general designs. In Taba's opinion, curriculum guides which evolve from concrete learning-teaching units prepared by teachers should be easier to introduce to teaching staff and more readily understood than is possible when only abstract general guides are available. Besides, curriculum plans of this kind are more likely to make changes in classroom practice.

2.4 Approaches to foreign language curriculum planning

Nunan (1988:1-2) claims that the problem of foreign language curriculum planning is that much of the development in language teaching has occurred outside the educational mainstream. The assumption seems to be that educational theory and research have very little to contribute to the field of language teaching. The belief that language pedagogy is basically a linguistic rather than an educational matter has led to research which is based on a linguistic rather than an educational paradigm. This, in turn, has created a fragmentation within the field, with different interest groups being concerned with particular aspects of the teaching-learning process to the exclusion of other aspects. Thus, in Europe in the 1970s, the focus was on the specification of content through the development of syllabi which have a linguistic focus. While the development of functional-notional syllabi represented a broadened focus, the focus itself was still basically linguistic, and there was a comparative neglect of methodology. Other practitioners focused on methodology to the exclusion of other elements in the curriculum, such as content specification and evaluation.
The foreign language curriculum is described by Crombie (1985:9) as a “list or inventory of items or units with which learners are to be familiarised”. Language learners are not very likely to come into direct contact with curricula. Instead, for them a curriculum is implemented in the form of teaching materials. The selection of teaching material is based on methodology.

In general, curriculum planning can be divided into separate stages. One of the most quoted models for curriculum planning in the literature is Taba’s (1962:12) seven-step model which consists of the following stages:

Step 1: Diagnosis of needs
Step 2: Formulation of objectives
Step 3: Selection of content
Step 4: Organisation of content
Step 5: Selection of learning experiences
Step 6: Organisation of learning experiences
Step 7: Determination of what to evaluate and means to evaluate.

Richards (1990:8) maintains that in language teaching, steps 3 and 4 are usually known as syllabus design. Syllabus design (the product of which is usually referred to as a syllabus in British usage and curriculum in American usage) is concerned with the choice and sequencing of instructional content.

However, Nunan (1988:2-3) criticises Taba’s ends-means curriculum planning model because it suggests that planning, implementation and evaluation occur in a sequential order. According to him, studies have shown that most teachers do not operate in this way. Instead, he introduces a negotiated curriculum model, in which much of the consultation, decision making and planning is informal and takes place during a teaching programme. Nunan’s model supports the attempts of bringing theory and practice closer together.

There are a number of different syllabi found in current English as a second language (ESL) courses and materials, particularly those dealing with speaking and listening. Nunan (1988:9) identifies the following kinds of syllabi (or variants and combinations of them) as the most common types of syllabi found:
1. Structural (organised primarily around grammar and sentence patterns)
2. Functional (organised around communicative functions, such as identifying, reporting, correcting, describing)
3. Notional (organised around conceptual categories, such as duration, quantity, location)
4. Topical (organised around themes or topics, such as health, food, clothing)
5. Situational (organised around speech settings and the transactions associated with them, such as shopping, at the bank, at the supermarket)
6. Skills (organised around skills, such as listening for gist, listening for specific information, listening for inferences)
7. Task or activity-based (organised around activities, such as drawing maps, following directions, following instructions).

In addition, Nunan (1988:10) points out that it should be emphasised that the form in which a syllabus is presented reflects the purpose for which the syllabus is designed. Also, Piepho (1981:13) argues that designing curricula and syllabi for language learning cannot be a neutral activity. It crucially implies political and educational decisions.

The two most common types of foreign language syllabi are the functional/notional and the structural syllabi. Widdowson (1990:132) suggests that the underlying implications behind the two approaches to syllabus design might be formulated as follows. The notional/functional syllabus implies that language is to be taught as units of communicative performance for accumulation. In contrast, the structural syllabus implies that the subject is to be taught as units of linguistic competence for investment. Although these two perspectives on the language subject are commonly represented as in opposition, they are really complementary, each compensating for the limitations of the other.

In addition, Nunan (1988:10) points out that it should be emphasised that the form in which a syllabus is presented reflects the purpose for which the syllabus is designed. Also, Piepho (1981:13) argues that designing curricula and syllabi for language learning cannot be a neutral activity. It crucially implies political and educational decisions.

Wilkins (1976:1-2,13) divides language syllabi into synthetic and analytic ones. In synthetic language teaching the different parts of language are taught
separately and step-by-step. Language acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of the parts until the whole structure of the language has been built up. A synthetic syllabus may consist of an inventory of grammatical structures and a limited list of lexical items. Since language learning is usually identified as learning the grammatical system of the target language, a typical approach to course design is a structural one. An analytic syllabus does not exercise careful linguistic control of the learning environment. Instead, a great variety of linguistic structures are permitted from the beginning, and the learner’s task is to gradually improve his own linguistic behaviour. An analytic syllabus is organised in terms of the purposes for which people are learning language, and of the language performance necessary to meet those purposes. The situational, notional, and functional syllabi are analytic. However, Wilkins points out that in theory any course or syllabus could be placed somewhere on the continuum from synthetic to analytic, but in practice courses tend to be closer to one pole or the other.
3 THE FINNISH SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

This section gives an overview of the history of the Finnish curriculum and the major curriculum development projects. Furthermore, the decentralisation of curriculum planning and the school-based curriculum are discussed. Finally, a framework for the foreign language curriculum for senior secondary school is described.

3.1 The history of the Finnish curriculum

3.1.1 From the past to the present

The first systematically planned curriculum for general education in Finland was published in 1925, and this curriculum was renewed in 1952. According to Malinen (1985:16-22), these early curricula followed the lehrplan model: the curriculum for each subject was a rationally planned presentation of the objectives and contents of learning. From the 1950s, the curriculum model began to influence Finnish curriculum thinking. The central idea of the curriculum model was to plan learning experiences based on an overall description of a child’s development. Until the 1970s, the curricula for general education were mainly based on the lehrplan model.

Until the end of the 1960s the Ministry of Education decided on the syllabi (oppimäärät) and the courses for different subjects and the National Board of General Education gave methodological directives. From the 1970s onwards it was the National Board of General Education which decided on both of these issues. At the same time with the comprehensive school renewal in 1968, senior secondary schools were separated into administratively distinct units and they were now owned by municipalities instead of the state.

The next major change occurred with the 1982 senior secondary school reform in which all subjects were divided into courses. This involved dividing the
school year usually into five separate periods and the syllabi of each subject into individual courses (a unit of some 38 lessons). These individual courses were taken in different periods, and the number of courses in each subject depended on the time allocation decided by the Parliament. The syllabi for each subject were published in the form of a booklet (see the National Board of General Education 1981).

In 1983 a new law was passed for senior secondary schools which started the decentralisation of curriculum planning. According to this law, the school curriculum was designed locally in municipalities and only the framework curriculum was nationwide. This framework curriculum for senior secondary schools, which was published in 1985, consisted of the syllabi of 1981. The first new curricula based on the new law were designed in municipalities in 1985-1986 and put into practice from August 1986 (see Apajalahti 1994:7, the National Board of General Education 1985, Suomen kunnallislitiitto 1986:21).

Since the 1980s, besides the decentralisation curriculum planning, there have been other attempts to decrease the central control of the educational system. The National Board of General Education and the National Board of Vocational Education were combined in the beginning of the 1990s into the General Board of Education. Additionally, since the school-based curriculum planning project was launched in the early 1990s and schools gained more independence, text books have no longer been previewed by the National Board of Education, and the provincial governments have also decreased inspection in schools. (Kaikkonen 1997:247.)

The non-graded senior secondary school (in which groups are formed according to different courses and not according to the year of starting the studies) was introduced in 1994. In the same year the new framework curriculum was published and schools began to plan their own curricula. Lindström (1994:12-13) states that the framework curriculum of 1985 was very objective-oriented. Based on the principles approved by the Parliament, the Government and the Ministry of Education, the National Board of General Education stated the objectives and the ways to reach and measure them. When the 1994 framework curriculum was written, the Parliament, the Government and the
Ministry of Education still had a significant influence on the educational policies but this time the emphasis was on the process and public discussion. The purpose of the 1994 framework curriculum was to provide schools with national objectives for teaching and objectives of development for school-based curriculum planning. The importance of the framework curriculum as an instrument of national education policy increased in the 1990s. After the decentralisation of educational planning the framework curriculum was one of the few documents that gave instructions to schools.

The functions of the present day senior secondary school curriculum are formulated by Apajalahti (1994:12) as follows: 1) to meet the society’s needs, 2) to meet students’ needs, 3) to deliver information to students and their homes, 4) to fulfil the school’s own interests, and 5) to act as a document which is directly or indirectly confirmed by the provider of the school. As we can see, Apajalahti advocates the acknowledgement of students’ needs in curriculum planning. However, as many studies indicate (see Chapter 4) students seldom get a chance to formulate their own needs when curriculum planning is concerned. Instead, most of the decisions on what students are expected to need are made ignoring learners in the decision making process.

3.1.2 Recent curriculum development projects

In the 1990s the Finnish senior secondary school has faced many challenges. Different development projects have played a very important role in attempts to keep up with these challenges. The aquarium experiment was a project which changed curriculum planning in schools. Other projects, such as the Kimmoke project and the Socrates projects, have concentrated on developing especially language teaching and learning. As these projects are such an essential part of present day education, it is reasonable to study their role in the school-based English language curriculum.

The National Board of Education carried out the aquarium experiment between 1992 and 1994. The purpose of this experiment was to test the new framework curriculum for comprehensive and senior secondary schools and to
study the prerequisites for and the progress of school-based curriculum planning. The experiment took place in 12 municipalities and 39 lower and upper stages of the comprehensive school and senior secondary schools were involved (Mehtäläinen 1994:1).

The experiment schools were called aquarium schools or pilot schools. The National Board of Education sent a contact person to each of the schools to consult teachers about curriculum planning. Also, representatives from the aquarium schools trained teachers at other schools in school-based curriculum planning. The aquarium experiment changed the Finnish curriculum planning culture profoundly and started the era of school-based curriculum planning.

Huttunen (1997:7-8,18-28,48-49) explains the Kimmoke project in a guide for teachers. The project is based on a paper entitled “Modern Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment; A Common European Framework of Reference for Modern Languages” by the European Union and the 1991 inter-government symposium held in Switzerland. The underlying reason for the framework is that the European Union wishes to increase both the amount and quality of communication between its members. The purpose of the common European Framework is to give a well-covering framework for all language teaching and planning for teachers, teacher trainers, government officials, students, parents, etc.

In 1996, based on the European framework, the National Board of Education initiated a project called Kimmoke which aims at the diversification and development of language teaching. The Kimmoke project involves 38 municipalities and some 250 schools each of which participates in one of the six main themes of the development projects: 1) Diversification of language programmes and co-operation between educational establishments, 2) Content and language integrated learning/integration of language teaching with other teaching, 3) Language learning and teaching methods, 4) International contacts and encounters with other cultures, 5) Distant and multiple-form learning/computer and information technology in language teaching, and 6) Development of oral language skills. Within these themes, each school has been
assigned a specific development task. (The National Board of Education 1997:5-6,21-28.)

Socrates is the European Union’s educational programme which aims at increasing European co-operation in education. Socrates is divided into three main sectors: 1) co-operation in higher education (Erasmus), 2) co-operation between schools (Comenius), and 3) extensive operations (such as Lingua). Lingua was initiated in 1989 and since 1995 it has been part of the Socrates programme. Lingua aims at developing the teaching and studying of the official and other languages within the EU. Lingua includes five main development projects: 1) general projects in language teaching, 2) continuing education of language teachers, 3) assistant-teacher training for teacher trainees, 4) improvement of the means for language teaching methods and evaluation of language skills, and 5) co-operation projects for improving young people’s language skills. (Ollikainen 1998:7, Euroopan komissio 1997.)

3.2 Decentralisation of curriculum planning and the school-based curriculum

The Finnish centralised curriculum planning system was decentralised in 1994. According to Atjonen (1993:1-2), decentralisation has been typical for both the American and the British school system until recently. Thus, the Finnish curriculum planning system is interestingly heading in a different direction from the system, for example, in Great Britain, where the Education Reform Act in 1989 defined the national curricula for core subjects, including mathematics, English, and science. However, the uniform Finnish school system has a very different foundation for its school-based curriculum planning than the American or the British system with private and alternative schools.

3.2.1 Reasons for decentralisation

According to Atjonen (1993:2, see also Pässilä et al. 1993:14-15), the municipal curriculum was an unfamiliar document to teachers, because it was planned by
experts, whose knowledge of everyday teaching routines, schools’ different conditions, and students’ various skill levels was insufficient. Therefore, these curriculum documents, although well planned, were left on the shelves. On the other hand, it is possible that teachers found it difficult to understand that a national curriculum document could give only the framework, and thus they considered it unrealistic. Välijärvi (1993:103) discusses the same problem by saying that previous research has shown that the national curriculum remained a superficial document for most teachers. In practice, the curriculum was implemented mainly through text books. Those teachers who were involved in curriculum planning were virtually the only ones who were willing and able to adopt the curriculum.

Syrjäläinen (1994:13-15) says that, before decentralisation, teachers talked about the contents and objectives of the curriculum as self-evident facts and they based their teaching on their own experience and intuition rather than on the curriculum. In many schools the curriculum was left unused intentionally. It was not studied with students or their parents; the textbooks served as teaching plans for students and parents. Syrjäläinen suspects that teachers’ negligence of the curriculum may simply have resulted from the fact that it had always been planned somewhere else than in the school, where it was supposed to instruct teaching.

The framework curriculum for senior secondary school (the National Board of Education 1994:10-14, see also Apajalahti 1994:9, and Välijärvi 1993:4) lists a number of reasons for the need of curriculum reform:

1. Socio-economic development
2. Growth of the significance of self-employment and private enterprise
3. Internationalisation
4. Change in the set of values
5. Changes in the world of young people
6. Conception of learning and science
7. Change in curriculum thinking.

Additionally, the National Board of Education (1994:10-14) emphasises efficient use of schools’ resources, a problem-solving approach to teaching, and lifelong
education in order to develop individuals’ abilities to face changes and to solve problems caused by changes. Students’ own initiative and responsibility in learning and the importance of good language proficiency are encouraged, too.

3.2.2 The school-based curriculum

The idea of a school-based curriculum is not new. As Lewy (1991:21) says, the widespread perception of the inherent weaknesses of central curricula led in the 1970s and 1980s to the rise of a counter movement which became known as a school-based curriculum development.

Lewy (1991:101,108-109,114) claims that the school-based curriculum is in a better position to respond to local needs than a nationally developed curriculum. However, it can be more easily implemented in educational systems with highly qualified and well-educated teachers, who work in well-equipped schools, with small classes, and are entitled to a reduced teaching load, or even being fully released from teaching assignment for a specified period of time. On the other hand, in an ideal situation, each school should use both externally and locally produced curricula, while each teacher should be engaged in the selection, adaptation and integration of curriculum materials and the production of new ones.

Atjonen (1993:2,5-6,23) suggests that a school-based curriculum should be seen as a means to develop the whole school. Planning a school-based curriculum is a team work, which enables teachers to see their school as a shared effort to provide students with a many-sided education. This kind of commitment or change in thinking cannot be reached by a centralised curriculum coming from above. In Atjonen’s opinion, a school-based curriculum is a process rather than a product (see also the National Board of Education 1994:13-14). It is constantly changing and under evaluation. In addition, a teacher who takes part in curriculum planning is committed to implementing it and interested in its development.

Van Els (1993:11) points out that curricula can be changed only insofar as teachers who are involved in the implementation are willing to bring about the
necessary changes. Additionally, Syrjäläinen (1995a:47) suggests that school-based curriculum development forces teachers to take part in writing curricula and when doing so they probably, for the first time, are forced to reconsider their working practices and pedagogical solutions. Teachers are forced to think why, what and how they teach. This is a new situation for most of the teachers in our country. So far our teachers have got orders and materials from higher authorities and experts.

Another issue which has been brought up by Malinen (1994:7) in connection with a school-based curriculum is the idea of a learning centre. With learning centre types of activities, it is possible to improve integration in the school’s curriculum, increase the flexibility of the school’s operations, create possibilities for learner-centred learning projects, and offer a more varied learning environment than in normal classroom teaching. Therefore, it is essential that the whole school participates in preparing the learning process. To apply the idea of a learning centre is a central part of school-based curriculum planning and implementation. If there is no need for a learning-centre type activity in a school, there is probably no interest for school-based curriculum planning. In such cases the municipal curriculum and its national framework are a sufficient basis for teaching.

3.2.3 The conception of knowledge and the Finnish school-based curriculum

The framework curriculum (the National Board of Education 1994:13) describes the present day conception of knowledge and learning as follows: the students are active in constructing their own structure of knowledge, and the role of the teacher is to act as a guide and to design learning situations. Additionally, students’ own attitudes, conceptions, and expectations direct where they focus their attention, what information they receive, and what interpretation they give to it. The framework curriculum also states that it is important to identify the basis for choosing the learning material and to distinguish the essential in the flood of information. Outdated and insignificant material in various subjects should continually be removed and replaced with new material.
3.2.4 The set of educational values and the Finnish school-based curriculum

Until the early 1990s, Finnish curriculum planning and curriculum documents supported partly a classical humanist and partly a reconstructionist view of education. The curricula were very content based: they consisted of detailed lists of separate, hierarchically organised items for learning and teaching. The objectives of learning were predetermined, and assessment and evaluation were based on how well students were able to reach these objectives. The transition to school-based curriculum planning was a step into a progressivist way of teaching and learning. The curriculum was seen rather as a process for continuous development of education than as a fixed set of contents or objectives.

The importance of values in education has been discussed by Lindström (1993:9-10). He discloses that the objectives of teaching are based on a set of values and methods to aim at these values. Therefore, in school development, some changes are more desirable than others. Even though the choices made are not conscious, they still reflect the set of values of educational planners. Recently, people have become more aware of the hidden or underlying set of values and they want to bring them up as discussion subjects. One of the value choices the National Board of Education has made is that it has expressed its trust in teachers, students as well as parents, and in their ability to make independent and wise choices concerning the arrangement of the operations of the school. However, the National Board of Education does not want to resign its responsibility in creating and evaluating school development in general.

Decentralisation and the school-based curricula are believed to bring a lot of improvement to education and school culture. According to Syrjäläinen (1994:19-20,25-26), these improvements are manifested in, for example, individualism, acceptance and support of difference, support for talented students, learners’ responsibility for their learning, learner-centred teaching, profit responsibility, entrepreneurship, and care of the environment. Behind all this is the general concern for the effectiveness of education and the concern for the nation’s survival in international competition, but also a global concern for the survival of mankind. As Syrjäläinen points out, the fragmented society is a
challenge for schools. General education is seen as a way to cope with the fragmented society and the flood of information; it is a tool for controlling the changing world.

3.2.5 Theories of foreign language learning and the Finnish school-based curriculum

The choice of a learning theory is also a very important decision which regulates the development of the educational process (Rauste-von Wright and von Wright 1994:159). In Finland, there is a long tradition in the structural approach to foreign language teaching. Especially the senior secondary school curricula for foreign languages have been designed on a structural basis. To achieve language competence has meant mastering the grammar of the target language. Communicative competence has received very little emphasis until recently. This tradition is so deeply rooted in the Finnish school system that a change will not happen overnight. As Kaikkonen (1997:264) points out, teaching in Finnish senior secondary schools still emphasises cognitive aims, and interactive skills are left aside.

3.2.6 Criticism

The transition to school-based curriculum planning has received both positive and negative feedback from researchers. Syrjäläinen (1994:21-23) argues that decentralisation has brought both advantages and disadvantages with it. Schools’ autonomy and specialisation have increased, teaching has become more individual, freedom of choice has increased, and profit responsibility is demanded of schools. Schools have become more independent and this has increased the power of principals, but this cannot always be seen as a positive development. Also, the planning of school-based curricula and the specialisation of schools would require a well-educated leader and well-educated teachers if the aim is really to develop the school. This is not always the case. Furthermore, the freedom of choice may support social division in society, as these choices may be
based on gender and social status. Syrjäläinen also points out that decentralisation demands some kind of a controlling system. If schools are responsible for producing good results, a comprehensive evaluation system is needed.

Syrjäläinen (1994:3) wonders if the school-based curriculum can change the fact that the curriculum is one of the documents with least significance in teachers’ everyday work. It is a generally known fact that schools are usually rather persistent in resisting changes. Therefore, it is not realistic to expect that the school reform could radically change the prevailing routines in a year or two.

According to Syrjäläinen (1995a:5), the idea of school-based curriculum planning and decreased central control have received criticism from some teachers and parents, who fear that the school-based curriculum will increase inequality. This inequality would partly be due to the lack of central control and partly due to the fact that teachers in some schools might be more interested and more qualified in developing curricula. The critics fear that, ultimately, there would be so-called qualified, partly qualified and some inefficient schools.

Pässilä et al. (1993:17-18,21) claim that the curriculum renewal in the 1990s has been superficial and that the change from the old to the new system is not noticeable, as the new curriculum is also based on the national framework curriculum. The framework curriculum aims to ensure that the quality of general education is maintained the same nationwide, and that the core of the contents is the same in every school. Pässilä et al. also criticise the time allocation system (the national directives for minimum number of hours in each subject) by saying that it is an absurd idea, because in reality, students reach their own objectives with different amounts of hours. In their opinion, learning depends on methods and students’ motivation rather than the hours spent on learning.

Finally, Takala (1993:57) takes a very critical attitude towards a frequent renewal of curriculum documents. Based on his involvement in language teaching development committees, he believes that “policy documents (general language policies and curricula) are only one of the components that determine the direction and outcome of language teaching”. On the other hand, as Atjonen (1993:3) points out, the curriculum document will always have a controlling role, because a cultural state cannot function without a curriculum or a framework
curriculum, which controls the quality and uniform standards of its education. Otherwise a curriculum should not be seen as an obstacle but as an opportunity, since it always leaves teachers the choice of methodology.

3.3 Framework for planning a school-based English A1-language curriculum

The 1994 framework curriculum for senior secondary school is a very general document. Instead of giving directives and exercising detailed control, the National Board of Education emphasises its role as the provider of information, continuous discussion, and the fact that it develops the objectives and teaching arrangements together with schools (Lindström 1993:10-11). The National Board of Education (1994:15) states the aim of education and teaching as follows:

The senior secondary school is developed as an educational institution that gives general education, leads to matriculation examination, and gives eligibility for continued studies. It supports young people’s personal growth, equality between the genders, and young people’s maturation towards adulthood.

There are very few written instructions for foreign language curriculum planners, but for example Komsi has written a book on the subject. According to Komsi (1994:32-33), three documents create the basis for the school’s foreign language curricula: 1) the framework curriculum, 2) a municipality’s language programme, and 3) the general section of a school’s own curriculum. The fourth major factor is teachers’ own experience and professional knowledge. In his book, Komsi specifies more clearly the guidelines given by the framework curriculum for planning foreign language curricula and suggests a way in which schools can plan their own foreign language curricula. In his opinion, the foreign language curriculum can, among other things, include relatively detailed advice for teaching arrangements and working methods, and foreign language teaching pedagogy. This would enable even a relatively inexperienced teacher or unqualified substitute to teach in accordance with the curriculum. Additionally, teaching arrangements and issues deducted from the general section of the school’s curriculum can be documented in the foreign language curriculum.
In Komsi’s (1994:33-34) opinion, the curriculum is made concrete in course descriptions. He suggests that at least the name, possible topic and emphasis on language skills should be described. In some courses working procedures should be documented as well. Furthermore, the aims and objectives are an essential part of course descriptions. The aim can be, for example, an emphasis on a language skill, a studying skill, independent search for information, use of a language register or increasing vocabulary. The central contents are the second most important issue in the curriculum. These should not only be topics or structures but also language use and communication contents.

Moreover, Komsi (1994:36) recommends that evaluation could be incorporated into course descriptions. It should be connected to the central objectives and aims of the course. Additionally, Komsi points out that one of the aims in planning a school-based curriculum is that textbooks would not be the curriculum. Course descriptions should be planned so that they do not require a certain textbook. It should be considered carefully, whether it is necessary to write down working procedures, because this can be too restricting if there are teachers with different styles of working at the school.

In the case of applied courses, Komsi (1994:36-39, see also the National Board of Education 1994:39) encourages integration with other subjects. Additionally, to make sure that the general plans and principles are not forgotten in every-day teaching, they should be built into the curricula of individual subjects and, subsequently, transferred into practical working methods and teaching arrangements. This can be done by connecting the school’s general set of values (such as healthy self-esteem, self initiative) with the foreign language curricula. In addition, Komsi points out that it is the foreign language teachers’ duty to help language students to find the most effective learning styles for themselves, and familiarise them with aim setting and self evaluation.

According to the time allocation prescribed by the government (see the National Board of Education 1994:23-24 and Komiteanmietintö 1993), the school has to offer its students the minimum number of compulsory courses in each subject and a certain number of optional specialised courses. In addition, the school may offer additional, locally defined, applied courses. The matriculation
examination is based on all the compulsory and specialised courses defined in the framework curriculum. In the case of A1-language (such as English) these requirements include six compulsory courses and two specialisation courses. The wide provision of optional subjects together with the non-graded system offer senior secondary schools a possibility to develop their own special profiles.
4 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON THE SCHOOL-BASED CURRICULUM

This section presents some previous studies on the school-based curriculum in Finland. These studies have been carried out during and after the aquarium experiment, which was launched in the early 1990s, when curriculum planning was transferred from municipalities to schools. The emphasis is on senior secondary school. Since studies on school-based curriculum documents have not been carried out, the studies presented in this section focus on curriculum planning processes, and the opinions and experiences of teachers and principals with reference to school-based curriculum planning and implementation.

Syrjäläinen (1994) has reported on events in aquarium schools in the first year of the experiment in 1992-1993, when the school reform was launched and schools began to plan school-based curricula. The purpose of her study was to raise discussion about the possible changes in the traditional school culture caused by school-based curriculum planning. The empirical data of the study were collected primarily from three aquarium schools in Helsinki. The schools were a junior comprehensive school, a senior comprehensive school, and a senior secondary school. The data were collected by participatory observation and interviews. Written documents were also used as data.

In the senior secondary school Syrjäläinen (1994:42,51,71,88,91) studied, school-based curriculum planning was organised as team work. All teachers participated in curriculum planning, which was guided by the framework curriculum. They did not find it difficult to write the school-based curriculum. Especially the subjects’ sections were considered rather easy to write, but writing the general section was found to be more difficult and frustrating. The principal, who was responsible for the whole process, observed the teams’ work, took care of the time schedule, and monitored the progress in regular staff meetings. Leadership played a very important role in changing the school culture, since the leader had an opportunity to introduce some real changes.
Syrjäläinen (1994:43-44,51-52,92) reports that the teachers and principals of the three aquarium schools experienced curriculum planning, above all, as a development process for the school. Sometimes the work was based on extensive discussions on the set of values. However, some senior secondary school teachers avoided such discussions, because they felt that their role was the role of an expert of their subject. They prepared students for the matriculation examination, and had no time for “idle talks”. On the whole, most of the teachers found curriculum planning very important and interesting, although it elicited feelings of anxiety and success in turns. Teachers were not discouraged by lack of time or the fact that curriculum planning was exhausting.

Based on the processes of the three aquarium schools, Syrjäläinen (1994:45,53,57) has identified some preconditions for successful curriculum planning. A good starting point was if a school had done a lot of previous development work. Other significant reasons for success were good leadership and teachers’ good co-operative skills. In contrast, the worst obstacle for curriculum planning was teachers’ resistance, negative attitudes and insufficient knowledge and skills. Moreover, many teachers were unaccustomed to co-operation.

Syrjäläinen (1994:62-63,66) says that school-based curriculum planning revealed needs for training. Teachers started to show interest in the state of their work community. Their need for professional development was manifested in a will to adopt new methods of teaching and more profound ways to understand how students think and learn.

The opinions of parents, and to a lesser degree those of students, were surveyed in many schools during the aquarium project. The schools Syrjäläinen (1994:97,99,100) studied co-operated with parents in order to get their views of the present state of the school and the ways they wanted the school to develop. Parents did not want to take part in curriculum planning, although they were offered a chance for it. On the other hand, students had the most insignificant role in curriculum planning, especially in the senior secondary school.

Mehtäläinen (1994) has also conducted a study on school-based curriculum planning within the aquarium experiment. First, his study aimed to
find out the opinions of the experiment schools on the framework curriculum as a basis for curriculum planning. Secondly, it aimed to find out in what way the schools had organised curriculum planning and how it proceeded. The study was carried out between 1993 and 1994. Research data consisted of interviews with teachers and principals in 39 aquarium schools. The schools’ curriculum documents were part of the data, too.

One of the results of Mehtäläinen’s (1994:19) study was that the objectives of the framework curriculum were generally interpreted to be so imprecise that nearly anything could be done within their limits in schools. Another view of the objectives was that the demands on what students should be able to do and understand were the highest ever in Finland. Mehtäläinen concludes that the objectives were very general in nature and therefore they demanded more than individual schools could possibly achieve.

In the senior secondary schools Mehtäläinen (1994:50) studied, some teachers thought that the foreign language section of the framework curriculum could not give less guidance. They found its objectives insufficient and without substance. Course topics were the same as before and similar in all foreign languages. Other teachers considered this freedom to be an asset, especially in A-languages, because they could still use the current course procedures and text books as the basis for new courses. When the school-based curriculum was written, the general course descriptions of the framework curriculum were specified and the plans for teaching structures were added.

Curriculum planning in the aquarium schools, as described by Mehtäläinen (1994:7-8,10), was done in aquarium groups, which consisted of four to eight teachers of different grades or subjects. Principals were technical advisers. The project started with discussions on the schools’ sets of values and some schools also inquired about the opinions of parents and students on the set of values and objectives. In some schools, the subjects’ curricula were written in mixed groups consisting of teachers from different subject groups, and the experiences from these experiments were encouraging. In senior secondary schools curriculum planning was organised by aquarium groups, too, but the process was mostly led by the principals. The biggest changes the senior
secondary schools had to face were the new time allocation system and the non-
graded system.

According to Mehtäläinen (1994:92-93), the first experiences of the non-
graded senior secondary school were both positive and negative. The freedom of
choice and the possibility for individual pace in studying were seen as positive
issues. The negative experiences resulted mainly from unfamiliarity with the non-
graded system. Teaching groups were too large from time to time and there was
not always enough tutoring available for students. Moreover, integration between
subjects became more difficult.

Mehtäläinen (1994:Abstract,23,121) mentions that one topic of discussion
in schools was how exact the subjects’ curricula should be. It was unclear what
the purpose of the school’s curriculum was, and for whom and why it was
written. However, probably the most important part of the curriculum planning
process were the school’s joint discussions on the state of the school and
teaching. Teachers realised that the final product, the written document itself, was
not what counted the most. Instead, the fact that the school as a whole discussed
its weaknesses, strengths and possibilities as well as those of its staff was very
significant.

Furthermore, Mehtäläinen (1994:9,20) notes that the reform offered
teachers an opportunity for professional development, which was said to be very
important. Writing the curriculum formed a large part of professional
development. However, teachers in Finland were trained neither for writing
curricula nor reading and analysing them. During the experiment it became very
clear that teachers did not really know what purpose the curriculum document
served and subsequently, for whom it was written. Actually, this was a great
obstacle for curriculum planning. Otherwise the reform did not encounter much
active resistance in schools; the resistance that existed was in the form of
indifference.

The opinions of subject teachers on school-based curriculum planning
have been studied by Ahtee and Erätuuli (1994). Their inquiry was directed at 52
teachers and it had two questions: what is a curriculum and what kind of
influence has the curriculum had on teachers’ work.
Ahtee and Eräätuuli (1994:190) divided the teachers' answers to the first question as follows: 40% of the teachers said that the curriculum gave detailed instructions for teaching, 30% said that the curriculum provided the overall guidelines for teaching, 20% thought that the curriculum contained the contents and general aims, and 10% of the teachers gave answers which showed that they had seriously thought about the purpose of the curriculum and clearly read their curricula. Every tenth answer was negative in tone. To the second question, 30% of the teachers answered by saying that the curriculum had had no influence at all on their work, 30% said that the curriculum had influenced their choice of course contents, work plans, or teaching methods, and 20% said that the curriculum had given instructions and guidelines. Some teachers (no percentage given) claimed that the curriculum had made teachers think in general.

In her ethnographic study, Syrjäläinen (1995b) describes the experiences of 65 teachers and principals in school-based curriculum implementation. The data were gathered in Helsinki in 1994. Teachers and principals of different school levels answered open questions about the possible changes the school-based curriculum had caused in the school.

Syrjäläinen (1995b:72,74,86) reports that, in the senior secondary schools, teachers and principals had rather negative experiences of school-based curriculum implementation. Their amount of work increased to "almost unbearable", because in many subjects courses were reorganised and the old teaching material could not be used any more. Teachers and principals did not have enough time for co-operation, common planning, and joint discussions. Stress, social problems, and competition were part of everyday working life. Teachers complained about the amount of work, stress, exhaustion, burn out, insecurity, frustration, and incompatibility of theory and practice, which undermined all attempts at personal or school development.

As Syrjäläinen (1995b:74,88,90-91) points out, the reform brought a lot of freedom to senior secondary schools, but the matriculation examination restricted this freedom substantially. Teachers would have liked to try new teaching methods, but the matriculation examination forced them to use the 'good old' methods to ensure their students' success. After all, teachers were experts in their
subject and responsible for their students’ success in the subject. They still worked very much alone. In the teachers’ opinion, the only things that caused some real changes were optional courses and the non-graded system. On the other hand, the teachers claimed that students’ everyday routines were not changed at all by the new curriculum, since students were rather conservative.

One point that Syrjäläinen’s study (1995b:80-81,91) revealed is that the development projects in senior secondary schools concentrated on competing students with other senior secondary schools. Despite the common problem of lack of resources, senior secondary schools marketed their special qualities for students. Another field of development was to find and learn new teaching methods, but there were no special projects for implementing new methods.

The renewal brought up the question of specialisation of schools. Syrjäläinen (1995b:116) claims that even her research alone indicates that schools are specialising, which increases inequality in society. Parents have many more possibilities to choose their children’s schools, and schools start to pick their students. Who eventually has the power to choose and where can the use of this power lead to at its worst?

Finally, Syrjäläinen (1995b:116-117) reminds that implementing the school-based curriculum is a different project from planning it. Implementation creates new problems, and teachers need support, training, and help from experts in solving them. A special danger for the success of the reform may be making a pedagogically unsuccessful national evaluation system, which can narrow down school-based freedom. The national evaluation system should be drawn up by persons who work in schools and understand every-day life in schools.

Syrjäläinen (1996) has also conducted a study on how senior secondary school teachers, principals, and students experienced the school reform. The survey was conducted by means of a questionnaire. The aim was to find out what teachers and principals thought of the development projects in senior secondary school and how they personally experienced the curriculum renewal. Students were asked about their possibilities to influence the development of senior secondary school and about the development projects.
This study by Syrjäläinen (1996:112-134) gives a more positive picture of the opinions of senior secondary school teachers and principals than her previous studies (1994 and 1995b). In general, the teachers and principals were interested in developing the school curriculum. They asserted that it improved motivation and enjoyment of work, and increased co-operation within subject groups as well as between different subjects. Furthermore, the renewal created more possibilities to influence one’s own work and to employ one’s own expertise in teaching. One of the negative features was increased competition in the work community: teachers competed for students by offering attractive courses to them. Teachers also found the non-graded system to be a problem, because it made it difficult to follow students’ progress. On the other hand, students had to take more responsibility for their own work. Teaching was diversified with the help of different development projects, and new teaching methods decreased the dominance of text books.

Syrjäläinen (1996:137,159) points out that the reform has changed the role of principals. They have become mediators between teachers and educational administration, and they have to represent the school to the surrounding society. As they lead the internal development in schools, they face increased demands and expectations, while the resources in schools become more scarce.

The opinions of students on senior secondary school were rather negative. Syrjäläinen’s (1996:14-19) survey showed that the students did not have the means to participate in the development of their school. Many students felt that it was a futile attempt to try to make any changes. Furthermore, some students had a completely passive attitude to school development.

The students criticised teaching in senior secondary school quite a lot. According to Syrjäläinen (1996:36-38,43-45,57-61), students found the teaching methods traditional. They thought that teaching relied too much on text books and it was teacher-centred: students were just passive receivers. Furthermore, the students claimed that senior secondary school was very theoretical and courses contained too much material. Especially language teaching was seen as old-fashioned, boring, and repetitive. However, the students said something positive about their schools, too. They liked team work and the fact that language studies
demanded quite a lot of independent work from them. The students also felt generally positive about the non-graded system, which gave them freedom and responsibility, more friends, and created less stress.

Jauhiainen (1996) has conducted a study on teachers and school-based curriculum planning. The purpose of her study was to investigate what kind of influence the curriculum planning process had on the work and professional development of teachers. The study was conducted by interviewing four to five teachers from three schools in Uusimaa once per term, over a period of three to five terms between 1993 and 1995. Additionally, all teachers wrote a description of a good teacher at the beginning of the research process as well as at the end of it.

Curriculum planning took a different amount of time in all three schools that Jauhiainen (1996:2,68-71) studied. The schools started to plan their curricula during the school year of 1992 - 1993. By the autumn term of 1995 two of the schools were implementing their school-based curricula but the third school had not finished its curriculum planning. There were also differences in the number of teachers participating in curriculum planning, how much time was offered for planning, and how much training the teachers received. In one of the schools the high turnover rate of teachers was seen as a hindrance for effective curriculum planning. It also appeared to be very difficult to motivate the teachers to adopt the idea of continuous development. But, as the results of the study showed, the more responsibility and training the teachers received, the more they dedicated themselves to the development work. Moreover, the process seemed to weaken the tradition of teachers being solitary workers. The subject-centred approach was replaced by developing the whole school.

Most of the previous studies on the school-based curriculum have concentrated on describing the curriculum planning process and the experiences of the teachers and principals involved. As shown above, the framework curriculum of 1994 had a central role in planning, which was usually done by teachers. Principals were in charge of the whole process, but they were less involved in actual planning. Students and parents were hardly involved at all.
The planning process evoked both positive and negative feelings amongst the teachers and principals. Along with resistance on the part of teachers, the biggest obstacle for successful curriculum planning was the fact that nobody really knew for whom and why the school-based curriculum was written. Furthermore, the school-based curriculum was not considered very important, since many teachers said it did not influence their work at all. The matriculation examination still controlled almost everything in senior secondary school.

Previous studies have revealed very little about the changes the renewal has caused in school-based curriculum documents and foreign language documents in particular, although there has been profound changes in the theoretical basis for Finnish curriculum planning since the 1980s. The emphasis has shifted from a classical humanist approach towards a progressivist one. As a result, the whole process of curriculum planning has changed. The question is whether the intended curriculum, the curriculum document, has also changed. Therefore, the present study examines the possible changes in the English A1-language curriculum documents of one senior secondary school.
5 RESEARCH DESIGN

So far, the concept of curriculum and different approaches to curriculum planning and renewal have been examined. From this theoretical background we have moved on to the development of the Finnish senior secondary school curriculum, from the lehrplan model to the school-based curriculum. Major findings of previous studies of the school-based curriculum have been outlined. The present study takes a closer look at the development of the English A1-language curriculum of one senior secondary school. The aim is to find answers to the following questions:

1. How similar or different are the English A1-language curricula of the case school for the years 1987, 1994, and 1998?
2. What factors can explain the development of the English A1-language curriculum, as shown in the documents from these three years?
3. To what extent and for what reasons has the case school used or not used its opportunity for independent solutions in designing its own English A1-language curriculum?

These questions are approached by analysing the curriculum documents and comparing the school-based curricula with the FC of 1994. Other possible factors which might have influenced the school-based curricula are also examined. Finally, two English teachers and the principal of the case school are interviewed.

As the present study describes the Finnish phenomenon of curriculum planning, the term syllabus is only used to refer to the number of compulsory courses in each subject (oppimäärä) that a student has to complete in order to graduate from the senior secondary school. For example, the English A1-language syllabus consists of six courses. The term curriculum is used to describe an administrative document, whether it is a document which covers all subjects or just one subject, for example English A1-language. Additionally, the concept of curriculum is studied here with a relatively narrow view as the subject of the study is the written curriculum document only. Levels of curriculum such as implementation or evaluation will be left out of the scope of the present study.
5.1 Research methodology

The present study is a qualitative case study. According to Yin (1994:1), the case study is an appropriate method when 'how' or 'why' questions are asked, when the events under study cannot be controlled by the researcher, and when the target of the study is "a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context". Finnish curriculum reform is a relatively recent phenomenon and curriculum documents are constantly under development.

The analysis is conducted according to an explanation-building mode proposed by Yin (1994:110-111): the goal is to analyse the case study data by building an explanation of the case, and by explaining the curriculum changes by stipulating causal links about it. As Yin points out, these links may be complex and difficult to measure, which is also the case in the present study. Some of the changes that have taken place in the written curricula, especially in 1994, can be traced to the framework curriculum of 1994. Finding explanations for some of the changes requires alternative perspectives, such as interviewing the persons involved in the planning process. An iterative nature of explanation building adopted from Yin (1994:111) is used: evidence is examined, theoretical positions are revised, and the evidence is examined once again from a new perspective.

Our research is conducted through the stages presented in figure 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 1: Three curriculum documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document analysis method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results 1: The document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results 2: Comparing documents with secondary data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 2: Three interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results 3: Analysis of interviews

Final conclusions =
Research questions + Results 1 + Results 2 + Results 3

Figure 1. The explanation building method of the present study.

The contents of the three curriculum documents are described and analysed in order to find out the similarities and differences in them. The results of the analysis are compared with the framework curriculum of 1994 and other available written sources for possible explanations for the changes that have occurred. The purpose of the interviews is to find reasons for the changes which cannot be explained by examining the written sources. The interviews are transcribed and analysed. The final conclusions are based on the analysis of the documents, information from other written sources and results from the analysis of interviews.

5.2 Selection of school and interviewees

During the spring of 1998 a telephone inquiry was made around senior secondary schools in Central Finland. The purpose was to find a school where both the principal and most of the English teachers had been working - preferably within the same school - since 1987, when the municipal English A1-language curriculum was put into practice. In this way all the interviewees would be able to answer the questions concerning all three curricula from their own personal experience. Furthermore, this starting point would make it possible to carry out valid comparisons between the interviewees' answers to all questions. Among the schools which more or less met the requirements, there was one in which the assistant principal was willing to participate in the study and to produce the necessary curriculum documents. This school was chosen as the case school.

The principal and all the English teachers of the case school were asked to be interviewed. The purpose was to interview all teachers who teach English as
a major subject. Teachers who had English as a minor subject were not considered because, according to preliminary information received from the assistant principal, they were not involved in planning the school-based English language curriculum. The principal was interviewed because the previous studies emphasised the role of the principal in planning the school-based curriculum.

However, one of the teachers had just begun her work at the school and felt that she did not have much to contribute to the study, but agreed to participate in a pilot interview. One of the English teachers declined the request for an interview. Finally, there were three persons to be interviewed: the principal and two English teachers. In order to maintain their anonymity, the case school of this study is not mentioned by name but referred to as the case school. The teachers and the principal are referred to as Teacher A, Teacher B and the Principal.
6 DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

6.1 The three curriculum documents of the case school

The municipal English A1-language curriculum of 1987

The municipal English A1-language curriculum of 1987 has its origin in the 1982 senior secondary school reform in which all subjects were divided into courses (a unit of approximately 38 lessons). The syllabi for each subject were published in the form of a booklet. These individual booklets were later put together into the 1985 framework curriculum for senior secondary school. (Apajalahti 1994:11.)

The case school’s municipal English A1-language curriculum of 1987 is nearly identical with the English A1-language section in the framework curriculum for senior secondary school published in 1985 (see the National Board of General Education 1985). The reason for this could be that the framework curriculum is a very thorough and detailed document - there is very little to add to it. The only thing the local authorities did add is a local topic, such as local education possibilities, for each of the six compulsory courses. So, although the local authorities had a chance to write a curriculum of their own, they appear to have followed the framework curriculum in detail.

The case school’s municipal English A1-language curriculum of 1987 is almost 23 pages long and its title is English language, A-syllabus (A-oppimäärä) (see Appendix 1). This curriculum is divided into six different chapters: 1) Objectives, 2) Emphasis on language skills, 3) Contents of learning, 4) Choosing teaching material, 5) Courses, and 6) List of grammatical structures.

The first four chapters, some five pages, describe the general guidelines for teaching English. Chapter 1, Objectives, formulates the main objectives for teaching English A1-language. These include the following: to give students sufficient skills to understand and use English, to activate students, to maintain and develop their language skills, to develop communication skills, and to increase and deepen cultural awareness and understanding.
Chapter 2, *Emphasis on language skills* states the overall objectives for students’ language skills: each student is expected to understand considerably more difficult language than he or she is able to produce. It also describes how the emphasis on language skills is divided between the courses and what kind of language skills students should be provided with.

Chapter 3, *Contents of learning*, points out which general objectives should be the basis for choosing the contents of learning. It also lists the items that are included under this chapter: contexts for language use, topics, grammatical structures, vocabulary, and pronunciation. All these items are given a brief description. *Contexts for language use* states, for example, how the different contexts have been grouped together, what should be kept in mind when choosing different contexts, and how the contexts of the first year of study differ from those of the second and the third year. *Topics* describes what kind of substance the topics that are chosen should include. *Grammatical structures* gives advice for the criteria for choosing the grammatical structures for different courses. It also gives suggestions concerning which structures should be taught during the first year of study, and which ones during the second and the third. *Vocabulary* formulates the objectives concerning the size of both the active and the passive vocabulary students are expected to know after they graduate. Furthermore, some general guidelines are given for how to choose the appropriate vocabulary items and how they should be taught. *Pronunciation* is described only briefly: it is stated that students are expected to know both British and American standard pronunciation, to recognise the main local and regional variants, and to be able to acquire as natural and correct pronunciation as possible.

Chapter 4, *Choosing teaching material*, suggests that there should be both written as well as audio material. It also describes what types of language the different material should include, and what kinds of texts are expected to be used for teaching, for example, structures, listening, and pronunciation. It is pointed out that all material should be tied together closely with the material that is in the junior secondary school’s English language syllabus.

Descriptions of the eight courses form chapter 5. The chapter begins with some general advice on how to specify the aims for each course, how to choose
the structures which should be taught, and what kind of language skills are expected to be achieved during the first year of senior secondary school. All courses are numbered (1-8) and they have a title which is closely related to the topic of each course. Courses 1-3, which are taken during the first year of senior secondary school, are divided into three sections which are titled as perspective, emphasis, and contents of learning. Perspective is a kind of introduction for the course. It presents some of the topics for the courses and describes, for example, the language skill requirements, material requirements, language style, and items that should be taught to students. Emphasis notes which language skills should be emphasised in each of the three courses. Contents of learning includes two lists: one is a list of topics and the other is a list of contexts for language use.

After the description of course 3 there is a short passage which explains the change in emphasis in teaching different language skills from the second year onwards. It also describes how the objectives and the texts differ from those of the first year.

Courses 4-8 are illustrated in the same way as the first three ones. In these descriptions Perspective serves an introductory purpose by mainly giving examples of the topics, suggesting ways to approach them or by explaining the special nature of the course (such as integration or revision). Emphasis states the language skills taught in each of the courses. In courses 4-8 the contents of learning include lists of topics and advice on how to approach them. In addition, in course 8 there is a more detailed description of the educational objectives and the amount and type of suggested texts and tapes. Lists of contexts for language use are excluded from courses 4-8.

Chapter 6 is a list of grammatical structures. This list includes the following structures: verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs, numerals, pronouns, and conjunctions and syntax. The list is twofold: it states which structures students should be able to use and which structures they should be able to understand.
The school-based English A1-language curriculum of 1994

The case school's curriculum written in 1994 was the first school-based curriculum for which the school itself was responsible. In practice this meant that, for example, the English teachers formed a team and wrote the English language curriculum together. All teachers participated in writing the curriculum for the subject they taught, and together with the principal they also wrote the general section of the school curriculum.

Since the school-based curriculum was a new idea in Finland, the teachers did not have much to depend on in their curriculum planning. However, the schools were not left totally on their own in their curriculum planning, since the Finnish National Board of Education published a book called Framework curriculum for the senior secondary school 1994. This document gave guidelines for senior secondary school curricula.

The case school's English A1-language curriculum of 1994 is rather a short document compared to the one of 1987 (see Appendix 2). It is two pages long and there is no general section. The curriculum consists of a description of a total of nine courses. The courses are numbered and given a title that usually indicates the topic of the course, for example, Studies and work and Science, economics, and technology. The courses are described briefly in a few sentences, the emphasis being on different grammatical structures and language skills.

The first six courses are compulsory national courses which cover the English language syllabus. All students have to take them in order to graduate from senior secondary school. Courses 7 and 8 are optional specialised courses, which all senior secondary schools have to offer to their students. Course 9 is a school-based, optional applied course; in this case a remedial course, where the basic material of courses 1 and 2 is reviewed.


The case school updated its English A1-language curriculum in May 1998 (see Appendix 3). The form of the document was not altered, but some changes and
additions were made. Course 6 was turned into a portfolio course. Three optional applied courses 10, 11 and 12 were added. Courses 10 and 11 are described with a title School-based applied course, and a short explanation of the contents of the course; course 10 is a revision course preparing students for the matriculation exam, and course 11 is an English discussion course. Course 12 is described as a discussion course with a native English language teacher. Other parts of the curriculum, i.e. courses 1-5 and 7-9, are identical to the ones of 1994.

6.2 Document analysis method

According to Tesch (1987 as quoted by Seliger and Shohamy 1989:205), there are two main ways of analysing qualitative data. The first one is to inductively derive the categories for sorting out the text segments from the text itself. The second one is to use already existing categories and apply them to the text; these categories can be derived from a conceptual framework or from the specific research questions. In the present study, both of these systems were applied. Existing categories were applied to the documents, but since they were not applicable as such, some categories were left out and some new categories were created on the basis of the items in the curriculum documents.

Barnes (1982:141) suggests that when analysing the curriculum documents of a school one could examine if they contain the following: a statement of general aims, a list of topics or content to be covered, a set of objectives, a list of skills to be mastered, learning activities and/or teaching methods, and methods for monitoring and evaluation. Not all these categories were relevant to the present study. Therefore, this categorisation was modified.

In analysing qualitative data, one usually uses a process called data reduction, which means selecting, sampling, and simplifying the original data (Miles and Huberman 1984:21). In the present study, however, no data reduction was done with the contents of the curriculum documents. In order to be able to see clearly the similarities and differences all text segments in the curricula were divided into the following six categories: 1) topics, 2) objectives, 3) grammatical structures, 4) language skills emphasised, 5) learning tasks, and 6) other items.
Barnes's (1982:141) categories _a statement of general aims and methods for monitoring and evaluation_ were excluded because the courses did not contain any material fitting into these categories. For the opposite reason, a category of grammatical structures was added. This categorisation covers the contents of all courses found in the three curriculum documents. The general section of the 1987 municipal curriculum is described separately above (see section 6.1).

The division of the curriculum items into the different categories was based on the original Finnish curricula. It was rather a difficult task, because some of the items could have possibly fitted into several categories if considered from different semantic perspectives. Furthermore, when translated into English, the meanings of some words might have - unintentionally - slightly changed. However, the items were divided into the different categories as objectively and consistently as possible.

Category 1, _topics_, includes the titles of the courses, subjects to be presented, lists of subjects to be covered, the ways to handle, approach and study these subjects, perspectives, and local subjects. Category 2, _objectives_, covers objectives for learning, and objective-like items in which it is being stressed or emphasised that this subject should be taught to students. It also includes objectives concerning the growth and development of students, and value-related objectives such as peace education. In addition to clearly stated structures, category 3, _grammatical structures_, includes, for example, _style of writing_ because it is closely connected to syntax and the choice of vocabulary. Category 4, _language skills emphasised_, includes the standard language skills mentioned in the curricula. According to the standard model the oral skills include both listening and speaking, and the written skills include both reading and writing. Category 5, _learning tasks_, contains clearly stated exercises, such as writing a letter, reading a book, etc. Category 6, _other items_, is a 'reserve' category for additional items mentioned in the course descriptions. These items, such as language style and contexts for language use, do not clearly fall into any of the categories mentioned above.
6.3 Document analysis

In this section, the aim is to identify the possible similarities and differences in the three English A1-language curricula. Courses 1-9 in the curriculum documents of 1994 and 1998 are identical, except for course 6 which is a portfolio course in the 1998 document. The curriculum of 1998 also includes three optional applied courses 10-12. In the following tables these three courses will be referred to specifically as '1998 only'. However, most of the time these two curricula of 1994 and 1998 are treated together as one entity and referred to as the SBEC of 1994/1998. Whenever discussed separately, they are referred to as the SBEC of 1994 and the SBEC of 1998. The case school’s municipal English A1-language curriculum of 1987 is referred to as the MEC of 1987.

In order to find the possible similarities and differences in the curricula, the text segments in the course descriptions were divided into the six categories presented above in the document analysis method (see section 6.2). Each category was presented in the form of a table and treated individually.

Some general observations can be made of these curriculum documents. The number of pages has come down substantially; the MEC of 1987 is 23 pages long, and the SBEC of 1994/1998 consists of two pages. This can be partly explained by the structures of the curricula. In the MEC of 1987 there is a large general section which describes general objectives, contents of learning, etc. The SBEC of 1994/1998 has no counterpart. Furthermore, in the MEC of 1987 there is rather a long list of structures the students have to be able either to use or to understand when graduating from senior secondary school. In the SBEC of 1994/1998 the structures are mentioned briefly in each of the course descriptions. However, all three curricula share the same basic structure: separate course descriptions.

Topics

Table 1 presents the topics of the three curriculum documents. The topics include the titles of the courses, subjects to be presented, lists of subjects to be covered,
the ways to handle, approach and study these subjects, perspectives, and local subjects. The bold font in the table indicates relevant differences in the curriculum documents:

Table 1. Topics

|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Course 1           | Man and his immediate surroundings  
|                    | - personal contacts reflect different cultures and the customs and attitudes of people of different ages and backgrounds  
|                    | - topics are studied mainly from young people's points of view  
|                    | - topics: one's own self; home, family, relatives, friends, other people; school, relations with school mates; everyday tasks; relationships; problems of young people; leisure-time activities; relationships between different generations;  
|                    | presentation of municipality X                                                                                   | Young people and their world                                                          |
| Course 2           | Man, his hobbies, and the services he uses  
|                    | - topics include hobbies and leisure-time activities, and man in the most common service situations home and abroad both as a user and a producer of services  
|                    | - topics: holidays; clubs and associations; sports and exercise; travelling and transportation; sport facilities and guiding in municipality X | Meeting people - the course introduces the American way of life                        |
| Course 3           | Man and his work  
|                    | - language used in studies and working life  
|                    | - topics are discussed in practical contexts and with concrete examples  
|                    | - topics: the meaning of language skills in studies and working life; a few professions, their qualifications and the education needed (profession with different levels of education); working and studying in home or abroad; summer jobs, participating in domestic duties, salary and pocket money; the changing nature of work and future professions; meaning of work, working moral, unemployment; education in municipality X | Studies and work - topics focus on presenting different jobs and applying for a job  |
| Course 4 | Man and society  
- perspective is both social and global  
- topics deal with the structure of society, its functions and principles both from the individual’s perspective - individual as a functioning member of society and user of its services - and from society’s perspective - man as a part of the society that provides him with his income and security  
- topics are viewed also through literature, interviews, comedy, case descriptions, etc.  
- the course can proceed from concrete, familiar topics in home country to wider, global contexts  
- topics: habitation, forms of living, rural and urban living; geographical surroundings; health services, social security both in one’s own country and in Anglo-Saxon countries; migration; unions and associations, politics; religion and church; law and order; living in municipality X | The surrounding society |
| Course 5 | Man, science and technology  
- man as a part of the whole world  
- the course is divided into two parts:  
1. one starting point can be the unequally shared global welfare caused by technological progress; topics can deal with man's relation to nature and outer space and international co-operation in developing science and technology  
2. the second part deals with acquisition of information and mass media; press, radio, television, and current issues form a constantly changing subject  
- technological progress can be handled, for example, by presenting typical representatives of different branches of technology; by examining typical branches or by presenting technological achievements  
- presentations and comparisons of mass media  
- topics: earlier and present achievements of different branches (inventors or important representatives of each branch); an important branch of industry of one’s own country; development of transportation; conquest of space; data processing and computers; a developmental outlook; futurology; the impact of mass media; advertising and consumer information; ways of getting information; data transmission and mass communication  
- presentation of an important branch of industry of municipality X  
- topics of municipality X's summer festival or other events are used | Science, economics, and technology |
| Course 6 | Man, education and culture  
- main part of the course is dealing with culture and  
  aesthetic field in its all forms  
- the main theme consists of film, theatre, music, arts and  
  particularly literature  
- another theme can be education and school system  
  especially in English-speaking countries; these topics are  
  treated briefly at the beginning of the course  
- the beginning of the course can deal with different features  
  of school systems both in Finland and in Anglo-Saxon  
  countries, and different ways of education  
- however, the basis of the course is aesthetic, cultural  
  themes  
- topics: presenting school systems; educational  
  opportunities; literature (short stories, novels, plays, poetry);  
  film and theatre; music and arts; arts both as a hobby and a  
  profession; prominent personalities both in Anglo-Saxon  
  and in Finnish cultural life; traditions and customs; pop-  
  culture; aesthetic questions as such; **presenting the cultural  
  life and a prominent personality of the cultural life of**  
  **municipality X** | Culture |
| Course 7 | Man and nature  
- man as a part of nature on the basis of facts rather than  
  personal feelings  
- the course can start from information concerning the  
  conditions of one’s own home town and country and  
  proceed to general topics concerning the whole world  
- topics: man’s relationship with nature; natural resources,  
  their division and use; conservation of nature and  
  maintaining the balance in nature; the planning of  
  environment; different living conditions; nutrition problems;  
  population problems; nature of one’s own country; people’s  
  ideas of nature and universe; a branch of applied natural  
  science (medicine, psychology, nature conservation, etc.);  
  geography, biology, physics, chemistry; hobbies involved  
  with nature | Changing World  
- topics include the environment  
  and sustainable development |
| Course 8 | Man and the peoples of the world  
- topics must be handled from various points of view and as  
  objectively as possible, and students must be given a chance  
  to express their own opinions  
- topics can be approached by presenting lines of  
  development and wide topic groups and/or by following  
  current events  
- topics: Finland’s position in the world; international  
  politics and economy; peace education and questions  
  concerning peace; economic redistribution and development  
  co-operation; international co-operation and international  
  organisations; human rights and racism; humanitarian  
  organisations; different interpretations of social systems and  
  ideologies; national economy and entrepreneurship; current  
  international events; national identity | Expanding  
world view  
- students  
become familiar with  
international co-  
operation and  
they consider  
current issues  
from European  
and global  
points of view |
| Course 9 | School-based  
applied course |
In the MEC of 1987, the topics of each course are described in detail. A lot of different topics are mentioned and various ways to approach and study them from different perspectives are suggested. The first six courses also include a local topic, such as *Education in municipality X*, and *Living in municipality X*. In seven courses of the SBEC of 1994/1998, the topic is mentioned in the form of a title. The rest of the courses include a title and a short description that clarifies the topic. Local topics are not included. The titles of the courses have changed from the MEC of 1987, but the main topics have remained nearly the same in seven courses. For example, course 4 is titled *Man and society* in the MEC of 1987 and *The surrounding society* in the SBEC of 1994/1998, and course 5 *Man, science and technology* in the MEC of 1987 and *Science, economics, and technology* in the SBEC of 1994/1998. Only course 2 has a completely new topic; in the MEC of 1987 it is *Hobbies and leisure-time* and in the SBEC of 1994/1998 it is *The American way of life*.

The optional applied course 9 of the SBEC of 1994/1998 and courses 10 and 11 of the SBEC of 1998, which do not exist in the MEC of 1987, have titles that differ from those of courses 1-8 in any of the curriculum documents. All three courses are titled *School-based applied course*. This title does not say anything about the topic or the themes of the courses. Course 12 of the SBEC of 1998 does not have a title at all. On the whole, the descriptions of the topics in the SBEC of 1994/1998 are radically shorter and less detailed than in the MEC of 1987.
Objectives

Objectives include objective-like items in which it is being stressed or emphasised that this subject should be taught to students, objectives concerned with growth and development of students, value-related objectives (for example, peace education), and clearly stated objectives of learning. These objectives are listed in Table 2. The bold font in the table indicates relevant similarities in the curriculum documents:

Table 2. Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>- to increase passive language skills</td>
<td>- the course strengthens students' command of vocabulary and basic structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a review of what has been learned earlier</td>
<td>- students become familiar with the types of activity in senior secondary school as well as with the use of various aids, and they learn different language learning strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- command of reviewed and learned structures and vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>- command of main structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>- both the meaning of language proficiency in studies and in working life and students' active roles in developing their language skills are emphasised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>- when the topics are dealt with it is worth emphasising individual's opportunities and duties in democratic society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- perspective is widened from one's own country and society to other parts of the world</td>
<td>- the course encourages students to become active members of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>- the course offers language skills for topics which deal with technological and scientific development and the resulting facilitation of world wide flow of information and ways of getting information. - when ways of getting information are dealt with, the individual’s duty to get information in order to develop himself, both as an individual and as a member of society, is emphasised. - skills needed in getting information should be taught as well as critical evaluation and use of information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>- the course gives students means to understand and use language related to nature and natural sciences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>- the course reviews what has been learned earlier and goes through structures and vocabulary again. - students’ writing skills are strengthened. - when the topics are dealt with, peace education and improvement of co-operation and mutual understanding of men and people should be taken into account.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MEC of 1987 the objectives are mentioned in every course description except for course 6. Some of the courses include several elaborate objectives, such as *emphasising students' active role in developing their language skills*, and giving students means to understand and use language related to nature and natural sciences. In the SBEC of 1994/1998 objectives are included only in courses 1 and 4. The objectives of course 1 differ in most parts from those in the MEC of 1987; the only similarity is the emphasis on vocabulary and structures. The objective of course 4, *to encourage students to become active members of society*, deals with the same issue as one of the objectives of course 4 in the MEC of 1987 but is formulated differently.
Grammatical structures

In addition to clear grammatical structures this category contains, for example, styles of writing, because it is closely connected to syntax and the choice of vocabulary. Table 3 lists the items of this category:

Table 3. Grammatical structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>- tenses, word order, and tag questions are reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>- the course deals with nouns, adjectives, ordinals, and indirect speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>- main issues are passive, pronouns, and formal subject</td>
<td>- idioms are practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>- grammar focuses on modal auxiliaries, relative clauses, and the use of articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>- main issues are infinitive and progressive tense (the -ing clause)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>- emphasis is on syntax and the styles of writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>- main issues of grammar are reviewed</td>
<td>- structures are practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>- structures are practised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MEC of 1987, the grammatical structures are not mentioned in the course descriptions, but they are presented in a separate list in the end of the English A1-language curriculum. This list is rather detailed, and it contains the following structures: verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs, numerals, pronouns, and conjunctions and syntax (see Appendix 1). It is not stated during which course these structures should be taught, but a difference is made between those structures students should be able to use, and those which they should be able to understand by the end of their studies. In the SBEC of 1994/1998, the grammatical structures are listed under the first eight courses, and thus divided
according to what should be taught during each course. The structures are not specified in detail as in the structure list of the MEC of 1987 curriculum. The optional applied course 9 in the SBEC of 1994/1998 and courses 10-12 in the SBEC of 1998 do not mention any structures.

Language skills emphasised

The oral language skills (or oral communication) mentioned in the curricula include speaking and listening, and the written language skills (or written communication) include reading and writing. Table 4 presents the language skills emphasised:

Table 4. Language skills emphasised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>- active oral language skills; understanding and producing speech</td>
<td>- oral practice is emphasised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- quite demanding reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tutored writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>- active, informal oral language skills (speaking)</td>
<td>- students continue practising oral communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- understanding speech</td>
<td>- students start to practise written communication, too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- writing practice begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>- language skills are emphasised rather evenly, although according to the general objectives of the first year English of senior secondary school special attention is paid to oral language skills</td>
<td>- students move on to practising more demanding oral and written communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>- different language skills are still emphasised rather evenly, although at this stage more attention is paid to the ability to understand larger text units</td>
<td>- students continue practising demanding oral and written communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>- understanding the essence of listening and reading comprehension tasks is emphasised</td>
<td>- students examine demanding texts about the topics mentioned above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>- understanding of speech and text units is emphasised</td>
<td>- students concentrate on self-directed oral and written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- special attention is paid to writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>- the receptive language skills constitute a great part of the course, but it includes material that develops speaking, too. The emphasis is on understanding the main points of factual texts, understanding speech, and writing.</td>
<td>- listening and reading comprehension is practised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>- the receptive language skills constitute a great part of the course, and listening comprehension rises to the level of text comprehension. Good reading and listening comprehension skills support students' oral language skills. The emphasis is on rather demanding factual texts, listening comprehension, and writing.</td>
<td>- students concentrate on producing and handling different kinds of texts with various methods. Listening comprehension is practised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 11</td>
<td>1998 only: - an English discussion course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 12</td>
<td>1998 only: - an English discussion course with a native English language teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general section of the MEC of 1987 says that all four language skills are practised in all eight courses but this is not the case according to the course descriptions. The only language skill covered in all courses is listening. The other oral skill, speaking, is not mentioned in courses 5 and 6. The written skills are not emphasised in two courses; reading is not named in course 2 and writing not in course 5.

In courses 1-8 in the SBEC of 1994/1998 speaking is not mentioned in courses 5, 7, and 8 and listening not in course 5. The written language skills are excluded from four courses, too. Reading is omitted from course 1, and writing from courses 1, 5, 7. Thus, it looks like the receptive language skills, listening and reading, get quite a lot of emphasis. In contrast, the productive language skills, speaking and writing, are emphasised less.

The optional applied course 9 of the SBEC of 1994 and course 10 of the SBEC of 1998 do not mention of any of the language skills. Courses 11 and 12 of the SBEC of 1998 do not specifically name any language skills either. However, as they are described as discussion courses, it is reasonable to assume that both speaking and listening are emphasised in these courses. Therefore, the
characterisation, an English discussion course, has been categorised as having an emphasis on oral language skills.

Figure 2, summarises the division of the four language skills in the curriculum documents. The initial L stands for listening, S for speaking, R for reading, and W for writing. The dots indicate that the language skill is emphasised in the course in question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Course 7</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Course 8</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 only: course 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 only: course 11</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 only: course 12</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The division of different language skills.

Figure 2 shows that in the MEC of 1987 all four language skills get emphasis in five courses, and in the SBEC of 1994/1998 in four courses. The MEC of 1987 and the SBEC of 1994/1998 seem to emphasise speaking and writing the least. On the other hand, listening and reading, which are important skills in the matriculation examination, are practised in nearly all courses.
Learning tasks

Learning tasks are clearly stated exercises, such as writing a letter, reading a book, etc. The learning tasks of the curriculum documents are shown in Table 5:

Table 5. Learning tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>- discussing one's self, one's family and immediate surroundings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reporting the events of everyday life and one's own experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- informal conversation and the command of language conventions in relation to it (such as greeting, introducing oneself, asking somebody's news, thanking, congratulating, apologising)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- answering the phone and talking on the phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- writing a postcard or a letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>- presenting one's own hobby, club or association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- interviewing fellow students about their hobbies and clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- presenting a popular hobby or sport in Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- introducing another person's hobby on the basis of what has been read or heard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- getting and supplying information in the most common service situations, such as accommodation, eating, transportation, entertainment and shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- travel account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>- discussions/interviews on topics related to studies, work and working life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- getting a student place/a job and studying/working, introducing oneself, giving information about education and work experience and answering questions concerning these issues, giving further information, presenting school reports and employment credentials, filling in applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reading different kinds of oral and written instructions and notices in studies/work, asking for instructions and advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- familiarising oneself with topic-related articles, literature extracts, writings and interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>- topics are also approached with problem-solving method: how students feel about presented institutions and how would they like to improve them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>- students read a book in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the MEC of 1987 the first four courses include quite a lot of different learning tasks, but the rest do not contain any. In the SBEC of 1994/1998 one learning task is mentioned in course 6 and in course 7. As far as this category is concerned, the curricula differ totally from each other.

Other items

This category comprises items that do not clearly fall into any of the categories mentioned above. These items are presented in Table 6:

Table 6. Other items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 1</strong></td>
<td>- language use in personal contacts</td>
<td>- the course provides a transition to senior secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- language is familiar and informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Course 3</strong></td>
<td>- the language used is mostly official and it includes inquiries, notices, instructions, etc. related to work and study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- starting point can also be an interview, literature extract, etc., so that the language can be informal, familiar, and entertaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Course 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 6</strong></td>
<td>- students can familiarise themselves with the branches mentioned in section 1 according to their hobbies and interests</td>
<td>1998 only:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Course 7</strong></td>
<td>- a portfolio course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Course 7 | - language is mainly factual  
|         | - topics offer an excellent chance to relate the  
|         | factual content to other subjects, such as natural  
|         | science, history, psychology |
| Course 8 | - there should be a lot of text material, so that the  
|         | students can choose from different texts  
|         | according to their level and interest and that they  
|         | would have an opportunity to learn wide range of  
|         | vocabulary by familiarising themselves with as  
|         | many topics as possible from different points of  
|         | view  
|         | - the general, basic texts are complemented by  
|         | current publications, leaflets, statistics,  
|         | newspapers, magazines, and different audio  
|         | materials; suitable literature extracts can be used  
|         | as well |
| Course 9 | - a remedial course,  
|         | where the basic material  
|         | of courses 1 and 2 is  
|         | reviewed |
| Course 10 | 1998 only:  
|          | - a revision course  
|          | preparing students for  
|          | the matriculation  
|          | examination |
| Course 11 |  
| Course 12 |  

In the MEC of 1987, other items include, for example, language style and contexts for language use. In the SBEC of 1994 two items fall into this category, both of them describe the nature of the course; course 1 is a transition course and course 9 a remedial course. In the SBEC of 1998 there are two additional remarks. Course 6 has been turned into a portfolio course, and the purpose of course 10 is to prepare students for the matriculation examination. There is nothing similar in the items of the MEC of 1987 and the SBEC of 1994/1998 in this category.

Summary

The differences between the curriculum documents examined above are much more frequent than the similarities. On the whole, the size of the English A1-language curriculum documents has been reduced noticeably. The general part in
the MEC of 1987 does not have an equivalent in the SBEC of 1994/1998. Otherwise, the basic structure of the curricula has remained the same. Courses still constitute the organising principle for the contents of the curricula.

Category 1, *topics*, shows that although the number of items in the MEC of 1987 is much higher than in the SBEC of 1994/1998, the main topics have remained nearly the same. Course 2 has a new topic in the SBEC of 1994/1998, as do the optional applied courses 9-12, because they do not have equivalents in the MEC of 1987. The local topics in the MEC of 1987 do not have counterparts in the SBEC of 1994/1998.

Category 2, *objectives*, includes one objective in the MEC of 1987 in course 4 which is almost the same as an objective in course 4 in the SBEC of 1994/1998. Otherwise the items in this category are all different from each other. Category 3, *grammatical structures*, is empty in the MEC of 1987, because the structures are not given in the course descriptions but in a separate list. In the SBEC of 1994/1998 the grammatical structures are listed under the first eight courses, and thus divided according to what should be taught during each course. In the additional courses 9-12, structures are not mentioned at all.

Category 4, *language skills emphasised*, is rather similar in the curricula. In the MEC of 1987, all language skills are emphasised quite evenly in all courses: listening is practised in all eight courses, reading and writing in seven courses, and speaking in six. The first eight courses of SBEC of 1994/1998 emphasise listening and reading in seven courses, and speaking and writing in five. The optional applied courses 11 and 12 in the SBEC of 1998 are discussion courses, which implies that the emphasis is on speaking and listening. The optional applied course 9 in the SBEC of 1994/1998 and course 10 in the SBEC of 1998 do not mention any language skills. The items in categories 5, *learning tasks*, and 6, *other items*, differ completely from each other in the MEC of 1987 and in the SBEC of 1994/1998.

As has been pointed out earlier (see section 6.1), the MEC of 1987 is almost identical to the framework curriculum of 1985. Though the central control over curriculum planning has decreased since the transition to school-based curriculum planning, the national framework curriculum for senior secondary
school is still the official - though relatively vague - basis and outline for every secondary school’s own curriculum. Thus, the next section of the present study examines the similarities and differences that can be found in the SBEC of 1994/1998 and the framework curriculum of 1994.

6.4 Comparison with secondary data

In this section, the case school’s English A1-language curricula of 1994 and 1998 are compared to the foreign A1/A2-language section of the framework curriculum for senior secondary school of 1994 in order to find out possible similarities and differences in these documents. The framework curriculum was published in 1994 to give general guidelines for curriculum planning in schools. Since it was the only official document the schools were supposed to base their curricula on, it is interesting to see what items, if any, the case school’s English A1-language curriculum has adopted from the framework curriculum. In the following analysis the framework curriculum of 1994 is referred to as the FC of 1994 and the case school’s English A1-language curriculum of 1994/1998 is referred to as the SBEC of 1994/1998.

6.4.1 The framework curriculum of 1994

The FC of 1994 is considerably less detailed than its predecessor from 1985. In the general part it explains the need for curriculum reform, states the aim of education and teaching, gives general guidelines for writing the curriculum and assessing it, gives guidelines for student evaluation, determines the general objectives for subject groups and subjects, and describes briefly the courses of each subject. Foreign languages are grouped together and specified as languages that start in the lower stage of the comprehensive school (A1 and A2), languages that start in the upper stage (B1 and B2), and a language that starts in senior secondary school (B3). Thus, depending on the school in question, the A1-language may be English, French, German, Russian, etc.
The FC of 1994 has a general section in foreign A1/A2-languages which describes the meaning of foreign language teaching, the general objectives, objectives for the languages that start at different levels, the contents, and compulsory courses. The SBEC of 1994/1998 does not have any similar section. The FC of 1994 also describes the contents of six compulsory courses of A1/A2-language and includes some remarks concerning specialised courses. In order to find out which features of the first six courses of the SBEC of 1994/1998 come from the FC of 1994, a comparison is made between the course descriptions of these six courses. The specialised courses, i.e. courses 7 and 8, and the optional applied courses 9-12 are treated separately later. As mentioned earlier, the courses 1-6 in the curriculum documents of 1994 and 1998 are the same, except for course 6 being a portfolio course in 1998. In this comparison these documents are treated together as one entity.

The items of these course descriptions are divided into the same six categories that were used in the analysis of the different curricula and presented above in the document analysis method (see section 6.2). Some categories are presented in the form of a table.

**Topics**

Table 7 introduces the first category, *topics*. Items of the SBEC of 1994/1998 that differ from those of the FC of 1994 or do not have an equivalent in the FC of 1994 are emphasised with bold font:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>Young people and their world</td>
<td>Young people and their world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>Communication and leisure - written communication is practised from the point of view of, for example, service situations and leisure</td>
<td>Meeting people - the course introduces the American way of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>Studies and work</td>
<td>Studies and work - topics focus on presenting different jobs and applying for a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>Society and the surrounding world - the course focuses on, for example, social, geographical, and ecological texts</td>
<td>The surrounding society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>Science, economics, and technology - the course focuses on texts dealing with, for example, various sciences, technological achievements, various forms of communication, and business life</td>
<td>Science, economics, and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>Culture - the topics may include, for example, the arts, literature, music, film, and the theatre</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The titles of the courses are nearly identical except for course 2 which in the FC of 1994 is titled *Communication and leisure* and in the SBEC of 1994/1998 *Meeting people*. The topic of course 2 is described in more detail both in the FC of 1994 and in the SBEC of 1994/1998, but these descriptions are naturally different from each other because the titles are different. Other topics are described in detail in the FC of 1994 in courses 4, 5, and 6, and in the SBEC of 1994/1998 in 3. So, apart from the titles, there are no similarities in this category.

Objectives

Objectives are presented in Table 8. The bold font identifies the objectives of the SBEC of 1994/1998 that are not the same as in the FC of 1994:
Table 8. Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>- the course strengthens students’ command of vocabulary and basic structures - the students become familiar with the types of activity in senior secondary school as well as with the use of various aids</td>
<td>- the course strengthens students’ command of vocabulary and basic structures - the students become familiar with the types of activity in senior secondary school as well as with the use of various aids, and they learn different language learning strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>- students strengthen their command of structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>- students learn to understand and also use the language of official contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>- the course encourages students to become active members of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>- the course focuses on improving comprehension skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objectives are stated in the FC of 1994 in courses 1, 2, 3, and 5, and in the SBEC of 1994/1998 in 1 and 4. The objective of course 1 is almost the same in the curriculum documents; one clause *they learn different language learning strategies* has been added in the SBEC of 1994/1998. No further similarities can be found in this category.

Grammatical structures

In the general section of foreign languages of the FC of 1994 it is remarked:

The starting point when selecting vocabulary and structures is their communicative value, frequency, appropriateness to the topics and different oral and written communication tasks. The range of vocabulary and structures is consistently expanded during the whole senior secondary school. (The National Board of Education 1994:72-73.)

However, the FC of 1994 does not specify which grammatical structures students should learn during each course in senior secondary school. Thus, the
school’s specification of grammatical structures that should be taught in each course seems to be the school’s own product.

Language skills emphasised

Table 9 displays the comparison of the language skills emphasised in the FC of 1994 and case school’s own curricula. The bold font demonstrates the item that is found in the SBEC of 1994/1998 only:

Table 9. Language skills emphasised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>- oral practice is emphasised</td>
<td>- oral practice is emphasised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>- students practise spoken communication</td>
<td>- students continue practising oral communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- written communication is practised</td>
<td>- students start to practise written communication, too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>- students practise fairly demanding spoken and written communication</td>
<td>- students move on to practising more demanding oral and written communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>- the course focuses on fairly demanding communication</td>
<td>- students continue practising demanding oral and written communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- special attention is paid to reading comprehension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>- students examine demanding texts about the topics mentioned above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>- students concentrate on self-directed oral and written work</td>
<td>- students concentrate on self-directed oral and written work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The curriculum documents list the language skills that should be emphasised during each course, and they are almost the same, although they are described with different words in some cases. Exactly the same expressions are used in courses 1 and 6. The content of courses 2 and 3 is nearly the same in this category. Reading comprehension is mentioned in course 4 of the FC of 1994, but not in the SBEC of 1994/1998. In course 5 of the SBEC of 1994/1998 it is
remarked that *students examine demanding texts about the topics mentioned above*; this is not stated in the FC of 1994.

Learning tasks and other items

Not many learning tasks are named in the documents. The FC of 1994 describes learning tasks in three courses as follows: *the course is suitable for short oral presentations* in course 2, *construction of summaries* in course 4, and *projects in course 6*. The SBEC of 1994/1998 does not mention any of these. Instead, a different learning task is introduced in course 6: *students read a book in English*. On the whole, it seems that the learning tasks are not considered to be an important part of the curriculum documents. Perhaps the purpose is to allow teachers to choose appropriate learning tasks from other sources.

The category *other items* includes two items in the FC of 1994 and the SBEC of 1994/1998. The first one in course 1 is the same in these documents: *the course provides a transition to senior secondary school*. The second one in course 6 is not the same. In the FC of 1994 it runs: *the subject matter and types of activity are chosen according to students' interests and preferences*. In the case school's curricula, the remark that course 6 is a portfolio course is mentioned only in 1998.

Optional specialised and applied courses

The FC of 1994 (the National Board of Education 1994:23) states in the general section that schools have to offer the number of specialised courses in each subject that is specified in the time allocation. The schools' curricula may, on the other hand, include more specialised courses than is recommended in the national allocation of hours. The time allocation defines that an A1-language has six compulsory courses and a minimum of two optional specialised courses. Thus, courses 7 and 8 of the SBEC of 1994/1998 are optional specialised courses.

The FC of 1994 does not give any detailed descriptions of other courses than the first six ones. There is only a short passage on specialised courses:
The focus in the courses is on the practice of oral language skills and on the reading and production of a variety of texts. The topics may include, for example, nature, environmental conservation, technology and trade, international co-operation, topical events, and different world views. (The National Board of Education 1994:75.)

As we can see, the FC of 1994 only suggests possible topics and language skills to practise.

The course topics in the SBEC of 1994/1998 clearly follow the framework curriculum’s instructions. Course 7 is entitled Changing world and the topics are said to include the environment and sustainable development. Course 8 is titled Expanding world view and it is said that during the course students become familiar with international co-operation and they consider current issues from a European and global points of view. (See Table 1.)

In category 4, language skills emphasised, the course descriptions of the SBEC of 1994/1998 follow the instructions of the FC of 1994 quite closely. Course 7 emphasises listening and reading comprehension, and during course 8 students concentrate on producing and processing different kinds of texts with various methods, and practise listening comprehension (see Table 4). The items of courses 7 and 8 in other categories are the school’s own products.

About optional applied courses the FC of 1994 (the National Board of Education 1994:23) states that in addition to compulsory and specialised courses, schools may offer locally planned applied courses that serve the educational and instructional objectives of senior secondary school. Course 9 in the SBEC of 1994/1998 and courses 10-12 in the 1998 curriculum are school-based applied courses. They are the school’s own products of interpreting its possibilities in planning a school-based English language curriculum.

Summary of the framework curriculum comparison

The case school’s English A1-language curricula include many details that are exactly the same as in the FC of 1994, but some appear to be the school’s own products, too. The most striking similarities in the FC of 1994 and in the SBEC of 1994/1998 are in categories 1, topics, and 4, language skills emphasised. In category 1, the titles of the courses are nearly identical, except for course 2. The
language skills emphasised are the same in courses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6. The other similarities in the documents are the objective in course 1, apart from the one clause added in the SBEC of 1994/1998, and the first entry in category 6, other items. Thus, it seems that these items in the SBEC of 1994/1998 are probably taken from the FC of 1994.

The components that are found only in the SBEC of 1994/1998 but not in the FC of 1994 are the specification of grammatical structures that should be taught in each course, the applied course 9 of the SBEC of 1994/1998, and courses 10-12 in the SBEC of 1998. The other details in the SBEC of 1994/1998 that are different from the ones in the FC of 1994 are the following: the title of course 2, the description of topics of courses 2 and 3, the objective of course 4, the added clause in the objective of course 1, the language skill emphasised in course 5, the learning tasks in course 6, and the remark that course 6 is a portfolio course in the SBEC of 1998. The existence of these items in the case school’s curriculum cannot be explained by the FC of 1994.

6.4.2 Other factors

In addition to the MEC of 1987 and the FC of 1994, there are other factors that may have affected the case school’s curricula. Based on the literature examined, an overall picture of the factors that seem to have influenced the school-based curriculum has been formed. This section presents these factors.

The law for senior secondary school is the legal basis for the curriculum. A new law came into force in the beginning of 1999, but during the time the curricula under study were written the law for senior secondary school from 1983 was valid. That law stated that the government decides the time allocation of senior secondary schools and accepts the general plan of language teaching including its qualitative and quantitative objectives. It also said that there has to be an accepted curriculum for senior secondary school, but it did not say by whom it had to be accepted. The law required that the National Board of Education published the framework curriculum defining the national objectives and contents of teaching, general grounds for student evaluation, and the
certificate formats. The law defined what subjects had to be included in the curriculum, but it did not give any details of the contents or objectives of different subjects; it gave the schools free hands for planning the details of their curricula.

Language teaching development projects (see section 3.1), such as Kimmoke, Lingua, and Comenius projects, have introduced some new ideas to foreign language teaching in Finland. For example, one of the aims of the Kimmoke project is to increase the teaching of oral language skills. However, it is difficult to tell which changes in the curriculum documents have been caused directly by the development projects, but they certainly do affect teaching.

Another factor which affects the contents of teaching at senior secondary school is the matriculation examination. Finnish senior secondary school has been described as a “powerful institution which is controlled by the matriculation examination” (Syrjäläinen 1995b:74). Therefore, it could be assumed that this control would also stretch over the foreign language curriculum. However, it is very difficult to define any clear relationship of influence between the matriculation examination and the English curriculum. According to Kaija Kärkkäinen (personal communication, October 1998) the matriculation examination is based, on the one hand, on the requirements stated in the framework curriculum and, on the other hand, on the experience and knowledge of the persons who draft the exams; they know what the students can be expected to know after having completed the senior secondary school syllabus. There are no written documents with exact information of what the senior secondary school syllabus should include. Furthermore, since 1994 the foreign A1-language matriculation examination has been based on the syllabus of eight courses, although only six courses are compulsory for students (the National Board of Education 1994:24).

Text books and other teaching materials are an essential part of teaching. Do they actually influence the curriculum document itself? Svingby (1985 as quoted by Aţonen 1990:37) says that the teaching material has a central role in teaching, because it is the channel for delivering the content of teaching to students. The teaching material also influences the way in which the teacher presents the contents of teaching. Text books especially have dominated teaching
methods. In addition, it is generally known that when planning teaching, teachers tend to use text books instead of a curriculum document. Atjonen (1990:37) points out that the text books should not be the curriculum, because subject-specifically designed text books do not emphasise the overall aims of general education and do not encourage integration of teaching. Text books as such are very useful, but the problem is the way they are being used. However, the school-based curriculum may change the situation, because teachers themselves plan the curriculum.

The case school has used three different book series during the time which the study covers; Wings (Helsinki:Otava) was used in the 1980s and in the beginning of the 1990s, Passwords (Porvoo:WSOY) was in use from 1992 to 1996, and from 1996 until the present, the school has used English Update (Porvoo:WSOY) as the main material for teaching English. All books available from all the three book series have been scanned to see to what extent the course descriptions in the books match with the course descriptions in the three curriculum documents. The Wings series covers courses 1-7, Passwords covers courses 1-8, and English Update courses 1-6. The topics in all three book series are in many ways similar to those in the curriculum documents. However, a new topic the American way of life appears for the first time in the 1994 curriculum in course 2; the 1987 version does not mention this particular topic in course 2. This addition might have its origin in the Password book series which was in use at the case school when the first school-based curriculum was designed. English Update - which has been used since 1996 - also has this theme in its description for course 2. None of the other individual solutions in the case school’s English A1-language curriculum can be explained by comparison with the text books.

Since curriculum planning is done in schools, the experience and work plans of teachers and principals probably affect the contents of the schools’ curriculum documents. Apajalahti (1994:11) notes that participating in the curriculum writing process is a step towards a change in the teacher’s role. Today, the emphasis in teachers’ work is no longer on executing plans made by other people, but in planning the teaching and learning processes using their own professional expertise and experience.
The idea of language and language learning affects the choice of language teaching methodology, which in its turn may affect the contents of the curriculum documents as well as the choice of teaching materials. On the other hand, teaching material may determine the curriculum contents and the teaching methodology. By studying curriculum documents, it is difficult to see whether the curriculum planners have consciously followed a certain idea of language and language learning, and to what extent, if at all, the choice of methodology has influenced the curriculum document. However, the idea of language and language learning is likely to be one of the factors guiding curriculum planning.

It could be assumed that students’ needs are central factors to be considered in curriculum planning. Nonetheless, Brooker and MacDonald (1999:83) claim that students’ involvement in curriculum planning has been marginalised. If students are consulted, it usually happens in the pilot stage of the curriculum development. Learner involvement in curriculum decisions is usually limited to selecting a course of studies (Lewy 1991:77). In Apajalahti’s (1994:12) opinion, the school has to serve not just the society’s needs, but also students’ own needs. Therefore, students should be involved in curriculum planning through, for example, the students’ union.

6.4.3 Summary

So far the present study has shown the differences and similarities between the municipal English A1-language curriculum of 1987 and the case school’s English A1-language curricula of 1994 and 1998. The latter two curricula have also been compared to the framework curriculum of 1994 in order to reveal the similarities in these documents. Other factors that could have possibly affected the school curricula of 1994 and 1998 have also been examined. However, these procedures left some questions unanswered. These questions concern mainly the persons involved in the planning process and their contribution to the curriculum documents. Furthermore, the case school has included some items in their English A1-language curriculum which could not be explained by any written sources available. These case school’s own products are summarised in Table 10:
Table 10. The case school’s own products in the school-based English A1-language curriculum.

| Category 1: Topics                  | • course 2: Meeting people; the course introduces the American way of life  
|                                    | • course 3: topics focus on presenting different jobs and applying for a job  
|                                    | • course 7: Changing world; topics include the environment and sustainable development  
|                                    | • course 8: Expanding world view; students become familiar with international co-operation and they consider current issues from a European and global points of view  
|                                    | • course 9: School-based applied course  
|                                    | • course 10 in 1998 only: School-based applied course  
|                                    | • course 11 in 1998 only: School-based applied course  
| Category 2: Objectives             | • course 1: students learn different language learning strategies  
|                                    | • course 4: the course encourages students to become active members of society  
| Category 3: Grammatical structures | • course 1: tenses, word order, and tag questions are reviewed  
|                                    | • course 2: the course deals with nouns, adjectives, ordinals, and indirect speech  
|                                    | • course 3: main issues are passive, pronouns, and formal subject, idioms are practised  
|                                    | • course 4: grammar focuses on modal auxiliaries, relative clauses, and the use of articles  
|                                    | • course 5: main issues are infinitive and progressive tense (the -ing clause)  
|                                    | • course 6: emphasis is on syntax and the style of writing  
|                                    | • course 7: main issues of grammar are reviewed, structures are practised  
|                                    | • course 8: structures are practised  
| Category 4: Language skills emphasised | • course 5: students examine demanding texts about the topics mentioned above  
|                                    | • course 7: listening and reading comprehension is practised  
|                                    | • course 8: students concentrate on producing and handling different kind of texts with various methods; listening comprehension is practised  
|                                    | • course 11 in 1998 only: an English discussion course  
|                                    | • course 12 in 1998 only: an English discussion course with a native English language teacher  
| Category 5: Learning tasks         | • course 6: students read a book in English  
|                                    | • course 7: students write essays at home and at school  
| Category 6: Other items            | • course 6 in 1998 only: a portfolio course  
|                                    | • course 9: a remedial course, where the basic material of courses 1 and 2 is reviewed  
|                                    | • course 10 in 1998 only: a revision course preparing students for the matriculation exam  

As we can see, the case school has introduced several entries of its own to the curriculum documents. These entries include, for example, the grammatical structures in the course descriptions and the contents of the optional specialised and applied courses 7-12. However, unlike the MEC of 1987, there are no general sections in the curricula. The local topics have been omitted, too. Additionally, the case school has not documented many learning tasks in its curricula.

The next phase in this study is to examine how the school has come to these solutions and what role the various factors have played in planning the English A1-language curriculum. This is made by interviewing the persons involved in planning the curriculum.
7 INTERVIEWS

7.1 Interview schedule

As Cohen and Manion (1985:292-293) point out, the interview has three different purposes: 1) to gather information which has direct bearing on the research objectives, 2) to test hypotheses or to suggest new ones; or as an explanatory device to help identify variables and relationships, and 3) to be used together with other methods during a research process. In the present study, the purpose of the interviews was to acquire further explanations for the relationships between the changes in the curriculum documents and the factors which might have caused these changes.

Seliger and Shohamy (1989:167) divide interviews into three types by the degree of explicitness and structure. Open interviews are usually informal and only controlled by a topic which allows the interviewee a great deal of freedom of expression. Semi-open interviews have a set of core questions which have been determined in advance and which are used as a starting point for related, in-depth questions. This method allows some flexibility but within limits. The third type of interview is the structured one. A structured interview has a predetermined list of questions which are presented to the interviewee. The structured interview is usually used when “uniform and specific information is needed and when it is necessary to interview a large number of subjects”.

The interview schedule was drafted primarily on the basis of the document analysis and the comparison between the school-based English A1-language curricula of 1994 and 1998 and the framework curriculum of 1994. Other sources of information, such as the previous studies, also influenced the selection of items for the interview schedule. The main purpose of the interview was to find out the reasons for those changes in the curriculum document which could not be directly explained by the framework curriculum or text books. These changes reflected the school’s own contribution to the curriculum and would be best explained by people who had planned the documents.
Interview questions

In the present study, a structured interview schedule was used. As specific changes and specific individual solutions in the English A1-language curricula were found, a structured interview was considered to be the most effective way of acquiring the interviewees’ explanations for these specific changes and solutions. Subsequently, the interview schedule was divided into the following groups: 1) the interviewees’ background, 2) persons and parties involved in designing the English A1-language curricula, 3) factors influencing the curricula, and 4) changes in the curricula. In construction of the interview schedule both open-ended items (items which provide only a frame for the answers with minimum restraints) and scale items (items which interviewees had to grade) were used (see Cohen and Manion 1985:296-297). The question items in groups 1, 2, and 4 were open-ended. The questions in group 3 were treated partly as scale items and partly as open-ended items.

The purpose of the ten questions in the first group was to gather information about the length of the interviewees’ teaching careers and their involvement in designing the English curricula. The group consisted of the following questions (translated from Finnish, see Appendix 4):

1. How long have you been working as an English teacher/ principal/ assistant principal?
2. Did your school have a chance to influence the planning of the municipal English language curriculum of 1987? If so, in what way?
3. Were you personally involved in planning the municipal curriculum?
4. What kind of a meaning has the transition from the municipal curriculum into the school- based curriculum had for you?
5. In your opinion, what are the underlying reasons for this transition?
6. Have you personally been active in school-based curriculum planning?
7. Have all the English teachers at your school participated in planning the school-based English language curriculum?
8. In your opinion, have you received enough support/ tutoring/ training for curriculum planning?
9. How often does your school update the English language curriculum?
10. In your opinion, what is the purpose of the English language curriculum in senior secondary school?

The purpose of the questions in group 2 was, first of all, to investigate whether all the persons directly involved in designing the English language curriculum were included in the interview schedule. Secondly, the aim was to
find out in what way the different persons and parties had contributed to planning the English curriculum, if they had done so. The list included the following ten items:

1. Principal
2. Assistant principal
3. English teachers
4. Other members of the staff
5. Students
6. Parents
7. School Board
8. Municipality
9. Other educational establishments, which ones?
10. Other persons/parties, which ones?

The questions in group 3 were intended to get an overall view from the interviewees about the importance of different factors in planning the school-based English language curriculum. These questions were formulated as scale-items and were handed to the interviewees on a piece of paper. The interviewees were asked to estimate on a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent the following ten factors had influenced the planning of the school-based English language curriculum. An open-ended question was included at the end of the list for unanticipated factors. The scale and the factors listed were as follows:

Scale: 
1 = not at all
2 = little
3 = to some extent
4 = quite a lot
5 = very much

Factors: 
1. The law for senior secondary school
2. The framework curriculum of 1994
3. The municipal English language curriculum of 1987
4. Different language teaching development plans and projects
5. The matriculation exam
6. Textbooks/Other teaching material
7. Teachers’ own experience/own ideas
8. Work plans
9. The idea of language and language learning/The methodology
10. Students’ needs
11. Other possible factors, which?

Factor number 8, work plans, refers to teachers’ own plans on the practical details of teaching procedures. After the interviewee had filled in the
form, additional questions were asked to find out in what way each of the factors had influenced the English curricula.

The 18 questions in group 4 were based on the document analysis and were asked in order to find out the interviewees’ explanations for the factors behind the changes and the case school’s own products in the English language curriculum:

1. In your opinion, what might explain the considerable ‘shrinking’ of the English language curriculum?
2. What is your impression about the fact that your school’s English language curriculum has no general section which would specify, for example, the subject-specific objectives?
3. In your school’s English language curriculum the topics of each course have been described in the form of titles. What might be the reason for this solution?
4. Why do you think that the local topic has been excluded from the school-based English language curriculum?
5. What is the origin for the topic in course 2, “the American way of life”?
6. What is the source for the topics in optional specialised courses and in school-based, optional applied courses?
7. In your opinion, what might be the reason that only a few course-specific objectives have been documented in the school-based English language curriculum?
8. From where does the objective in course 4 originate: “to encourage students to become active members of the society”?
9. In your opinion, why has your school decided that it is important to mention, in the curriculum, the grammatical structures in each of the courses?
10. In what way have the specific grammatical structures been chosen for each course?
11. Have the learning activities been documented somewhere else than in the English language curriculum?
12. Course 6 has been transformed into a portfolio course. What factor might explain this solution?
13. Course 3 has been changed into an oral course. Why has this not been documented in the curriculum?
14. Your English curriculum does not mention anything about integration between the subjects. Does integration take place in practice?
15. In what way does your school’s set of values influence the English language curriculum?
16. Do all the English teachers have a common idea of language teaching and learning or does every teacher have her own? (What is your own idea about this?)
17. Does your school make regular surveys among the teachers and interest groups about how one should develop the English language curriculum?
18. What might be the reason for the fact that your school has made very few changes in the English language curriculum between 1994 and 1998?

Pilot study

The purpose of the pilot study was to test both the interviewing skills of the researchers and the interview schedule in practice. The pilot interview was
conducted at the case school. The interviewee was one of the school’s English
teachers. She had started her work in the case school in autumn 1998 but her
teaching career was over 20 years long. She had participated in school-based
curriculum planning in her previous workplace.

The interview was recorded on tape and a summary of the answers was
constructed. The pilot study showed that the interview schedule was sufficient for
a one-hour interview and that the interviewing technique was suitable for
conducting a structured interview. Furthermore, the interview questions seemed
to work well in practice. Thus, only minor adjustments were made to the
interview schedule. These adjustments concerned mainly the questions in group
4, the detailed questions about the changes in the English curriculum. These
questions were partly reformulated and some new questions were added to the
schedule.

The pilot interview confirmed the fact that the school participated in the
Kimmoke project and was involved in an experiment called development of
evaluation in oral language teaching. Course 3 had been turned into an oral skills
course. However, as this change was in no way visible in the school’s English
language curriculum a question concerning this issue was added into the
interview schedule (see above: group 4, question 13).

About the interviews

All three interviews were carried out in November 1998 and the location was the
teachers’ office at the case school. Each interview took approximately one hour,
the first one with Teacher A being the shortest and the last one with the Principal
being the longest. All interviews were recorded with a DAT-recorder, re-recorded
on a C-cassette, and then transcribed verbatim. The transcriptions of the three
interviews were processed through a content analysis.

As Krippendorff (1980:52) points out, data in content analysis are usually
very complex and unstructured. Therefore, the objects of interest in the data have
to be distinguished and segmented for analysis (unitising). If there is an
unmanageable number of units one might have to take a smaller portion from all
possible units (sampling). Each unit must then be coded and described in analysable forms (recording).

Miles and Huberman (1984:21-22) present a slightly different way of analysing qualitative data. The three stages he refers to are 1) data reduction, 2) data display, and 3) conclusion drawing/verification. Data reduction can be done not just by quantification, but also by selection or through summary or paraphrase. Data display can be done as a narrative text.

In the present study, the unitising of the answers was done already when the questions were formulated for the interview schedule. The sampling of the answers was done by reducing the transcription material into core answers which were then categorised to respective questions. In this way the answers could be compared with each other. All three interviewees’ scale-item answers for the questions in group 3 were collected into a table (see Table 11 in section 7.5). The interviews will be first described in detail in the following section in the same order as they were carried out after which a summarising analysis is given. In these descriptions the case school’s school-based English A1-language curriculum is referred to as the SBEC. The quotations of the interviews used in the text have been translated from Finnish into English.

7.2 English Teacher A

Professional background

Teacher A started her teaching career in 1993, and in the case school she had worked since 1995. Subsequently, she was not involved in municipal curriculum planning. In her previous workplace from 1993 to 1995 she was more like a spectator when the first school-based curriculum was designed. As a new teacher she was not expected to take an active role in curriculum design. When she started her work at the case school in 1995, the SBEC had already been written. She had no knowledge of whether all the English teachers had been actively involved in designing the SBEC. When asked if all the English teachers were involved in updating the SBEC she replied:
“Well, every teacher has a possibility to make suggestions about things that should be included in the curriculum but unfortunately we don’t really all get together to discuss the curriculum.”

As far as Teacher A remembered, the only time that the SBEC had been updated while she had been working at the case school had been in the spring of 1998. In her opinion, the purpose of the English language curriculum in senior secondary school was to emphasise other things than the ones listed in the text books’ lists of contents. She said:

“It would be good if the curriculum contained general guidelines about what is done outside the text books’ lists of contents. Unfortunately, we don’t have much co-operation between the English teachers here.”

Persons and parties involved in curriculum planning

Teacher A answered these questions based on her present day knowledge of the involvement of different persons and parties in the updating of the SBEC. In her opinion, the Principal did not have a lot to do with the curricula of different subjects. Instead, the Principal was mainly in charge of the general part of the case school’s curriculum. The assistant principal had a very important role, because she was also an English teacher. The other English teachers participated to a varying degree. She had no knowledge of any other persons’ or parties’ involvement in designing the SBEC, but she suspected that students and their parents were somehow involved in it. She said:

“There has been some co-operation with students and their parents concerning the general section. But what comes to the subject-specific curricula, I would imagine that they didn’t have anything to do with it, I don’t know for sure.”

The influence of different factors on the English A1-language curricula

Teacher A hesitated in filling in the form because she felt it was too difficult for her as she had not participated in the planning or updating of the SBEC. Finally
she agreed to fill it in according to what she would consider important if she
planned the curriculum (see Table 11 in section 7.5).

In Teacher A’s opinion, the teacher’s own experience, second language
teaching methodology and the idea of language, and the students’ needs might
influence the English language curriculum very much. However, she admitted
that:

“Quite frankly, what there is and what there isn’t does not make very
much difference to my own work and probably many other teachers
think in the same way.”

Different language teaching development projects, the matriculation
exam, and the books and other teaching material would have quite a lot of
influence on the English language curriculum. Teacher A considered the teachers’
own work plans to have influence to some extent. In her view, the matriculation
examination limited the possibilities of what one could do with the students’
English knowledge. She opposed the matriculation examination but felt that in
this particular school the importance of the examination was so great that it left
very little freedom. She added:

“Students and their parents as well as other teachers think that the
matriculation examination is very important. Some other schools don’t
emphasise it this much, and they have more freedom there.”

With only little influence Teacher A marked the law, the framework
her opinion, these documents did not contain anything essential which she would
have included in the school-based English language curriculum.

Explanations for the changes in the English A1-language curricula¹

Teacher A commented on the shrinking of the SBEC by saying that the municipal
curriculum was experienced as a very restrictive, almost enslaving document. She

¹ For the Finnish transcript of section 4, see Appendix 5.
suspected that a less restrictive SBEC gave teachers more space and freedom to choose what to do. She did not know why the SBEC had no general section.

Teacher A suspected that the reason for giving the course topics in the SBEC only in the form of titles could be that they did not want to limit the wide range of issues which could be dealt with under such titles. When asked why the local topic had been excluded from the SBEC she replied that it was still covered in practice to some extent in course 3, when Finland was presented in the teaching material. Maybe there were more local topics in comprehensive school and they did not want to repeat it too much. The reason for introducing the topic *the American way of life* in the SBEC might have been that at least the present text book concentrated especially on this topic in course 2. She suspected that the topics for the specialised and applied courses 7 - 12 were based on the books, at least in courses 7 and 8.

The course objectives were not explicitly mentioned in the SBEC. Teacher A explained:

"There is a course guide booklet for the students, and I think that these objectives are more specifically listed in that booklet. Anyway, the objectives are discussed with students at the beginning of each course."

The objective of course 4, *to encourage students to become active members of society*, was probably based on the topics and themes of the book. Course 4 was about politics, social issues, and family issues so it fitted well together with the themes.

Teacher A suggested that the reason for listing grammatical structures in each course in the SBEC was the fact that students changed from one teacher to another in non-graded senior secondary school. Therefore, it was maybe useful for the teachers to divide the structures into particular courses in order to avoid too much repetition and to make sure that everything was covered. The division of grammatical structures between courses followed the text books’ order for presenting grammatical structures.

Teacher A thought that the reason for excluding the learning tasks from the SBEC might be that the text books were used as the main source for learning tasks. Other material was used as well, but every teacher had her own preferences
concerning learning tasks. At this point she brought up the lack of co-operation again and remarked:

"Especially the younger generation is willing to co-operate more, but the older teachers are used to and want to work alone. On the other hand, the fact that we now have such a vague curriculum enables us to work independently and make our own decisions; nobody can come and say that this is what your curriculum says, why are you doing it differently."

The origin of the description of course 6 as a portfolio course was perhaps that it was an experiment. The teachers had also received portfolio training. She thought that having course 6 as a portfolio course might only be a temporary experiment. She pointed out:

"One of the few things that I was specifically advised upon was that course 6 had to be a portfolio course. . . . Now we have talked about this course that it is not necessarily a good idea, it is not working the way it should be, so maybe we are going to drop it at some point."

Teacher A was not able to explain why it had not been written in SBEC that course 3 was an oral course. She suspected that it might be mentioned in the students’ course guide. This, too, was possibly a temporary experiment (a product of the Kimmoke-project) due to the lack of resources. It had not received unreserved support from the other subjects teachers who thought that this experiment consumed the already scarce common resources. However, students were very pleased with this course. The smaller teaching groups made it easier for the teachers to get to know their students and to evaluate their performance. She expressed the view that:

"Maybe it is due to this temporary nature of this experiment that it has not been documented in the curriculum. On the other hand, you can make changes into the curriculum all the time, so why not write down these temporary experiments, too."

The SBEC did not say anything about integration. Teacher A’s comment on this was that non-graded senior secondary school made integration very difficult. The students were mixed into different groups all the time. Without any steady groups integration was virtually impossible. However, they had tried to
carry out little experiments in practice. Furthermore, the underlying set of values of the school were not visible in the SBEC. In her opinion, it was because one of the values, internationalisation, was self-evident in teaching English and that it was covered automatically. That was why there was no need to document it separately in the SBEC. She added:

“It is a pity if people think that every subject is a separate item. The general objectives and other ideas should be shown somehow in the curricula of subjects, otherwise it is a bit pointless if these things are listed somewhere but they are not used in practice.”

Teacher A was asked whether the English teachers had a common concept for teaching English. She felt that the generation gap was visible here. Older teachers did not want to talk about teaching during the breaks. Younger teachers talked about teaching, they compared methods and ideas, and exchanged material. Older teachers stuck to their own teaching routines. Teacher A was also asked whether any surveys were made among teachers and other interest groups about the development of the SBEC, and she said that every year it had been discussed that any possible changes would be documented. In most cases the teachers thought that “if there are no changes let it stay the way it is”. The every-day teaching in practice was more important than keeping documents up-to-date. In her opinion, this was perhaps the reason why there had not been many changes in the SBEC between 1994 and 1998.

7.3 English Teacher B

Professional background

Teacher B had been teaching in the case school for 33 years. She was one of those English teachers who had designed the municipal English language curriculum for senior secondary schools in this municipality in 1987. She also participated in planning the school-based curriculum, and according to her, all the other English teachers were actively involved as well. She pointed out that they had not received any training for curriculum planning. When asked how often the English
language curriculum was updated, she laughed and said: “Not often enough!
Many years passed before we updated it last spring. The intention is to update the
whole curriculum every year.” In her opinion, the transition from central
curriculum planning into school-based planning was a fruitful possibility for the
whole work community. She stated:

“We started by discussing the set of values of the school-based
curriculum, our educational idea, and the major points of emphasis. The
whole staff was intensively involved in these discussions, and I found it
a good way of getting to know all colleagues in a new context.”

She explained that the reason for this transition at the time was that the new chief
of the National Board of Education wanted to dissolve all norms in educational
planning and give more freedom to schools. For her the purpose of the English
language curriculum was to direct teachers to achieve the objectives of teaching
English.

Persons and parties involved in curriculum planning

According to Teacher B, the Principal did not participate in planning the SBEC.
All planning was done by the English teachers as a team. The municipality’s role
was just to give the final approval for the finished curriculum document. None of
the other persons or parties mentioned in the interview (other staff members,
students, parents, the municipality, etc.) participated in planning the SBEC.
However, as she pointed out:

“Both students and parents took part in a discussion on the set of
values, and when we wanted to get their opinion on whether our school
should specialise in something like IT or arts, we sent an extensive
questionnaire to them, but their opinions on subjects’ curricula were not
asked.”

She added that in the case of optional applied courses the teacher of each course
could decide over the topic and contents of the course. She also emphasised that
there were contacts between some vocational colleges and senior secondary
schools so that students could take some courses at other schools as well.
However, these arrangements did not influence the schools’ curricula in any way.
The influence of different factors on the English A1-language curricula

When filling in the form, Teacher B listed the following factors as having very much influence on the planning of the SBEC: the framework curriculum of 1994, the matriculation exam, the books and other teaching material, and teachers' personal work plans (see Table 11 in section 7.5). In her opinion, the framework curriculum of 1994 gave the structure for planning the SBEC and the number of compulsory courses and their topics. The matriculation examination influenced everything in senior secondary school but it became especially visible in the optional applied courses in which students were prepared for the examination by going through examinations from previous years. She pointed out the importance of the text books by saying:

"We have so good teaching material in English, it follows so well the national curriculum. All the objectives have been divided to courses very well; it is very important."

Such factors as the law, different language teaching development projects, teachers' own experience, and international projects like Comenius and Lingua Teacher B considered to have quite a lot of influence. She said that the law gave the frame for the curriculum. As an example of the influence of different language teaching development projects on the practical level she gave the Kimmoke-project, which had enabled them to have 50 per cent smaller teaching groups in course 3 in order to practise oral language skills. This procedure had not been written down in the SBEC. The teacher's own experience did not become visible in the curriculum document either. She said:

"There is a meeting at the beginning of each school year in which we decide on our common practices for examinations and evaluation. I suspect we have written down very little in the curriculum document. We should give more detailed instructions on, for example, evaluation in the document, maybe our curriculum is a bit too vague."

The international projects influenced the practical level, not the actual document. In the Comenius-project, for example, students interviewed their parents or grandparents about their education and wrote an essay about this in English.
On having influenced the planning of the SBEC to some extent, Teacher B marked the municipal English language curriculum of 1987, the language teaching methodology, and students' needs. At first she marked the municipal English language curriculum as having quite a lot of influence but changed it when asked what kind of influence it had had. She did not specify this clearly, instead she admitted that it is not as important as the framework curriculum of 1994. The language teaching methodology had little influence on the SBEC. Teacher B argued:

“We have all been in the teaching profession for such a long time, that we have not received much training in methodology. Last year we teachers took a course within the Kimmoke project and this course dealt partly with methodology, but I found it rather theoretical.”

The teachers participated regularly in pedagogical meetings arranged by the municipal board of education and there was also training for the Kimmoke-project but the ideas that rubbed off from these courses were employed in everyday teaching procedures but not documented in the curriculum. Students' needs received very little attention in planning the SBEC. She said:

“I don't know how much we ask students about their needs... Maybe so that in this modern teaching material students have a lot of possibilities in choosing according to their own interests.”

Usually the teacher also asked at the beginning of each course whether students wanted to have a test on vocabulary after each unit.

Explanations for the changes in the English A1-language curricula²

Teacher B claimed that the reason for the 'shrinking' of the English language curriculum between 1987 and 1994/1998 could be explained partly by the fact that B1-English had been excluded from the teaching programme. She suspected that another reason might be the fear of documenting too much. She thought that

---
² For the Finnish transcript of section 4, see Appendix 6.
the agreements between colleagues were more important, and these agreements were not documented. She also added:

“This does not mean that our English teaching would not develop all the time and that it would not be up-to-date. The things documented in our curriculum do not imply that our teaching routines would have remained the same.”

In Teacher B’s opinion, the fact that English was a compulsory language was the main reason for leaving out the general part of the English language curriculum where, for example, the general objectives for teaching English were stated. Therefore, there was no need for a similar marketing section in the curriculum as the optional B2 and B3 languages had. She suspected that - in this respect - they had followed the example of the Swedish language curriculum at their school.

When asked why the topics of the courses in virtually all of the cases were described only in the form of a title Teacher B replied: “I presume it has not been clear for us for whom we are writing this curriculum. For whom should they be more explicit, then?” She added that they wanted to leave as free hands as possible for the teachers. Students did not read the curriculum; for them there was a special course guide with a short summary of each course.

The municipal curriculum mentioned a local topic in the first six courses but this had been left out in the SBEC because it came automatically in the teaching material when Finland was being presented. The teaching material explained the addition of the topic the American way of life in course 3, too. According to Teacher B, the topics for the optional specialised courses (courses 7 and 8) came from the teaching material. The topics for the optional applied courses were decided by the English teachers. When asked why the specific course objectives had been left out in most parts of SBEC she said:

“They must have been there in detail earlier, such as the structures to be practised and so on. Students do not read this curriculum; for whom would we document the objectives there?”
In course 4 there was an objective to encourage students to become active members of society. In her opinion this, too, could be traced directly to the topic of the course.

According to Teacher B, the grammatical structures had been listed in the curriculum document to advise the teachers about which structures were taught in each course. She also suspected that they might have followed the example of some of the other languages, and that the intention had been to make it as thorough a presentation as possible. The grammatical structures mentioned in each course in the curriculum document were based on the teaching material.

In Teacher B’s opinion, the learning tasks had been left out - unintentionally - from the document, but she was quite certain that, if asked, each teacher would add a long list of different learning tasks into the curriculum from their own work plans. She commented: “I think that because of the Kimmoke project, every teacher would add some tasks on oral skills into the curriculum.” The reason for turning course 6 into a portfolio course was to give students free hands to choose the material for their portfolios, especially because the course topic was culture. She added that the aim of the course was to practise students’ skills in self evaluation and to encourage students to read a wider range of English texts and also a whole book.

When asked why it did not show in the SBEC that course 3 had been transformed into an oral language skills course, Teacher B admitted that it was simply forgotten when the curriculum was updated in May 1998. Furthermore, it was only the second year for this experiment; the course was carried out for the first time during the spring term 1998.

In the municipal English language curriculum of 1987 a possibility for integration was mentioned in course 7. This was left out in the SBEC because, as Teacher B speculated: “There are no profound integration plans in our school, probably due to the school’s big size”. Integration was done primarily during the portfolio course, during which students could seek professional assistance from teachers of other subjects depending on their field of portfolio topics. Four of the case school’s teachers had taken a course in content and language integrated
learning, and therefore every year at least one course (other than an English course) was given in English.

Teacher B explained her opinion on how the school's individual set of values was shown in the English curriculum by saying:

“Our educational idea is from the national to the international. There have not been any motivation problems in teaching English; every modern young person realises that to be able to cope in the modern international world he/she needs English.”

When asked if the school's English teachers shared a common methodological conception of language teaching and learning she said that that was impossible. Most of the teachers had been working for at least 20 years, so both time and personal experience must have moulded their views of teaching and learning. In her opinion, the best way for students to learn was to be as active as possible, to engage in writing and speaking. However, she admitted that this was very difficult in a big school like theirs, so sometimes one had to use frontal teaching. Students were sometimes quite conservative when it came to the methods of teaching, especially when grammar was being taught; this meant that a structure was first explained by the teacher and then practised by students. She also thought that the modern teacher was more like a supervisor who gave out tasks and then circled around the classroom as an expert or an adviser. She said: “The more you make them do themselves the better they learn.”

The development of the SBEC relied entirely on the English teachers. The case school did not make any enquiries among the rest of the school staff or other interest groups about how to develop the SBEC. As a reason for not making many changes in the SBEC between 1994 and 1998, Teacher B mentioned the great amount of work at school: they were happy after the original school-based curriculum planning was done in 1994, so it took some time before they were able to start working with the development of the document again.
7.4 The Principal

The intention was to carry out the Principal’s interview in the same way as the teachers’ interviews. However, in the beginning of the interview, the Principal announced that due to his work commitments he was so busy that he would not have time for a long interview and that he would not answer any detailed questions about the English curriculum. Because of this, some of the additional questions in group 3 were grouped together, and all but two questions from group 4 were left out. Therefore, the Principal answered the questions only partially.

Professional background

The interviewee had worked as a principal for 25 years and in the case school he had worked for 14 years. He reported that the case school participated in planning the municipal curriculum of 1987. Personally, he was involved in the designing of the history curriculum. In his opinion, the transition from a municipal into a school-based curriculum was a great challenge and a possibility to develop the school and the curriculum. As a reason for this transition he gave the dissolving of norms in educational planning. He added that one no longer believed that the development of schools could be maintained by centralised planning and control. The Principal himself was involved in school-based curriculum planning by observing the different subject groups’ work. In his opinion, a principal was not just an administrator but had pedagogical responsibility, too. He claimed that all the English teachers had been involved in designing the English curriculum, but that some had been more active than others. When asked whether the teachers of the case school had received enough training for planning the school-based curriculum he replied:

“The National Board of Education sent a contact person to all aquarium schools, but this person was mainly excusing his existence and probably thought that because the norms had been disassembled they were not supposed to give any guidelines. As far as I can remember this person had a language teacher background so he/she could have given a lot to
our language teaching. But I’m probably not the right person to say what our language teachers benefited from him/her.”

According to the Principal, the school was using the fourth version of the SBEC. The main form of updating the English language curriculum had been to add new courses into it. In his view, the purpose of the English language curriculum was to be the foundation for all teaching and teaching arrangements. However, he added that good teaching material - like English had at the moment - had a remarkable role in how teaching was organised.

Persons and parties involved in curriculum planning

In his opinion, the Principal acted as a general manager in making sure that the persons in charge of the different subjects’ curricula evaluated how their curricula worked, if they were up-to-date, and whether they gave the best learning results. He let the teachers of each subject plan their own curricula autonomously and did not interfere in their work. The assistant principal, being also an English teacher in this school, took care of the updating of the English language curriculum. When asked about the role of the other English teachers in designing the SBEC he did not really answer the question. Instead, he mentioned that there had been a turnover of English teachers in the past few years, and that this had to be kept in mind. Then he continued to talk about the teaching material, which functioned very well in teaching English. He said that there was already a large number of courses in English and therefore no need to create some fancy new ones. The Principal was certain that all the language teachers co-operated, for example, concerning evaluation principles. He said:

“I believe - even if I haven’t seen it written down anywhere - that teachers have tried to unify the general learning criteria for language teaching, like what is expected for an accepted performance and what for top-quality results.”

Students were represented by one member in the curriculum work group. This group consisted of teachers from each subject group and one student who
was there to present the ideas and opinions of students. Students had a possibility to make suggestions about topics for the applied courses. The Principal said:

"Students have probably not comprehended the whole idea of the curriculum; for students the teaching is the same as the books because that is what's concrete for them."

The parents had no part in the subjects' curricula. Their opinion was asked about the general 'rules of play'. For example, it was discussed with the parents to what extent students should be able to complete courses without contact teaching.

The municipal board of education confirmed the school-based curricula. The school had to inform the board every spring if there were going to be any changes in the existing curriculum, after which the board gave its opinion on the necessity of these changes. The Principal had not heard that the board would ever have refused to confirm a change that a school had suggested. Other educational establishments did not have any influence on the SBEC. He mentioned that the case school had close contacts with the department of applied linguistics at the University of Jyväskylä, but did not specify the nature of these contacts or how they affected the SBEC in particular. As an example of the other possible persons or parties who might have an effect on the SBEC, he mentioned the foreign embassies and the British Council and the teacher organisations which probably provided teachers with some teaching material.

The influence of different factors on the English A1-language curricula

In the Principal's opinion, only the matriculation examination had influenced the English curriculum very much (see Table 11 in section 7.5). The examination was a nationwide meter for measuring a student's level of competence. It was also usually the most important aim for students in senior secondary school. He speculated:

"If the matriculation examination was abolished, it would make the teachers job rather interesting, because they could no longer justify anything with the fact it will come up again in the matriculation examination."
The following the Principal listed as having had quite a lot of influence: the framework curriculum of 1994, different language teaching development projects, textbooks and other teaching material, and teachers’ experience. The framework curriculum acted as a starting point for curriculum planning, but since then its importance had decreased. As an example of the influence of different projects he mentioned the Kimmoke-project, which had increased the pressure on emphasising the teaching of oral language skills in the school and because of which the teaching groups in English and Swedish had been split in half in course 3. In his opinion, the whole teaching staff together decided to invest the school’s resources in these arrangements, although it could not be done in any other subjects. He did not specify the influence of textbooks and teachers’ experience.

The following the Principal marked as having had influence to some extent: the law for senior secondary school, the teachers’ work plans, the conception of language and language teaching methodology, and students’ needs. In his opinion, the school was obliged to fulfil the minimum requirements of teaching and therefore the law had to be abided. About students’ needs he explained that the curriculum was designed for the average student level and this design was then applied in planning individual students’ personal curricula, if needed. He did not specify the influence of the other factors.

The municipal English language curriculum of 1987 the Principal estimated to have had little influence on the SBEC. In his opinion, the municipal curriculum did not really mean much to the teachers because it was given from above. He said, jokingly:

“If someone wondered where to hide some money, the best place to put it was between the pages of the municipal curriculum document, because nobody ever used it. However, one has to admit the curriculum was given more substance with the 1994 school-based curriculum planning project.”
Explanations for the changes in the English A1-language curricula

Due to the lack of time only two questions from the group 4 were asked. The first one was question 17. The Principal was asked whether the school made surveys among teachers and other interest groups about how to develop the SBEC. He replied:

“Well, it is essential for a well functioning curriculum that it is regularly scrutinised with parents and students and with all those parties which are connected to the school, like the business world.”

The school also arranged regular meetings with parents and these meetings had been quite popular. He did not specify more clearly what kind of an impact these meetings or scrutinies had had on the SBEC in particular.

The Principal was also asked for his opinion about why there had been so few changes in the English language curriculum between 1994 and 1998. He pointed out that because the English text books were very good it had been easy to maintain the teaching within the frames given by the books. He considered the number of courses in English to be sufficient as well. He added that English already dominated teaching. One of the aims was to increase content and language integrated learning in English. Furthermore, he did not think it would be meaningful to change some expressions in the SBEC and then continue teaching exactly the same way as before. He stated:

“I think it is fair to say that none of the teachers has considered curriculum planning to be so important that significant improvements should be made every year. They probably prefer it simple. . . . We could write anything on a piece of paper, but then ignore it completely in practice.”

---

3 For the Finnish transcript of section 4, see Appendix 7.
7.5 Comparison of the interviews

Professional background of the interviewees

The interviews supported the assumption that all relevant persons were included in the interviews, since the English teachers together planned the SBEC and the Principal was in charge of the whole curriculum planning process. Unfortunately, one English teacher refused to give an interview, but the two other teachers and the Principal participated in the study. All three interviewees had very different professional backgrounds, a fact which most likely affected their answers as well. Teacher A was a 'new generation' teacher with very little experience on the municipal English language curriculum, because she had entered school life just when the transition was in progress. She was not expected to fully participate in planning the school-based curriculum at her previous work place. At the case school she had not acquired an active role in making suggestions for the development of the SBEC even though she appeared to have a lot of ideas about developing it. Teacher B, having had a long career as an English teacher, seemed to be the one person most involved in planning the school’s English curriculum. The Principal, who had worked as a principal for 25 years, proved to be the least involved of the interviewees in planning the English curriculum. His role appeared to be more that of a supervisor and an administrator: he did not interfere directly with the planning of any subject’s curriculum.

Teacher A had no knowledge of the reasons underlying the decentralisation of curriculum planning, and she did not feel that the transition had had any significant impact on her personally. Teacher B claimed that the new chief of the National Board of Education dissolved the norms of educational planning and started the era of school-based curriculum planning. In her opinion, the transition was a positive chance to develop the work community. The Principal confirmed Teacher B’s view about the reason for the transition and said that the transition was a big challenge and an opportunity to develop the school and the curriculum. All three interviewees gave very different interpretations of the purpose of the SBEC. Teacher A explained that the purpose of the SBEC was
not to repeat the list of contents of the text books, but to emphasise other issues. However, she did not define these issues. In Teacher B’s opinion, the SBEC directed teachers to reach the objectives of teaching English. The Principal, in turn, concluded that the purpose of the SBEC was to provide the foundation for all teaching arrangements.

Persons and parties involved in curriculum planning

According to Teacher B, the English teachers wrote the SBEC together as a team. However, both Teacher A and the Principal suggested that not all the teachers were equally active in curriculum planning. The Principal was mostly in charge of the general section of the curriculum, such as deciding on the set of values and so on, and in making sure that each subject group individually produced an acceptable curriculum to be included in the school’s overall curriculum document. Parents were not involved in planning the SBEC; their, as well as the students’, opinions were asked on matters concerning the general section of the school’s curriculum. The Principal mentioned that there was a student representative in the curriculum planning group and this person was able to make suggestions for course topics in the curricula. However, as both of the teachers pointed out, the students had very little say on the contents of the actual English language curriculum document. The role of the municipality was to give approval for the finished curriculum document.

The influence of different factors on the English A1-language curricula

There was some variation between the interviewees’ opinions on the importance of different factors in planning the SBEC. Table 11 shows the interviewees’ scale-items:
Table 11. The scale-items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>The Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The law for senior secondary school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The framework curriculum of 1994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The municipal English language curriculum of 1987</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Different language teaching development plans and projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The matriculation examination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Text books/other teaching material</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers’ own experience/own ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work plans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The idea of language and language learning/the methodology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students’ needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other possible factors, which?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (Comenius, Lingua, Friendship-schools)</td>
<td>4 (Kimmoke-project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scale: 1 = not at all  
2 = little  
3 = to some extent  
4 = quite a lot  
5 = very much

In comparing the answers, it had to be kept in mind that Teacher A did not answer the questions based on her experience, but more from a hypothetical point of view. Teacher A did not consider the official norms, such as law and framework curriculum, to be very important. Instead, she gave more emphasis to students’ needs and the language teaching methodology, as well as teachers’ own experience in planning a curriculum for the English language. According to her, the text books, matriculation examination, and different projects were quite important factors. Teacher B, in turn, was more in favour of following the framework curriculum, the text books, the matriculation examination, and the
teachers' work plans in planning the SBEC. She added that the work plans influenced the teaching of English but not the curriculum document itself. In general Teacher B gave more emphasis on all the factors listed as she did not mark any of them as having little influence. But, her opinion on the meaning of students' needs and language teaching methodology differed completely from Teacher A's opinion. The Principal considered the matriculation examination as the most important factor in planning the SBEC; the framework curriculum of 1994, text books, projects and teacher's experience he considered to be quite important factors. He, too, gave less emphasis to students' needs and methodology. In all, it seemed that both the teacher with a longer career, Teacher B, and the Principal had more unanimous ideas on the importance of the different factors and Teacher A, the young teacher, represented a different view on curriculum planning.

Teacher A gave fewest explanations when asked how the different factors influence the SBEC. In general, very little information was gained in this part of the interview schedule. Both Teacher B and the Principal mentioned that the law and the framework curriculum give the outline and the frame for the SBEC. Both of them mentioned that because of the Kimmoke project, course 3 had been turned into an oral course. However, this had not been documented in the SBEC.

Explanations for the changes in the English A1-language curricula

As mentioned earlier in the interview description, only teachers A and B were asked all the questions in group 4. An interesting observation was that both teachers referred many times to the teaching material and especially text books as an explanation for the changes in the curriculum. Teacher A referred to teaching material seven times (questions 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11) and Teacher B four times (questions 4, 5, 6, 10). The interviewees' answers suggest that in the SBEC the teaching material and especially the text books had played an important role in forming the topics, the objectives, as well as the choice of grammatical structures. Both teachers pointed out that the learning tasks were not included in the SBEC
because they could be found in the teachers’ work plans and - according to Teacher A - in the teaching material.

Teachers A and B were quite unanimous about the reason for the shrinking of the SBEC and why the topics in the SBEC were in most cases given in the form of a title: more freedom for the teachers. As Teacher A mentioned, the previous municipal English language curriculum was almost “too enslaving” and therefore the SBEC was designed to give individual teachers more freedom to decide, for example, about the topics.

None of the factors anticipated explained the omission of the general section of the SBEC or the course-specific objectives. Instead, Teacher B claimed that the general section was left out partly because of the example of the Swedish language curriculum, and partly because they did not feel a marketing section was needed, since English was a compulsory language. Teacher A did not know why the general section had been left out. She suggested that the specific course objectives were possibly in the students’ course guide and also in the teachers’ work plans. Teacher B wondered what the purpose of writing down the objectives in the SBEC was, as the students did not read the curriculum.

The reasons given by the teachers for the introduction of a portfolio course (course 6 in the SBEC of 1998) were divided. Teacher A presumed it was an experiment and a result of ideas taken from in-service teacher training. Teacher B claimed that this solution came from the course topic (culture) which gave students a lot of freedom to decide over their own fields of interest. However, it is difficult to see the topic alone as a reason for introducing the portfolio course. Maybe the original idea for a portfolio course came from in-service teacher training and this idea was then applied to the most suitable course.

The influence of different language teaching development projects on the SBEC was shown mainly on a practical level in the case school. None of the changes which had occurred in the SBEC could be explained by any of the development projects the school was involved with. Instead, as both teachers noted, most projects were carried out in practice, but they were not necessarily documented in the SBEC.
Both teachers were asked about the set of values of the school and the SBEC. Teacher A thought that it was a pity if the value statements of the school remained just in the general section as "empty words" but were not put into practice in each subject's curriculum. Teacher B, on the other hand, saw the values as something taken for granted when it came to teaching English. Especially one of the school's values, internationalisation, was self-evident in the SBEC.

The purpose and development of the English A1-language curriculum

In the course of the interview, Teacher A referred quite often to the fact that, in her opinion, there was a generation gap that divided the English teachers. Because of this, there was a lack of co-operation between the young and the older English teachers in the case school. The younger teachers consulted each other over language barriers in questions concerning teaching methodology and exchanging teaching material. The older teachers dedicated the breaks to relaxation and issues which did not concern teaching. This lack of co-operation in methodological issues was confirmed by Teacher B, who admitted that every English teacher at the school had her own ideas of language teaching and learning methodology.

The updating of the SBEC appeared to be the responsibility of the English teachers alone. No other persons or parties were involved. Teacher A pointed out that she herself had not taken an active role in the curriculum design. In her opinion it was very difficult to change the procedures, which were mainly dictated by the older teachers. The lack of any major changes in the SBEC between 1994 and 1998 was explained quite differently by all three interviewees. Teacher A thought that the every-day teaching was more important than updating the documents. Teacher B referred to the tremendous job they did when they planned the first version of the curriculum, and therefore it took some time before they were ready to make any amendments in it. The Principal thought that there was no need to change something on paper if practical teaching continued as before. In his opinion, the text books in English were very important in giving the overall framework for teaching English.
Teacher B admitted that they had not thought of anybody in particular when they had been writing the document. She said that it was not clear what the document should have contained and that it would have been a good idea to have better instructions about how to write the curriculum. She claimed that the former system when all the municipality's teachers of the same language gathered together to discuss language teaching was a very good system, and that it was a pity that it had ceased to exist.

In all, the interviews gave the impression that the SBEC was not considered to be very important. At least the teachers concentrated more on the actual teaching and its development than the development of the SBEC. In many cases the teachers treated the questions from the implementation point of view. For them, if a change had taken place in the classroom it was in the curriculum even if it had not been documented in the SBEC. This led to the fact that the researchers and the teachers (the implementors) seemed to have a slightly different way of looking at the concept curriculum. Despite this, a lot of interesting and valuable information was received by interviewing Teachers A and B, and the Principal.

7.6 Summary

According to the interviewees, the reason for the decentralisation of curriculum planning was that the new chief of the National Board of Education wanted to dissolve the norms of educational planning. The transition was seen as a big challenge and a chance to develop the school, the curriculum, and the work community. The purpose of the SBEC was to emphasise other issues than the text books did, to direct teachers to reach the objectives of teaching English, and to provide the foundation for all teaching arrangements.

The English teachers wrote the SBEC together, but some teachers had a more active role in curriculum planning than others. The Principal was in charge of the general section of the curriculum and the process as a whole. The opinions of parents and students were asked on general matters, but they were not involved in curriculum planning. A student representative in the curriculum planning
group could make suggestions for course topics, but otherwise students did not
influence the English language curriculum. The municipality gave approval for
the finished curriculum document.

All the interviewees agreed that the factors which had influenced the
SBEC the most were the matriculation examination, text books and other
teaching material, teachers’ own experience and work plans, and different
language teaching development projects. The municipal English language
curriculum of 1987 was not considered important. Opinions on the rest of the
factors, the law, the framework curriculum of 1994, the idea of language and
language learning and the methodology, and students’ needs, were divided.
However, none of the factors was marked as having no influence at all.

Teaching materials, and especially the text books, explained many
changes in the English A1-language curricula concerning the topics, the
objectives, and the choice of grammatical structures. Learning tasks were not
included in the SBEC because they could be found in the teachers’ work plans
and in the teaching material. The reason for the shrinking of the SBEC and for the
topics being in the form of a title was to give more freedom of choice for the
teachers. The general section was left out partly because it had been left out of the
Swedish language curriculum as well, and partly because there was no need for a
marketing section. The specific course objectives were possibly mentioned in the
students’ course guide and also in the teachers’ work plans.

The portfolio course was an experiment, which resulted in ideas taken
from in-service teacher training. Course 6 was a suitable portfolio course because
the topic, culture, gave students a lot of freedom to decide over their own fields
of interest. However, some language teaching development projects were carried
out in practice, but not documented in the SBEC. The set of values of the school
were documented in the general section but, unfortunately, were not put into
practice in each subject’s curriculum. Some of the values, for example
internationalisation, were considered self-evident in teaching English.

A generation gap dividing the English teachers may have caused the lack
of co-operation between the young and the older English teachers. English
teachers at the school had their own ideas of language teaching and learning
methodology, which they did not share. The English teachers updated the SBEC together, but it was difficult to change the procedures dictated by the older teachers.

The lack of any major changes in the SBEC between 1994 and 1998 reflected the fact that the every-day teaching was more important than updating the documents. Planning the school-based curriculum had been a tremendous job and therefore the curriculum had not been updated until the spring of 1998. Furthermore, there was no need to make changes in the document if they were not carried out in practice. The English language text books formed an important part of teaching English.

In all, it was not clear for the teachers what the English language curriculum was supposed to contain. Better instructions on how to write the curriculum would have been needed. Despite the fact that the teachers themselves had written the SBEC, they did not consider it important. The teachers focused on teaching and the development of teaching rather than the development of the SBEC. But should the SBEC not be a part of teaching and in fact, the foundation for it?
8 DISCUSSION

Similarities and differences

The first objective of the present study was to establish the possible similarities and differences in the English A1-language curricula of the case school from years 1987, 1994, and 1998. The document analysis revealed that there were not many similarities between the MEC of 1987 and the SBEC of 1994/1998; only the main topics and the emphasis on different language skills were rather similar in these documents. Furthermore, the MEC of 1987 was much larger in size and more detailed in its course descriptions. Unlike the SBEC of 1994/1998, it contained a general part and a separate list of grammatical structures. The lack of similarities was not surprising since there had been rather profound changes concerning curriculum planning between 1987 and 1998. The decentralisation had involved new persons with their own experiences and ideas in curriculum planning. A new framework curriculum had been published in 1994, and it was much less restrictive than its predecessor from 1985. It could be noted that the MEC of 1987 had not had much influence in planning the SBEC. This was confirmed by the interviewees of the case school.

The SBEC of 1994 and 1998 were almost identical except that in 1998 course 6 had been turned into a portfolio course and optional applied courses 10-12 had been added. This suggests that the case school had not invested in updating the curriculum document, a fact which was also confirmed by the interviewees. Thus, it seems that the progressivist idea of continuous evaluation and development of the SBEC has not been adopted at the case school.

Factors explaining the development of the SBEC

The second objective of the present study was to identify the factors which could explain the development of the English A1-language curriculum. The comparison between the SBEC of 1994/1998 and the FC of 1994 showed that the FC of 1994
was one of the major factors affecting the contents of the school-based English A1-language curriculum. Previous studies by, for example, Syrjäläinen (1994) and Mehtäläinen (1994) confirmed that the FC of 1994 had a leading role in planning the school-based curriculum. However, as Mehtäläinen (1994:50) concluded, the objectives of the FC of 1994 for foreign languages were generally considered very vague. Some teachers found the vagueness to be an asset, others thought the objectives were insufficient and without substance. In the interview, Teacher B observed this problem and expressed her hope for more explicit instructions on what the curriculum should include.

In order to get information on the importance of different factors, a list of factors was presented to the interviewees for evaluation. According to the interviewees, the most influential factors were the matriculation examination, textbooks and other teaching material, teachers' own experience and work plans, and different language teaching development plans and projects. This confirmed the fact acknowledged by other researchers as well that in the Finnish senior secondary school the matriculation examination and the textbooks have a very decisive role in determining most of the teaching arrangements. However, the present study showed that at the case school the different development projects were considered almost equally important as the factors generally considered significant.

Although the interviewees identified many factors as very important, when asked, they did not give any detailed examples of how the influence of these factors was shown in the SBEC. In general, based on the curriculum documents only, it was very difficult to draw any clear connections between the SBEC of the case school and any other factors except the FC of 1994. Even though, for example, the matriculation examination was considered to be a very important factor, it was very difficult to see what particular feature in the curriculum would have resulted from the examination. More likely, there appeared to be a network of influences: the matriculation examination was based on the requirements of the FC of 1994, which was also a major source for the contents of the SBEC of the case school.
Solutions and explanations

As the third objective, the intention was to find out to what extent and for what reasons the case school had used or not used its opportunity for independent solutions in designing its own English A1-language curriculum. The case school’s own solutions comprised such features as including grammatical structures in the course descriptions, some additions in topics and language skills emphasised, and some other minor additions (see Table 10). The case school had extended the SBEC by adding several applied optional courses, which, however, were very briefly described in the curriculum document. These changes were very similar to the ones identified by Mehtäläinen in his study (1994, for details see chapter 4). All in all, the case school did not employ any totally new innovations in its SBEC, but followed the structure and, in most parts, the contents suggested by the FC of 1994.

According to the English teachers and the Principal, the text books explained many of the case school’s own solutions in the SBEC. For example, the grammatical structures had been picked up into each course from the text books, as well as some of the topics (courses 2, 7, 8). As an explanation for documenting the grammatical structures so specifically, Teacher A named the non-graded system: the detailed lists were there to help the teachers as the teaching groups change frequently. However, not all the independent solutions resulted from the FC of 1994, the text books or some other written sources, as some of them were the product of the English teachers who planned the SBEC.

The role of different persons and parties in planning the SBEC

The present study showed that the principal had a very important role in directing overall planning, but that the principal’s influence did not usually extend to the curricula of individual subjects. The previous studies support this view (see Syrjäläinen 1994 and 1996). Even though the Principal of the case school noted that the role of a principal was not just to act as an administrator but also to have the ultimate pedagogic responsibility, the actual planning of the SBEC was
carried out by the English teachers only. This division of work was the same at most of the schools studied in connection with the aquarium experiment (see Syrjäläinen 1994, Mehtäläinen 1994). At the case school, neither the students nor the parents had many possibilities for contributing anything tangible to the SBEC. In the light of the previous studies (see Syrjäläinen 1994 and 1996), this seems to be very typical. According to the interviewees in the present study, the participation of other persons or parties in planning the SBEC was virtually non-existent.

Another issue that came up in the present study, especially in the interview with Teacher A, was the lack of co-operation between the English teachers, and the generation gap. She had not acquired an active role in curriculum planning at the case school, because she felt that the school had strong traditions in doing things in a certain way, and that it was difficult to make changes there. She also pointed out that, because of the generation gap, there was very little co-operation between the younger teachers and the more experienced ones. The generation gap also manifested itself in the evaluation of the influence of different factors on the curriculum. For Teacher A, who had graduated in the 1990s, the students’ needs and teaching methodology were more significant than for Teacher A and the Principal, who had had long careers and who found the law and the FC of 1994 to be more important.

Theory and practice

A central problem in curriculum planning is the gap between theory (the written curriculum) and practice (the implemented curriculum). The present study indicated, too, that a lot of curriculum development happened outside the curriculum document, and not all of it got documented. On several occasions Teacher B brought up the fact that perhaps they had been afraid of documenting too much. Moreover, they had simply forgotten to document some issues when they updated the SBEC in 1998. Also, as Yrjönsuuri (1994:19) points out, the curriculum is usually too tightly based on the contents of learning. Based on the document analysis (see section 6.3), it can be said that the SBEC of the case
school follows relatively closely this traditional approach to foreign language curriculum planning. Such things as grammatical structures and language skills emphasised are listed in detail in the SBEC, but, for example, specific course objectives are mentioned only briefly in a couple of course descriptions. The SBEC seems to represent a combination of Nunan’s (1988:9) syllabus types. It has features from both structural and topical, as well as skills based, syllabi.

For whom is the SBEC written?

One result of the present study was that the English teachers of the case school were forced to take a critical look at their own production and to evaluate the purpose of the SBEC. An interesting contradiction came up in the interview with Teacher B. In her opinion, the purpose of the SBEC was to help teachers to reach the objectives of teaching English. However, as we saw earlier, the case school had not documented many clear objectives in its curriculum. When Teacher B was asked about an explanation for not including more objectives, she replied with a counter question: for whom should they be there? She admitted at the end of the interview that it had not been clear to them for what purpose the curriculum document was written. She also brought up the following questions: Was the SBEC of the case school too general? What was it supposed to include? These questions reflected the same problems Mehtäläinen (1994:20) discussed in his study. He argued that teachers in Finland were not trained in curriculum planning or in reading and analysing curricula. For them the purpose of the curriculum had remained unclear. This may prove to be a serious problem for the future development of the curriculum if teachers do not receive adequate training and guidance in both planning (updating) and implementing a curriculum.

Reliability and validity

The document analysis in the present study can be considered quite reliable because the original analysis conducted included all material in its original,
unreduced form (Finnish). This made it possible to make observations about the changes in the curricula. The semantic interpretations in transferring text segments from the curricula into different categories are the results of two researchers' decisions and therefore not entirely subjective. However, during the interviews the researchers' categorisation of different text segments was sometimes interpreted differently by the interviewees. As this study includes both the three original curriculum documents (see Appendices 1-3) as well as the analysis based on the categorisation of all text segments, the findings can be contested by the reader. Still, as Yin (1994:82) points out, it is important while studying a document to keep in mind that it was not written for the researchers but for "some specific purpose and some specific audience". Therefore, the present study does not rely on document analysis only, but also substantiates the findings with interviews with the persons involved in curriculum planning.

Using open-ended questions in an interview schedule has many advantages. They allow flexibility, they can clear up misunderstandings, or they can even result in unexpected or unanticipated insights which can suggest unthought-of relationships (Cohen and Manion 1985:297). The problem with the open-ended questions is that they can result in complex and unmanageable data which is difficult to analyse in any uniform way. As an extension of the present study, further refinement of the interview questions could provide more exact information, which is also easier to analyse. A further point in the present study is that the answers ultimately reflect the interviewees' opinions on the issues in question and are not necessarily matters of facts. However, the greatest set-back for the validity of the interviews was the refusal of the principal to answer all the questions. This caused an imbalance in the interview data concerning the English A1-language curriculum and made it impossible to make systematic comparisons about the reasons behind the changes in the case school's school-based English A1-language curriculum.

Due to the circumstances of the first and the last interview, some changes had to be made to the interview schedule. In the first interview, the questions concerning the interviewees' involvement in municipal curriculum planning in 1987 were not asked because this teacher had first started her career in 1993. In
the last interview (with the Principal) all but the last two questions in group 4 -
the questions about the changes in the school-based English A1-language
curriculum - were excluded because the Principal refused to answer them.
Largely because of the limited time available for the interviews, the additional
questions in group 3 based on the interviewees’ answers in the questionnaire were
grouped together. Therefore, the interviewees usually commented only on the
first item in the group.

By providing the interviewees with open questions, they were given a
possibility to give their honest opinions without restricting them to the
predetermined list of factors (see group 3). It would have been useful to make
additional questions and encourage the interviewees to specify more clearly what
they thought were the reasons for this and that. However, by using the method
described a lot of unanticipated information was gained. Also, as Yin (1994:85)
points out, it has to be kept in mind that “interviews should always be considered
verbal reports only; as such, they are subject to the common problem of bias,
poor recall, and poor or inaccurate articulation”.

There are some limitations to the present study. Being a case study, it is
context specific. Results from other schools can be different and therefore the
results of this study cannot be generalised. Furthermore, the written English A1-
language curricula form only one level of the whole English curriculum, and they
do not necessarily correspond to, for instance, the implemented curricula. Thus,
the written curriculum documents give a simplified picture of teaching English.

Suggestions for further studies

Decentralisation has not changed curriculum planning as much as could have
been expected. Although the idea has been to get rid of the top-down approach to
curriculum planning, the national framework curriculum is still the official basis
schools use in planning their curricula. The present study indicated that school-
based curriculum planning has not substantially increased the significance of the
English language curriculum in everyday teaching. Therefore, it would be very
interesting to examine how important both teachers and students consider the
English language curriculum document to be. Another subject for further study could be to find out to what extent the English language curriculum works in practice. This might be difficult to measure, though.

Furthermore, Mäkitalo (1996:46-47) claims that the evaluation of a school’s written curriculum document does not necessarily say anything about the school’s reality because schools do not always invest in the written document. This brings us to an interesting dilemma. The written curriculum has been a central part of Finnish educational planning for quite some time, and its importance as a basis for all teaching has been emphasised both in literature and in teacher training. Keeping this in mind, why does the curriculum not tell anything about the school’s reality? Why are the theory (the curriculum) and the reality of the school still so far apart? For whom is the curriculum written? And ultimately, what is the point in having a written curriculum if it is not implemented in practice? It might be a fruitful but demanding task to search for answers to these questions.

The present study concentrated on analysing the changes in the English language curriculum of a single school. In the future, it would be intriguing to repeat this study in order to see whether the new law for senior secondary school (which came into force on the 1st of January, 1999) and the new instructions for evaluation (to be published in autumn 1999) have brought any changes into the curriculum document. Another possible approach could be to compare the contents of the English language curricula of several schools. A more explicit subject could be to investigate how the different schools’ English language curricula reflect the current theories of language teaching and learning, national language policy, or the sets of values of schools.
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Appendix 1
THE MUNICIPAL ENGLISH A1-LANGUAGE CURRICULUM OF 1987

Englannin kieli
A-oppmäärä

1. Tavoitteet
Lukion englannin kielen A-oppmäärän tavoitteena on antaa oppilaille riittävän valmius ymmärtää ja käyttää kieltä sekä herättää heissä harrastusta saavuttamansa kielioiden ylläpitämiseen ja kehittämiseen sekä koulualana että sen jälkeen.

Ensissijaisena kielellisenä tavoitteena on kommunikaatioiden kehittäminen (= ymmärtäminen ja ymmärryksiset tuleminen) keskeissä kielenkäyttötilanteissa. Oppilaan tulee hallita kielen rakennet saavutettuna edellyttämällä tavalla. Niinpä kielen rakenteiden harjoittamisen mielekkyyssä riippuu sitä, miten hyvin harjoitus palvelee oppilaan mahdollisuuksia selvittää erilaista kielioiden vastakkaisista tilanteista.

Tavoitteena olevan kommunikaatioiden edellytyksenä on painaisa kielen rakenteen ja sanaston hallinta myös kielen liittyvän kulttuurietteidän ja -ymääräyksen sekä sen, maiden elämänpiirin tuntemuksen syventäminen keskeisimpänä erityispiirteiden osalta.

2. Kielenaitojen osa-alueiden painotus
Tämän oppimäärän tavoitteena on, että oppilas pystyy ymmärtämään huomattavasti vaikeampaa kieltä kuin itse tuottaa. Passiivisesti ja aktiivisesti hallitavan kieliaineksen ero tulee ottaa huomioon myös oppimateriaaleja laadittaessa ja valittaessa.

Kaikkia neljää kielenaitojen osa-aluetta harjoitetaan jokaisen kurssin aikana.

Puheen ymmärtämisen osuus säilyy koko lukion ajan suurin piirtein samana.

Puheen ymmärtämisen osuus on suurimmillaan lukion alimmalla kurssiteillo, vaikkaakin puhumista tulee harjoittaa kaikilla kurssiteillä.

Tekstin ymmärtämisen harjoittaminen lisääntyy kurssien myötä niin, että sen osuus on päästövaiheessa suurin.

Kieliopistamista harjoitetaan läpi koko lukion.

Opetuksessa korostuu erityisesti tekstien ymmärtäminen, sillä se on edellytys opintojen jatkamiselle korkean asteen oppilaitoksissa sekä oman alan seuramukselle myöhemmin elämässä. Opetuksen on taattava oppilaalle myös hyvä puhutun kielen ymmärtämisen taito sekä antaa sellainen suullinen kieltaito, että he arastelematta käyttäisivät kieltä ja pystysivät kommunikoinaan kiellelle tyyppillisistä rakenteista ja sanomosta käytten keskeissä kielenkäyttötilanteissa. Kirjallinen tuotaminen painottuu vähintä. Tavoitteena on kuitenkin riittävän taito niissä tilanteissa, joissa viesti normaalisti välitetään kirjallisesti. Lukion päästövaiheessa oppilaan edellyttävät pystyvän tuottamaan myös loogista, sisoteistä tekstiä.

3. Oppisäällöt
Oppisäällöjen valinnan perustana ovat lukion yleiset kasvatustavoitteet, kielenopetuksen yleistavoitteet ja tämän oppimäärän tavoitteet. Tavoitteita ja sisällöitä ovat kiinteästi sisodoksissa toisinsa. Tavoitteita voidaan kuitenkin toteuttaa erilaisin oppisäällöisin ja keinoin.

Oppisäällöihin luetaan kuuluvaksi kielenkäyttötilanteet, aihepiirit, rakenteet, sanasto ja ääntäminen.

3.1. Kielenkäyttötilanteet
Kielenkäyttötilanteet liittyvät ihmisen toiminnan keskeisiin alueisiin. Tässä oppimäärissä kielenkäyttötilanteet on ryhmitelty seuraavasti:

- menilökohtaiset kontaktit
- harrastukset
- arkielämän palvelutilanteet
- työelämä
- virallisuutenteet kielenkäyttötilanteet
- tiedon hankkiminen ja välittäminen

Kielenkäyttötilanteita valittaessa on kiinnitettävä huomiota siihen, että peruskoulussa käsiteltävät tilanteet ja niissä tarvittavaa kieltä vahvistetaan, laajennetaan ja syvennetään. Ensimmäisen lukuvuoden tilanteet ovat melko konkreetteja ja perustuvat kaksisuuntaiseen viestintään (keskusteluun, kirjeenvaihtoon yms.). Toisena ja kolmannena vuonna oppilaitos valitsee ja hallitsee perustuvat omenan yksisuuntaiseen viestintään kuten ääniteiden kuuntelemiseen ja tekstien lukemiseen.

3.2. Aihepiirit
Aihepiiriä valittaessa on pyrittävä ottamaan huomioon peruskoulun perusvalintisopimuksen kehittämisen sekä kulttuurin ja yhteiskunnan vaatimuksia. Aiheiden valinnan tulee tehdä kansainvälistä yhteisöyhteistyöstä ja niiden tulisi käsitellä myös oman maan yhteiskunta ja kulttuuria, jotta oppilas pystysisi välittämään tietoa maamme oloista.

Aiheiden tuli kiinnostaa oppilaita ja motiivoa opiskeluun. Tarkeää on myös, että yhteisesti käsiteltävien tekstien aineisto ottaa rakenteellisesti ja sanastollisesti sopivalla tavalla. Sen sijaan oppilaiden kiinnostukseen ja harrastukseen perustuvan oheis- ja valinnaismateriaalin tuli olla mahdollisimman autenttista.

3.3. Rakenteet
Rakenteiden valinnan peruskierroinä on niiden käyttökoelpoisuus keskeisissä kielenkäyttötilanteissa sekä keskeisiä aiheita käsiteltäessä. Ensimmäisen lukuvuoden aikana on tarkoituksenmukaista keskityä peruskoulun kehkeisten rakenteiden kertaamiseen sekä verbibioin pääkohtoihin. Toisen ja kolmannen vuoden aikana on syytä muoto-opin lisäksi käsitellä myös lauseepin keskeisiä kysymyksiä.

Rakenneluetelo on laadittu koko lukion kattavaksi ja se sisältää myös peruskoulussa opetettujen rakenteen. Rakenteiden osaaminen taso on rakenneluetelossa määriteltävä päteväkäyttömeniin. Aktiivisen (käyttävän ja passiivisen ymmärrän) hallinnan valilla on tehty selvä ero. Passiivisesti tarkoitetujen rakenteiden tuottamista ei vaadita eikä myös arvioida.

Rakenteiden sijoittaminen kurssseihin tulee olla porrasrettien: myöhemmin aktivoitava rakenteen pyritään esittelemään ennakkoaveriin ja vasta ymmärrettäväksi. Rakennelueteloa laadittaessa olim kiinnitettävä erityistä huomiota siihen, että ne esiintyvät luonnissa kielenkäyttötilanteissa.
3.4. Sanasto
Peruskoulun englannin A-oppimäärän tavoitteena on, että oppilait ovat vaadittavissa 900-1200 keskeistä sanaa ja sanonta mahdollisimman hyvin. Tämän perussanaston lisäksi oppinaekseen sisällytetään sanastoja, jonka aktiivista osaamista ei oppilailla vaadita.

Tutkimusten mukaan sanaston puuteellinen hallinta vaikeuttaa viestin ymmärtämistä enemmän kuin rakennevihreitä. Siksi sanasto on kommunikatiivisen kielenopetuksen keskeisimpia elementtejä. Tavoitteena on, että oppilaila olisi vanhka perussanasto ja sen luottavaraväsittäin.

Sanasto on valitaessa tulee ottaa huomioon sen yleisyyys, käyttötarkoitus ja kattavuus. Opetussuunnittelun systemaattisuus edellyttää, että sanojen valinnan yhtenä kriteeriinä ovat myös aihepiiri, Valintakriteerienä voidaan käyttää myös synonyymiä, vastakohtaisuutta ym.

Aktiivisesti hallittavan sanaston tulee olla keskeistä, ja sen hyvään hallintaan tulee pyrkiä. Passiivisesti hallittavien sanojen määrä on suuri, ja niiden olisi katettava mahdollisimman laajoja ja vaihtelevia aloja. Kovin harvinaisia sanoja ei ole syytä sisällyttää passiivisesti hallittavien sanojen joukkoon.

Oppilaille tulee myös selvittää sananmuodon periaatteet, koska he näiden perusteella pystyvät päätelemään myös heille ennestään tuntemattomien sanojen ja sanantojen merkityksiä. Myös idiomaattisiin ilmakuviin on syytä kiinnittää huomiota.

3.5. Aäntäminen
Tavoitteena on, että oppilas ymmärtäisi sekä Britannian että Amerikan englannin sivistynytta puhetta. Hänen tulisi saada kuulla myös muitakin puhekielejä kirjallista että äänitietaria, esimerkiksi keskinäisen painoton ja valokuvaajan painoton kuten - persoonallista (dialogit, keskustelut) - kuvalevaa (henkilöiden, olojen, harrastusten, asuinpaikkojen yms. kuvailu) - kertoava (tarina, kertomus, tapahtuma) - ilmialusilla (mielipiteet, asennoituminen, vaikutelmat, tunnelmat) - esittävia (artikkelit, esitelmät yms.) - erityisesti kieliksi (kuuletutokset, ohjeet, opastukset, luetelot yms.)

Yhteisten perustekstien tulisi olla sanastoltaan ja rakenteeseen sopivasti porrastettuja sekä edetä puhevirikkeitä antavasta, esim. persoonallisesta kielenkielistä, esittävänä ilmaisuun. Oppilaaiden kiinnostukseen ja harrastuksen perustuvan oheismateriaalin tulisi sen sijaan olla mahdollisimman autenttista.

Materiaaliin tulisi kuulua rakennetta ja puhumiseen, puhumiseen, äänittämiseen ja intonaatioon, ohjaustaan ja vapaampanaan tuottamiseen liittyvää tehtävää sekä kerhontaitoa ja erityismateriaalia. On huolehdittava siitä, että aktiivisesti sanavarastoon kuuluvat sanat ovat selvästi erotettavissa ja kertautuvat tarpeeksi usein. Rakenteiden jakamisessa eri kurssille on otettava huomioon niiden vaikeuskustus ja soveltuvuus äänite- tai tekstialanointiston laatu. Rakenteiden systemaattiseen kertautumiseen tulee myös kiinnittää huomiota.

Lukion oppimateriaalien tulee niveltä saumattomasti peruskuolan oppimäärän mukaiseen materiaaliin.

5. Kurssit
Kielelliset tavoitteet määräytyvät osittain kunkin kurssin painotuksen mukaan. Kunkin kurssin yleistavoitteena on, että oppilas opettanut kieliainekse saksaajasta pystyy

* tyypillisiin kursseihin aihepiiriin liittyvää normalitaposta puhutta oleellisen sisällön sekä valoinkin kuin siinä on jonkin verran outoakin kieliainesta

*ymmärtämään* kurssin aihepiiriin liittyvää normalitaposta puhutta oleellisen sisällön sekä valoinkin kuin siinä on jonkin verran outoakin kieliainesta

*ymmärtää* suhteellisen vaivattomasti aihepiiriin liittyvää, vain vähän uutta kieliainesta sisältäviä tekstiä sekä pääkohdat sellaisesta aihepiiriin liittyvistä tekstistä, joka sisältää myös jonkin verran enemmän uutta kieliainesta

keskustelemaan* kurssin aiheesta ja hallitsemaan sopivat puhekomentot

käyttämään* kieltä kirjallisesti kurssin painotukseen, luokkatasoan ja aihepiirien ja kielenkäyttötallenteiden mukaisesti.


Ensimmäisen opiskeluvuoden kurssit perustuvat nykyisissä rakennettaan sitä käytännön kielitoimi, jota oppilas tarvitsee oppisissä joissakin tässä alanissaisissa kielentoimissa. Kurssien painopiste on näin ollen puheen ymmärtämisessä ja puhumisessa. Tässä suhteessa ensimmäisen vuoden kurssit eroavat 2. ja 3. opiskeluvuoden kurssseista, jotka korostavat reseptivistä puolta.

Ensimmäisissä kurssissa käsiteltävät tekstit sisältävät vain kohtuullisesti uutta, kestäviä kieliainesta. Kurssien edestä kieliainen vaikeutuu.

1. KURSSI: Ihmisen ja hänen lähimmänä lähimmänä

Näkökulma
Painotus
Kurssissa painottuvat puheen ymmärtäminen ja puhuminen sekä kurssissa kerrattujen ja opittujen sanojen ja rakenteiden hallinta.

Oppisisällöt
Aihepiirejä
- oma minä
- koti, perhe, suku, ystävät, muut henkilöt
- koulu, suhteet koulutoveriin
- jokapiivyiset askareet
- ihmisseutet
- nuorten ongelmat
- ajanvietotapa
- sukulaisen väliset suhteet
- [kunnan X] esittely
  - Kielenkäyttötila
    - keskusteleminen omasta itsestään, perheestä ja omasta lähiympäristöstä
    - jokapiivaisen elämän tapahtumista ja omista kokemuksista kertominen
    - tuntuvallisen keskustelun käynnin ja siihen kuuluvien kielellisten konventioiden hallitseminen (esim. tervetulluminen, esittäytyminen, kuulumisten kysyminen, kiittäminen, omisteltuminen, antekipsipyöytyminen)
    - puhelineen vastaaminen ja puhelinasioiminen
    - kortin tai kirjeen kirjoittaminen.

2. KURSSI: Ihminen, hänen harrastuksensa ja hänen käyttämiänsä palvelut
Näkökulma
Kurssissa käsitellään toisaalta harrastuksia ja vapaa-ajan käyttöä, toisaalta ihmistä yleisimmillä palvelutilanteissa, joihin hän voi joutua ulkomailla ja kotimaisissa erityisesti palvelujen käyttäjänä mutta myös niiden tarjoajana. Kielenkäyttötilanteet edellyttävät edelleen aktiivista, epävirallisluonteista suullista kielitaitoa sekä puheen ymmärtämistä.

Painotus
Kurssissa painottuvat puheen ymmärtäminen ja puhuminen sekä keskeisten rakenteiden hallinta. Myös kirjallista tuottamista aletaan harjoitella.

Oppisisällöt
Aihepiirejä
- erilaiset harrastukset
- vapaa-ajan käyttö yleensä
- loma-ajan vietto
- seurat ja kerhot
- urheilu ja kuntoliikunta
- matkailu ja liikenne
- tavallisimmat palvelutilanteet
- urheilumahdollisuuksia [kunnassa X]
- opastamistilanteita [kunnassa X].
  - Kielenkäyttötilanteita
    - oman harrastusalan esitteleminen
    - oman kerhon tai seuran esitteleminen
    - oppilasluokan haastatteleminen heidän harrastuksistaan ja kerhoistaan
    - jonkin maassamme suositu henkilön harrastuksen tai urheilulajin esitteleminen
    - toisen henkilön harrastuksen esitteleminen lautua tai kuullun perusteella
    - tiedon hankkiminen ja väittäminen tavallisimmilla palvelutilanteissa; tällaisia ovat esim. majoittuminen, ruokailu, liikenne, ajanviette ja kauppapalvelut
    - matkakertomus.

3. KURSSI: Ihminen ja hänen työnsä
Näkökulma
Kurssissa keskitytään opiskelussa ja työelämässä tarvittavaan kieleen ja kielencäyttöön. Aiheita käsitellään käytännönäheisesti ja konkreettein esimerkkein. Käytettävää kieli on paljolti virallisluonteista ja sisältää mm. työhön ja opiskeutun liittyviä tiedusteluja, tiedotteita, ohjeita ym. Lähtökohtana voi olle myös haastattelu, kirjallisuusyote tms., jolloin kieli voi olle epävirallista, tuttavallista tai viihtyelista. Kielitaidon merkitystä opiskelussa ja työelämässä tähdennotään samoin kuin oppilaan aktiivista osuutta kielitaitonsa kehittämisessä.

Painotus
Tässä kurssissa kielitaidon osa-alueet painottuvat melko tasaisesti, joskin lukion ensimmäisen vuoden englannin yleistavoitteiden mukaisesti suulliseen kielitaitoon kiinnitetään erityistä huomiota.

Oppisisällöt
Aihepiirejä
- kielitaidon merkitys opiskelussa ja työelämässä
- muutama ammattiala, niiden vaatimukset ja tarvittava koulutus (eristeista koulutusta vaativia aloja)
- hakeutuminen työhön tai opiskelemaan kotimaassa tai ulkomaillle
- kesätyöt, työhön osallistuminen perheessä, palkka ja taskurahat
- työn muuttuvuus luonne ja tulevaisuuden ammatit
- työn merkitys, työmaara, työttömyys
- koulutus [kunnassa X]

Kielenkäyttötilanteita
- keskustelut/haastattelut opiskelun, työhön ja työelämään liittyvistä aiheista (esim. nuori/työhönottaja, nuorio/vanhemmat, alainen/esimesi)
- hakeutuminen opiskelun/työhön ja siinä toimiminin, itsensä esittelemisen, tietojen antaminen
   koulutuksesta ja työkokemuksista, vastaaminen em. asioita koskeviin kysymyksiin, lisätietojen antaminen, koulu-
   ja työ todistusten esitteleminen, hakulomakkeen täyttäminen
- opiskelussa/työelämässä esiintyviä erilaisia suvellisten ja kirjallisten käyttö- ja toimintaohjeiden ja
   tiedotusten lukeminen, ohjeiden ja neuvojen kysyminen
- aihepiireihin liittyviin artikkeleihin, kirjallisuusosoteisiin, kirjoituksiin ja haastatteluihin tutustuminen.

Toisen opiskeluvuoden alusta kurssien painopiste siirtyy enenevääsä määrien puheen ymmärtämisen ohella
tekstin ymmärtämisen ja kirjoittamisen suuntaan. Puhumista harjoitellaan kuitenkin lukion loppuun asti, joten
oppimateriaalin on sisällettävä tähän tarkoitukseen sopivia kirjallista ja äänitettävä virkamerkistöä.
Puheen ymmärtämisen osuus säilyy koko lukion ajan ja suurin piirtein samana.

Tekstien vaikeustaso kasvaa kurssi kurssilta, ja ne muuttuvat asianpiirteemiksi ja abstraktimpaan
suuntaan. Yhdeksi keskeisiksi tavoitteiksi tulee vaikeahkojen tekstien asiaisällön ymmärtäminen.
Ekstensivistä lukemista eri aiheista pyritään harjoittamaan mahdollisimman paljon, joita oppilaat voivat
mutta tai monipuolisuus sanastoon ja muuhun kielialueeseen. Reesepitivistä kielivalmiudet tulevat nyt selvästi
ensiäisiäksi. Kurssissa oppilaita tulee myös ohjata itsenäiseen, omavastaiseen ja pitkäjänteiseen

4. KURSSI: Ihminen ja yhteiskunta

Näkökulma

Kurssin näkökulma on yhteiskunnallinen ja yleismaailmallinen. Kurssissa käsitellään yhteiskunnan
rakennetta, toimintatapoja ja periaatteita valottavia aiheita toisaalta yksilön kannalta - yksilön
yhteiskunnan toimivana jäsenenä ja palvelujen saajana - toisaalta yhteiskunnan kannalta - ihminen
osana yhteiskuntaa, josta hän saa toimeentulosaa ja perusturvan. Aiheita lähestyään myös kirjallisuuden, haastattelujen, huumorin,
tapahtumakuvuisten yms. kautta. Aiheiden käsitteilyssä pyritään myös ongelmanasetteluun: millaisiksi
oppilaat kokevat esitellyt instituutiot ja millaisiksi he niitä kehittäisivät. Näkökulmaa pyritään avartamaan
omasta maasta ja yhteiskunnasta muuhun maailmaan.

Painotus

Kielitaidon eri osa-alueet painottuvat edelleen melko tasaisesti, joskin tässä vaiheessa aletaan aikaisempaa
ennemmän kohdistua huomiointiin ja ymmärtääi laajempaa tekstikokonaisuuksia.

Oppisissällöt

Kurssissa voidaan lähteä liikkeelle oppilaita läheillä olevista konkreteisteä aihepiireistä ja oman maan oloista
ja edetä laajempiin kokonaisuuksiin ja muiden maiden oloihin. Aihepiirejä käsitteellä kannattaa korostaa
yksilön mahdollisuuksia ja velvollisuuksia demokraattiseen vaikuttamiseen.

Aihepiirejä

- asuminen: asumisen muodot, asumisen maalaa ja kaupungissa
- maantieteelliset olet
- terveysvalvelut, sosiaaliturva sekä omassa maassa että anglosaksisissa maissa
- muuttoliike
- järjestötoiminta, poliittinen toiminta
- uskonto ja kirkko
- laki ja järjestys
- asuminen [kunnassa X].

5. KURSSI: Ihminen, tieto ja tekniikka

Näkökulma

Kurssi antaa kielallisiä valmiuksia aiheisiin, jotka liittyvät tekniseen ja tieteelliseen kehitykseen sekä tästä
seuranneeseen maailmanlaajuisen tiedonkulun ja tiedonhankinnan helpottumiseen. Tässä yhteydessä
tarjoutuu tilaisuus käsittää ihmisten osana koko maailmaa. Tiedonhankinta käsiteltäessä korostetaan yksilön
velvollisuutta hankkia tietoa kehittämiseen itseään sekä yksilönä että yhteiskunnan jäsenenä. Kurssissa on
syytä opettaa tiedonhankintaan liittyviä taitoja sekä tiedon kriittistä arviointia ja käyttöä.

Painotus

Kurssissa painotuu erityisesti ydinkohtiin keskittyvää kuullun ja luetun kokonaisuuden ymmärtäminen.
Oppisisällöt
Kurssi jakaantuu kahteen osaan. Tekniikan kehittyminen ja sen mukaan tuoma hyvinvoinnin lisääntyminen sekä hyvinvoinnin epätaasainen jakautuminen maailmassa voivat olla yhtenä lähtökohtana. Tekniikan kehitystä voidaan tarkastella esim. esittelemällä eri teknikan alojen tyyppillisä edustajia, tarkastelemalla tiettyjä selkeitä esimerkkialoja tai esittelemällä tieteen saavutuksia. Ihmisen suhde luontoon ja avaruuteen sekä kansainvälisen yhteistoimintaa tieteen ja teknikan kehittämiseksi voivat olla alustavasti jo tämän kurssin aiheita.

Kurssin toinen osa käsittelee tiedonhankinnan ja joukkotiedotuksen kysymyksiä. Lehdistö, radio ja televisio sekä ajankohtaiset asiat muodostavat alati uudistuvan aihekonaisuuden.

Aihepiirejä
Tieto ja tekniikka
- eri alojen saavutuksia ennen ja nyt (keksijöitä tai alan huomattavia edustajia)
- jonkin tieteellisen esittely
- jokin keskeinen oman maan teollisuudenala
- liikenteen kehitys
- avaruuden valloitus
- tietojenkäsittely ja tietokoneet
- kehitysnäkymiä, futurologiaa.

Tiedonhankinta
- tiedotusvälineiden esittely ja vertailua
- tiedotusvälineiden vaikutusta
- mainonta ja kuluttajan valistus
- tiedonhankinnan keinoja
- tietoliikenne ja joukkotiedotus.

Keskeisen kunnan keskeisen teollisuudenalan esittelyä. [Kunnan X kesätapahtuman] aiheiden hyödyntäminen.

6. KURSSI: Ihminen, koulutus ja kulttuuri
Näkökulma

Kurssin toisena teemanä voidaan käsitellä koulutusta ja koululaitosta erityisesti englantia puhuvissa maissa. Näihin aiheisiin paneudutaan lyhyesti kurssin alussa.

Painotus
Kurssissä painotuvat teksti- ja puhekokonaisuksien ymmärtäminen. Lisäksi kiinnitetään erityistä huomiota kirjoittamiseen.

Oppisisällöt
Kurssin alussa voidaan käsitellä koulutusjärjestelmien piirteitä sekä Suomessa että anglosaksisissa maissa sekä ihmisen erilaisia mahdollisuksia hankkia koulutusta. Kurssin perusurungen muodostavat kuitenkin esteettisluonteiset, kulttuuriin liittyvät aihekonaisuudet.

Aihepiirejä
- koulutusjärjestelmiä esittelyä
- koulutusmahdollisuudet
- kirjallisuus (novelli, romani, näytelmä, lyriikka)
- elokuva ja teatteri
- musiikki, kuvaamataite
- taidemuodot harrastuksena ja ammattina
- anglosaksisen maailman ja oman maan kulttuurihenkilöitä
- perinteet, tapakulttuuri
- pop-kulttuuri
- esteettiset kysymykset yleensä
- [Kunnan X] kulttuurielämän esittelyä
- [Kunnan X merkikohenkilö].

7. KURSSI Ihminen ja luonto
Näkökulma
Kurssi käsittelee ihmistä luonnon osana, ei miinkään henkilökohtaisten tuntemusten kuin tosiasioiden pohjalta. Kieli on näin ollen etupäässä asiapitoista ja kurssi antaa oppilaille valmiuksia ymmärtää ja käyttää luontoon ja luonnontieteisiin liittyvää kieltä. Vastaanottavan kieltädaijon osuus on huomattava, mutta kurssin sisällöitä käsitellään myös puhumisvalmiuksia kehitettävää aineesta. Kurssin aihepiiri tarjoaa erinomaisen mahdollisuuden kytkeyttää asiapitoisesti muihin oppiaineisiin, lähinnä luonnontieteisiin, historiaan ja psykologian.

Painotus
Kurssissa painotettiin asiapitoisen tekstin pääkohtien ymmärtäminen sekä puheen ymmärtäminen ja kirjoittaminen.
Oppsisäällöt
Kursissa voidaan lähteä liikkeelle oman paikkakunnan ja maan olona koskevista tiedoista ja edetä koko maailmasta käsitteleviin yleisiin aiheisiin.

Aihepiirejä
- ihmisen suhde luontoon
- luonnon voimavarat, niiden jakautuminen ja käyttö
- luonnonsuojelu ja luonnon tasapainon säilyttäminen
- ympäristön suunnittelu
- erilaiset elinympäristöt
- ravinto-ongelmat
- väestöongelma
- oman maan luonto
- ihmisen käsitykset luonnosta ja maailmankaikkeudesta
- jokin sovelletun luonnontieteen ala (lääketiede, psykologia, ympäristösuojelu yms.)
- maantiede, biologia, fysiikka, kemia
- luontoon liittyvät harrastukset.

8. KURSSI Ihminen ja maailman kansat
Näkökulma

Painotus
Kurssissa painotuu vaikeahkoon asiapitoisen tekstin ja puhutun kielen ymmärtäminen sekä kielen kirjallinen tuottaminen.

Oppsisäällöt
Kurssin aihepiirejä voidaan näheestyä esittelemällä kehityslinjoja ja laajahkoja asiakokonaisuuksia ja/tai seuraamalla ajankohtaisia tapahtumia. Tekstimateriaalia tulee olla runsaasti, jotta oppilait voivat valita tekstejä tasonsa ja mielenkiintoa mukaisesti ja jotta heillä olisi mahdollisuus saada monipuolistaa sanastoa tutustumalla mahdollisimman moneen aihepiiriin eri näkökulmasta.

Aihepiirejä
- Suomen asema maailmassa
- kansainvälinen politiikka ja talouselämä
- rauhankasvatus ja rauhaa koskevat kysymykset
- taloudellinen uusjako ja kehitysyhteistyö
- kansainvälinen yhteistyö ja kansainväliset järjestöt
- ihmisarvo ja rotuongelma
- humanitaariset järjestöt
- erilaiset yhteiskuntatulkinnot ja aatesuunnat
- kansantalous ja yritystoiminta
- ajankohtaiset kansainväliset tapahtumat
- kansallinen identiteetti.

Yleisluonteisia perustekstejä täydennetään ajankohtaissilla julkaisuilla, esitteillä, tilastoilla, sanoma- ja aikakauslehdeillä sekä erilaisilla äänitemateriaaleilla. Myös aihepiiriin soveltuvia kirjallisuusotteita voidaan käyttää.

Aiheita tulee käsitellä monipuolisesti ja mahdollisimman objektiivisesti sekä antaa oppilaille mahdollisuus omien käsitystensa esittämiseen. Aiheita käsiteltäessä tulisi ottaa huomioon myös rauhankasvatus sekä ihmisten ja kansojen välisen yhteistyön ja yhteisymmärryksen edistäminen.

6. Rakenneluettelo
Englannin A- kiel
Lukion päätöväheessa oppilaan tulisi saamansa opetuksen perusteella osata käyttää seuraavia rakenteita ja ymmärtää seuraavia rakenteita:

VERBIT
Aikamuodot
käyttää
- yksinkertainen preenss, imperfekti, perfekti ja pluskvamperekki
- edellisten kestomuodot
He was watching TV. when I came in.
It has been raining all day.
What have you been doing?
- futuro, will-apuverbi ja shall-apuverbi yksikön ja monikon 1. persoonan kysymysläuseissa
- rakenne be going to
- yleispreesens tulevan ajan ilmaisuna ehtoa ja aikaa ilmaisevissa sivulauseissa
- imperatiivi

**Apuverbit**

**käyttää**
- apuverbit can, could, must, may, mustn’t, should ja rakenne have to eri aikamuodoissa
- apuverbi should (ought to) kehotuksissa ja kielloissa
You shouldn’t have done it.
- apuverbit can (could) ja must sekä niiden vastineet keskeissä merkityksissä eri aikamuodoissa
Have you been able to do it?
They will have to go there.
He must have been ill.
She can’t have done it.
- apuverbi may (might) ja rakenne be allowed to eri aikamuodoissa
Has he been allowed to come?
- rakenneet have/get something done ja used to
He had his hair cut.
He used to sit for hours.

**ymmärtää**
- apuverbien keskeiset erikoiskäytöt, esim.
Who is to do this?
He was about to leave.
You do look pale.
He would sit for hours doing nothing.
You might have been a little more careful.
If somebody should call...
I suggest this should be done.

**Ehtovirkkeet**

**käyttää**
- I ja II konditionali
- irrealinen ehtovirke viittaamaan sekä nykyhetkeen ja tulevaisuuteen että menneisyyteen
If he knew about it, he would not act like that.
If he had come, I would have told him about it.

**Passiivi**

**käyttää**
- passiivi eri aikamuodoissa sekä ilman agenttia että agentin kera
- passiivityyppi objektiivi - passiivilauseen subjekti
They were shown the sights.
- passiivi apuverbien can, must, may, should ja ought to kanssa
It should be done.
The book must be read.
- verbis supposes, say, think, expect passiivissa
They are supposed to come by 10 o’clock.
He is said to be very rich.
- sanat we, you, one, they ja people passiivin vastineina
- passiivi apuverbien can, must, may, should ja ought to yhteydessä viittaamaan menneisyyteen
It should have been done.
- verbin liittyvä prepositio rakenne myöspassiivilauseissa
These problems are often talked about.

**Infinitivi**

**käyttää**
- infinitiivi to-partikkelin kanssa ja ilman päätapauksissa
- tavallismat infinitiviirakenteet
- infinitiivi lauselyhenteissä
Tell me what to do?
- mm. seuraavat infinitiviirakenteet:
It’s good for you to do this.
I want him to come.
It was kind of you to help me.
The bag is too heavy (for me) to carry.
- infinitiivin preensens aistihavaintoverbien (hear, see, watch jne.) ja verbien let ja make kanssa
aktiivissa ja passiivissa
- infinitiivin perfekti aktiivissa
He seems to have heard it.
- kielteinen infinitiivi keskeissä tapauksissa.
He told me not to do it.

**ymmärtää**
- infinitiivin perfekti passiivissa
The house seems to have been painted.

**Gerundi**

**käyttää**
- gerundi sitä vaativien tavallisimpien verbien yhteydessä (esim. avoid, enjoy, mind jne.) sekä
adjektiivien busy, worth, like yhteydessä
Would you mind opening the door?
It’s no use going there.
The place is worth visiting.
- gerundi prepositioiden kanssa
We thought of visiting my aunt.
He is good at dancing.
He succeeded in doing it.

y mmärtää
- gerundi seuraavassa rakenteessa
- It resulted in his/him failing the test.

SUBSTANTIIVIT
käyttää
- epämääräinen ja määrävä artikkelien substantiivin yhteydessä, myös yleisimmissä sanonnoissa
- aine- ja abstraktisanojen sekä erismäären ilman artikkelia
- säännöllinen monikko ja tavallisimmat epäsaannolliset monikoomuodot (esim. man, woman, child, wife, half, leaf) ja substantiivit joiden monikoomuoto = yksikoomuoto (esim. sheep, fish, Japanese, means)
- tavallisimmat kollektiivisubstantiivit esim. people, police
- seuraavat substantiivit: advice, baggage, furniture, information, luggage, money, news, knowledge, business
- substantiivin monikko, joka ilmaisee usealle eri henkilölle erikseen kuuluvaan käsittää
They shook their heads.
- sanat joiden yhteydessä artikkelia on poikkeuksellisella paikalla (all, both, half, such, quite ja huudahduksissa what)
- s- ja of-genetiivi
- s-genetiivi paikkaa ilmaisevissa ja keskeisimmässä aikaa ilmaisevissa sanonnoissa
He is at the dentist’s.

Have your read today’s paper?

- of-genetiivi määrää ilmaisemassa sekä paikanmimien yhteydessä
- a cup of tea
- the city of London

y mmärtää
- muut monikoltaan epäsaannolliset substantiivit
- as, so, how, too + adv. + a/an
- -kaksoisgenetiivi a friend of my sister’s

ADJEKTIVIT
käyttää
- adjektiivien perus- ja vertailumuodot, keskeiset epäsaannolliset vertailumuodot
- eräät vain predikatiivina käytetty adjektiivin, esim. afraid, alike, alive, alone, ashamed, asleep, awake, glad, ill, well
- tavalliset adjektiivien vahvistussanat esim. as...as, too, far, by far, ... of all, very + superlatiivi, a little, a bit
- rakenteet
better and better = yhä parempi
more and more beautiful = yhä kauniimpi
- tavallisimmat kansallisussanat ja kielten nimet
- adjektiivin käyttö substantiivina esim. the blind, the impossible
- absolujtuinen superlatiivi

y mmärtää
The scenery is most beautiful.
I read a most interesting story.

- superlatiivi predikatiivina ilman artikelia verrattessa samaa käsittää eri aikoina tai eri paikoissa

London is most beautiful (at its mostbeautiful) in the spring.
- the...the ilmaisemassa “mitä...siitä”

ADVERBIT
käyttää
- säännölliset ja tavallisimmat epäsaannolliset adverbit ja niiden vertailumuodot
- adverbit adjektiivin tai adverbin määriteentä
unusually patient, extremely well
- adverbin vahvistussanat esim. very, rather, too, even, much, a lot, still, far, of all

LUKUSANAT
käyttää
- perus- ja järjestysluujen lisäksi tavallisimmat murtooluvut
- rakenteet
dozens of, hundreds of, thousands of, millions of

PRONOMINIT
käyttää
- persoonapronominin subjekti- ja objektimuodot
- persoonapronominin objektimuoto paikkaa ilmaisevien prepositioiden jäljessä
Shut the door behind you.
- adjektiiviset ja itsenäiset possessiivipronominit
- itsenäiset possessiivipronominit myös rakenteessa
a friend of mine, that friend of yours
- own -sana rakenteessa
my own book, a book of my own
- reflektiivipronominit
- reflektiivipronominit myös seuraavissa tapauksissa:
Enjoy yourselves.
I did it by myself.
- resiprooppilainorominin each, one another
- demonstratiivipronominit
- rakenteet this one, that one sekä eräitä keskeisiä this/that -sanontoja esim. this year, that’s right, in those days, that’s why, like this/that
- seuraavat determinatiivipronominit
a/the person who, the people who, those who

- seuraavat determinatiivipronominit
  the one, the ones/those, the one who

kahvattaa
- määrävä artikkelit merkityksessä se, ne
  This is the book I mean.

ymmärtää
- substantiivia korvaava that-pronominin of-genetiivin ja relatiiviuseen edessä
  The climate of Finland is colder than that of Egypt.

käyttää
- interrogatiivipronominit ja kysymyssanat
  - pronominit jota ja johon myös seuraavanlaisissa tapauksissa:
    What size?
    Which house is yours?
    Which of them?
    What about...?
    - tavalliset indefiniittipronominit
    - indefiniittipronominit much, many ja muut keskeiset paljoutta ilmaisevat sanonnat esim.
      little - a little/few - a few
    for the last few days
    some ja any itsenäisinä
    none
    other (keskeiset tapaukset)
    more ja most tavallistimmassa tapauksissa
    most of you
    indefiniittipronominit of-sanan yhteydessä
    who else jne. (tavallisimmat tapaukset)
    any-alkuiset indefiniittipronominit myönteisissä väitteleuseissa, esim. Anyone can do it.

ymmärtää
- tässä luettelossa mainitsematta jätetyt indefiniittipronominit lauseyhteyksissä

käyttää
- relativipronominit ja which
  - seuraavat tapaukset:
    of which/whom, little/much that
    that-pronomin, erityisesti sitä vaativissa tapauksissa
    Can you remember all that happened?
    - relativipronominit keskeisimmissä tapauksissa rajoittavissa ja selittävissä relatiiviuseissa
      The Thames, which flows through London...
      The river which flows through London is the Thames.
      - which-pronominii viittaamassa kokonaiseen lauseeseen
      He told me he had been to see his mother, which wasn’t true.
      - seuraavat ilmaisevat:
        whoever, whatever, whichever, such as
        - prepositiot relatiivialaisten yhteydessä
          The book I told you about...
        - rakenne the same as
          - tuskana one adjektiivin yhteydessä

KONJUNKTIOT JA LAUSEOPPI

Vyöhykkeiset ja perussaneläkykys

käyttää
- vää-, kiello- ja kysymyslauseiden muodostaminen ja sanajärjestyksen pääkohdat
  - objekti ja objektiivin keskinäisesti oikeassa suhteessa
    She gave the man two dollars.
    She gave two dollars to the man.

ymmärtää
- käänteen sanajärjestyksen käyttö, kun lauseen alussa on kielteinä tai rajoittava ilmaus
  Seldom have they been there.
  Not a word did he say.

käyttää
- liitekykyiset
  They won’t come, will they?
  She speaks French, doesn’t she?
  Let’s go, shall we?
  - keskeiset adverbit lauseopillisesti oikeissa paikoissa
    I saw him at the station last night.
    They seldom visit us.
    I would never have believed it.
    He will probably come tomorrow.
    He sang beautifully at the concert last night.

Yhdysvirkkeet

PÄÄLAUSEET

käyttää
- yhdysvirkkeet, joita yhdistävät konjunktio and, or, but, so sekä seuraavat rinnastuskonjunktio tai
  liitesanat
  as well as, and so
  He speaks English and so does his brother.
  nor, neither
  He didn’t write. Nor did I.
  however, yet, still, for
- neither - nor

SIVULAUSEET
- alisteiset lauseet, jotka on muodostettu tavallisimpien konjunktioiden avulla (because, when, if, that, before, after, although, as)
- oheiset päättyvät ja yhdysvirkkeet, joita yhdistävät seuraavat alistekonjunktioit tai liitesanat:
  aikaa ilmaisevat sivulauseet
  - while, after, until (till), not - until
  - since, as soon as

ymmärtää
- no sooner - than, scarcely- when, once, now (that)
- lyhenteet
Having written it, he phoned me.
Before going there, think about this!
After writing it he went home.

käyttää
- ehtoa ilmaisevat sivulauseet
- reaaliset ehtovirkkeet (futuri ja if-lause) ja irrealiset ehtovirkkeet (I konditionaali ja if-lause)

ymmärtää
- unless, supposing, assuming, in caseprovided (that)
- ehtolauseet korvavaa inversio
Hadh he been there, I would have told him.

käyttää
- since
- tavallisimmat syytä ilmaisevat lyhenteet
Seeing that it was raining, he put on his raincoat.
The last train having gone, he had to walk.

käyttää
- muita seikoja (esim. myönnystä, vertailua, tarkoituksa) ilmaisevat sivulauseet
- though, so that, like (US), even though, even if, as if, in order that

ymmärtää
- whatever, however jne. no matter how, as though, while, whereas

käyttää
- relativilauseet
- relativilauseet ilman relativivironominia
- tavallisimmat relativilauselyhenteet
- The man living across the street in Mr. Hill.
- They saw a film directed by Frank Capra.
- This is the best thing to do.
- The girl with brown eyes is charming.

ymmärtää
- relativilauseet, jotka alkavat relativivironomieilla
- that, what, which ja who
- epäsuorat kysymyslauseet
- eri aikamuodoissa epäsuorat kysymyslauseet, jotka alkavat kysymyssanoilla tai sanoilla if, whether

He asked me if John was around.
He wondered whether they had come.

ymmärtää
- epäsuorat kysymyslauseet, jotka toimivat rakenteella whether - or
I can’t say whether he knows it or not.
Whether he knows it or not makes no makes no difference.

Suora ja epäsuora esitys
käyttää
- epäsuora esitys
- She said she wrote home.
He said he had learnt... She said she would go...
Tell me what he knows.

Lauseen hajotus
ymmärtää
- korotukseen pyrkivän lauseen hajotuksen käyttö
It is here that it happened.
It’s work that we want, not charity.
It was those boys who did it first.

Muodollinen subjekti
käyttää
- it ja there sanat aikaa, säätiää ja välimatkaa ilmaisevien sanontojen kanssa muodollisena subjektina
- It’s two hours till noon.
It’s six miles to Brighton.
There is a thick fog.
- - rakenne there is/are
- it-sana muodollisena subjektina esim. seuraavissa rakenteissa:
It’s useful for you to know this.
It took us four hours to get there.

Prepositiot
- tavalliset aikaa, paikkaa, suuntaa, keinoa ja tapaa ilmaisevat prepositiot
- opituihin verbeihin ja adjektiiveihin kiinteästi liittyvät prepositiot (lähinnä sanastollisina asioina)
- myös muita sanastollisina asioina opittuja prepositiota.
THE SCHOOL-BASED ENGLISH A1-LANGUAGE CURRICULUM OF 1994

ENGLANTI A1-KIELI
PERUSKOULUN ALA-ASTEELTA ALKANEEN VIERAAN KIELEN KURSSIT

YHTEISET KURSSIT

1. kurssi (ENA01) Nuori ja hänen maailmansa

2. kurssi (ENA02) Ihmisten kohtaaminen

3. kurssi (ENA03) Opiskelu ja työ

4. kurssi (ENA04) Ympäriöiva yhteiskunta

5. kurssi (ENA05) Tiede, talous ja teknikka
   Kurssilla käsitellään yllä mainittuihin aihepiireihin liittyviä vaativampia tekstejä. Kielioopin keskeisinä asioina ovat infinitiivi ja ing- muoto.

6. kurssi (ENA06) Kulttuuri

SYVENTÄVÄT KURSSIT

7. kurssi (ENA07) Muuttuva maailma

8. kurssi (ENA08) Laajeneva maailmankuva

9. kurssi (ENA09) Koulukohtainen soveltava kurssi
   Kurssi on tukikurssi, jolla kerrataan 1. ja 2. kurssien keskeinen aines.

ENGLANTI A1-KIELI
PERUSKOULUN ALA-ASTEELTA ALKANEEN VIERAAN KIELEN KURSSIT

YHTEISET KURSSIT

1. kurssi (ENA01) Nuori ja hänen maailmansa

2. kurssi (ENA02) Ihmisten kohtaaminen

3. kurssi (ENA03) Opiskelu ja työ

4. kurssi (ENA04) Ympäröivä yhteiskunta

5. kurssi (ENA05) Tiede, talous ja teknikka
Kursilla käsitellään yllä mainituini aihepiireihin liittyviä vaativampia tekstijä. Kielioopin keskeisinä asioina ovat infinitiivi ja ing- muoto.

6. kurssi (ENA06) Kulttuuri

SYVENTÄVÄT KURSSIT

7. kurssi (ENA07) Muuttuva maailma

8. kurssi (ENA08) Laajeneva maailmankuva
Kursilla paneudutaan kansainväliseen yhteistyöhön sekä tarkastellaan ajankohtaisia asioita europpalaisesta ja globaalista näkökulmasta. Keskitytään erilaisten tekijien monipuoliseen käsitteelyyn ja tuottamiseen. Lisäksi tehdään kuullunymäärämis- ja rakennetutkintoihin.

9. kurssi (ENA09) Kouluokhtainen soveltava kurssi
Kurssi on tukikurssi, jolla kerrataan 1. ja 2. kurssien keskeinen aines.

10. kurssi (ENA10) Kouluokhtainen soveltava kurssi
Ylioppilastutkintoon valmistautuven kertauskurssi

11. kurssi (ENA11) Kouluokhtainen soveltava kurssi
Englannin keskustelukurssi

12. kurssi (ENA12)
Natiiviopettajan pitämä keskustelukurssi
THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS IN FINNISH

1. Taustakysymyksiä:

1. Kauanko olette toiminut englannin kielen opettajana/rehtorina/apulaisrehtorina?
2. Oliko koulullanne mahdollisuus vaikuttaa v. 1987 kuntakohtaisen opetussuunnitelman englannin kielen osuuden laadintaan? Miten?
3. Oletteko itse mukana kuntakohtaisen opetussuunnitelman laadinnassa?
4. Miten olette okoneet muutoksen kuntakohtaisesta opetussuunnitelmasta koulukohtaiseen?
5. Minkä arvelette olevan tänän muutoksen taustalla?
6. Oletteko itse ollut aktiivisesti mukana koulukohtaisessa opetussuunnitelmatyössä?
7. Ovatko kaikki koulunne englannin kielen opettajat osallistuneet koulukohtaisen englannin kielen opetussuunnitelman laadintaan?
8. Oletteko saanut mielestänne riittävästi tukea/ohjausta/täydennyskoulutusta opetussuunnitelmatyöhön?
9. Kuinka usein koulunne päivittää englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmia?
10. Mikä teidän mielestänne on englannin kielen opetussuunnitelman tehtävä lukiossa?

2. Miten seuraavat henkilöt/tahot ovat osallistuneet koulukohtaisen englannin kielen opetussuunnitelman laadintaan?

1. Rehtori
2. Apulaisrehtori
3. Englannin opettajat
4. Muu henkilökunta
5. Oppilaat
6. Vanhemmat
7. Koulu ja johtokunta
8. Kunta
9. Muut oppilaitokset, mitkä?
10. Muut henkilöt/tahot, mitkä?

3. Kyselylomake: Millä tavoin katsotte eri seikkojen vaikuttaneen englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmaan?

Arvioi skaalalla 1 - 5, kuinka paljon seuraavat seikat ovat vaikuttaneet koulukohtaisen englannin kielen opetussuunnitelman laadintaan?

1 = ei lainkaan
2 = vähän
3 = jonkin verran
4 = melko paljon
5 = erittäin paljon

1. Lukiolaki
2. Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet 1994
3. Kuntakohtainen englannin kielen opetussuunnitelma 1987
4. Erilaiset kieltenopetuksen kehittämishankkeet ja -projektit
5. Ylioppilaskirjoitukset
6. Oppikirjat/muu oppimateriaali
4. Mitkä tekijät voisivat selittää seuraavat muutokset englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmassa?

1. Minkä arvelette vaikuttaneen siihen, että englannin kielen opetussuunnitelma on kutistunut huomattavasti?
2. Mikä on näkemyksenne siitä, että koulunne englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmassa ei ole yleistä osiota, joka määritteli esim. ainekohtaiset tavoitteet?
3. Koulunne englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmassa eri kurssien aihepiirit on kuvaitu otsikkojen muodossa. Mikä mahtaa olla tämän ratkaisun taustalla?
4. Miksi arvelette paikallisen aihepiirin jääneen pois koulukohtaisesta englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmasta?
5. Millä tavoin on syntynyt kurssin 2 aihepiiri "amerikkalaiseen elämäntapaan tutustuttaminen"?
6. Miten syventävien ja soveltavien kurssien aihepiirit syntyvät?
7. Mikä näkemyksenne mukaan on vaikuttanut siihen, että koulukohtaiseen englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmaan ei juurikaan ole tarkemmettu kurssikohtaisia tavoitteita?
8. Kurssin 4 kohdalla on tavoitteeksi asetettu "oppilaan perehdyttäminen aktiiviseksi yhteiskunnan jäseneksi". Mistä tämä on johdettu?
9. Minkä vuoksi arvelette koulussanne katsotun tärkeäksi mainita opeteltava kielioppiaines kunkin kurssin yhteydessä?
10. Miten kussakin kursssissa käsiteltävää kielioppiaines on valittu?
11. Oppimistehtävät: onko kirjattu jonnekin muualle kuin englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmaan?
12. Kurssista 6 on tehty portfoliokurssi: mikä on tässä taustalla?
13. Kurssin 3 on muutettu suulliseksi; mikä lienee syytä ettei sitä kuitenkaan ole kirjattu opetussuunnitelmaan?
14. Koulunne englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmassa ei mainita eri oppiaineiden vähäistä integrointiä; tapahtuuko sitä käytännössä?
15. Miten koulunne oma arvomaailma vaikuttaa englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmaan?
16. Onko koulunne englannin kielen opettajilla yhteinen käsitys kielen opetuksesta ja oppimisesta, vai onko kullakin opettajalla oma käsitys? (Mikä Teidän käsityksenne on?)
17. Tehdääanko opettajien ja sisäryhmien parissa säällöllistä kartoistusta siitä, miten englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmia pitäisi kehittää?
18. Mistä mahtaa johtua se, että vuosien 1994 ja 1998 välillä ei ole tehty paljonkaan muutoksia englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmaan?
THE INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER A, TRANSCRIPT OF SECTION 4

U  joo. sitte meillä on liuta kysymyksiä tästä nykyisestä opetussuunnitelmasta oot varmaan kuitenki sen siis joskus nähnyt,
A  no olen lukenu,
U  /ja tota ihan, ihan tota niin, tämmöisiä omia arvioita jos tuota annat näistä, elikää
A  /sentään
U  ensinnäki tää englannin kielen opetussuunnitelma on kutistunut huomattavan paljon se vanha kuntakohtakohtan oli,
A  joo
U  yli kaksymmentä sivunen nyt on kaksikyt sivua että minkä arvelet vaikuttaneen tähän seikkaan
A  /mm
joo. no oisko siinä nyt sitten se että et. voi tietysti olla että alunperi ehkä ehkä se, se kuntakohtan sitte koettiin niinku vähä, no orjuuttavanakki ehkä en tiä kun en oo sitä, sitä aikaa sillä tavalla eläny mutta tua ja sitte ajateltiin että nyt ku on on vapaat kädet niin tuota, niin ei tarvi niin sitten tosiaan ihan pitkuntarkasti kaikkeen mahdollista siihen siihen laittaa että, että annetaan vapaautta niinku siinäkin mielellä että, että, saa tosiaan sitte, valita mitä, mitä tehän miten tehän enemmän ja ja näin en en tiä sitte,
U  joo
A  muuta syystä
U  tästä koulun englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmasta on myös tämä yleinen osio jätetty pois joka määriteltä siinä vanhassa muun muassa ainekohtasest tavoitteet että minkä arvelisit että siihen, siihen on johtanutn. vai oisko samasta syystä kun
A  varmaan sitte joo joo et en mä kyllä siinäkään osaa sen tarkemmin, tarkemmin sanoo
U  joo sitte tässä opetussuunnittelumass näi eri kurssien aihepiirit on kuivaltu yleensä vaan otsikon muodossa että, mikä minkähkön on vaikuttanut tähän ratkaisuun
A  jaa. tuota tuota. niin o soisko siten taas se että et nyttään nehan on valtavan laajoja siis sillä tavalla ne aihepiirit että joku tämmönen, yhteiskunta tai tai joku näin niin ja se on niin laaja et ehkä sillä sitte halutaan niinku, justiin taas sitä samaa että ei rajata liikaa että et sielä voi sitte, käsitellä erilaisia, erilaisia aioit tietysti ehkä osa ajatellee nyt sitä että meilläik oppilaat vaihtaa opettajalta toiselle ja ja noin etti, oisko siitä toisalaat sitte jossakin tapaucksassa iha hyötyäki että ois vähän tarkemminki rajattu sitte mut ei nyt iha aihepiiri sitten miksei se vois olla tommonen laaja justiu, sita nyt voi sillä tavalla ehkä ajatella että ne menis kauheisti päällekkään tai muuta en tiä varmaan tää että, ihan, niin, kyllä mun on vaike tohunki s-
U  /mm
joo sitte tämä paikallinen aihepiiri on jääny pois kokonaan nyt tästä koulukohdaisesta englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmasta, mikä luulisit että siihen on vaikuttanut
A  eli nimeomaan niinku [kunta X] esimerkiks keskisuomi siis tämmönen joo
U  /niin
A  tuota tuota. no se jollaki tavalla ehkä tulee vähän sielä, no nyt nimeomaan kolmoskurssissa on suomi, aihetta niin ehkä se on sitte ajateltu että se jotenki siihen sitte kuitenki tulee otettua en tiä ehkä oisko sitte se että ajatellaan että peruskuolussa on sitten sitä jo käyty, niin paljon ja, ja niin, joo en taas tiä kyllähän sekii tietysti ois ihan, iha hyvä, en tiä nyt on semmonen no se nyt ei englanti (rykäisy) liity suoranaisesti mutta on puhuttu semmosesta joka joissaka kouluisa on tuota, semmonen niinkun opaskurssi järjestetään oppilaile että kun tulee vieraata koulun esimerkiks taikka [kunta X:än] yleensä niin niin kouluteeta oppilaita niinku eri kielillä nimeomaan toimimaa oppinaa sitte koulussa ja [kunta X:ssä] ja muuta ja ja näin nii siit on ollu puhetta ja mun mielestä se olis yllä aika tietenki se on sitte ihan tämmönen valinnainen niille jotka jotka on kiinnostuneita semmosesta ni se olis aika jännä koska siinä tulis just täti omaa omat kotiseutta omaa koulua ja muuta ja et mutta se nyt ei englannin kurssina olis vaan vaan semmosena yleisemä mutta tuota, mut kuitenki että eri kielillä se ois semmonen niinku jotenki aika, aika kiva vaihtoehdo en tiä niin onko sitte ajateltu et tosiaan peruskoulussa on sita ollu paljon ja että oppilaat kyllästyvät jo taas pitää, jotakoi omaa kotikukkukiasa esittää enen tiä mm
U  sitten, tämmönen kysymys että millä tavoin on synty nykkisin kaks aihepiirii amerikkalaaisen elämäntapana tutustuttaminen tämä kiinnostaa meitä sen takia kun, noissa perusteissa ei ollu mainittu kun nää muuten noudattee aika paljon näinä aihepiirit perusteid aihepiirejä mut tämä oli niinku että koului itse laittan sinne omaan opetussuunnitelmaansa
A  mm
U  tiedätkö tän tämän taustasta
tuota tuota jaa no nykyään ainake se oppikirja joka on käytössä niin se nimeomaa keskitty
enemmän siis justiin kakkoskurssi tämmöseen amerikallaisuuteen ei kyllätkään pelkästään
siihen että ei se mut en se on niinju yks semmonen mutta toisaalta se oppikirja joka sillön oli
käytössä niin niin onko to nyt sitte siinä alkuperäisessä nimeomaa ollu vai onko se tullu nyt
tän uuen oppikirjan myötä niin sitäkään mä en tiä

M

tää on ollu jo siinä alkuperäisessä #

tätä ei oo muutettu nyt

u

u

u

ija alkuperäisessä, nii,

justiin oiskohan se ollu siinäkin sitte nimeomaa se oppikirja niinju lähinnä en tiä mutta nyt
ainakin se niinju toisaan sopii se oppikirjan kanssa siis ihan hyvin kyllä, kyllä justiin koska
siinä painotetaan

A

ja

painotetaan täätä, kakkoskurssissa

A

A

U

/heidatko miten, tiedätkö miten nämä syventävien ja soveltavien kurssien

aihepiirit, synty

A

no edelleenki varmaan sen oppikirjan mukaan enemmänkki että et nimeomaa ainake ne se

seiska ja kasikurssi niin niin niissä, varmaan toisaan on, on niinju noudateltu sitä sitte.

aikaalaila suoraan

U

/uoo, no mikä arvelet että on vaikuttanut siihen että koulukohtaiseen englannin kielen

opetuussuunnitelmaan ei oo juurikaan noita kurssikohtaisia tavoitteita, laitetut

A

ja

A

M

tuleeko ne kenties esille jossain muualla sitte

A

tuota tuota. nyt mä en muista ihan tarkkaan nyt on olemassa se semmonen semmonen opinto-

opas, joka on jaetaan oppilaille ja, ja tota nyt täytyy taas tunnustaa että en kyllä muista ihan

tarkkaan mul olis semmonen käsitys et siellä jotenki olis ehkä enemmän näitä näitä tavoitteita no

ideana tietystt on se että kurssin alussa kuitenki joka tapauksessa käyään läpi oppilaitten kanssa

tavoitteita et et kylläpi se niinju, kyllä se varmaan sitten kuitenki ainake siinä käytännössä

tulee, esille mutta se minkä takia ne ei oo siellä, jaa enpä taas (naurahdus) taas tiä vois kyllä

kuvitella et olis tietystt hyvä olla mut en onko sitte nii selkeesti taas määriteltävissä

väittämättä että, niin ja taas sitte se et kuka sen päätää koska nyhtään niinju, tavallaan sitte

justiin tuohan nyt antaa sitte mahollisuuden sitäksi aika lailla niinju vaikella että et opettaja ja

oppilaat siinä kurssin alussa keskenään sitte niiäntä niistä sopii että, ta tavallaan

U

/ävain

A

u

u

u

u

A

A

A

no varmaan sitten taas tämän oppikirjan näitten näitten, niinju, teemojen mukaan et siinähän on

tämmösti politistaa ja tämmösti toisaan yhteiskunnallisia perheasioita ja ja kaikenlaisia

tämmöitä sosiaalisia asioita just siinä nelokurssissa niin tuota ehkä sitte on jotenki ajatteltu et

se on tommonen luonteva siihen, siihen niinju, siihen yhteyteen mutta

U

/joo

A

A

A

u

u

u

u

u

u

A

A

no sitte mitä sieltä opetussuunnitelmasta löytyy on muun muassa tämä opeteltava kielipiaines

joka on eritylty ku- kunkin kurssin kohdalle, että, mistä luulet että se on niinju katsottu

tärkeäksi mainita, siellä opetussuunnitelmassa

A

no olisko siinä sitte justiin tästä, kysy en en taas kyllä tiä tää on pelkkä arvaus mutta tota

(rykäisy) mutta enemmänkii siitä että nyt ku toisaan oppilaatka vaihtaa aina opettajaalt

toiselle ja tuota nykyäänäh ei voi niin siten tehdä että ajattele että että jotenki tilanteen muka

aina katoo että mikä nyt sopii mihinkin hyvin ja nii edelleen vaan että et ehkä kielipiai on sitte

justiin semmone, osa-alue jossa ajatellaan että että on ois mitä käyä tietyillä lailla läpi ne tietyt

asiat mut toisaalta sitte on on huono jos sitte jankaataan samoja asioita taas sitte useemmalla

kurssilla että et ehkä se on niinju enemmän semmonen, jossa on sitte helppo jakaa justiin tiet-

tietyille kursseille tietyt asiat että, et muilla osa-alueilla nii mä tii onko se sitte edes nii tärkeät

ruveta sitte jakama, jakama et tietenki kyllähän tavallaan sanostoki ehkä jos ajatellaan nii

jakautuis nitten aihepiiriin kautta mutta, jonkun verran, mutta tota ja taaskin tietysti

oppikirjan siinän on sitte käytännössä niinju kuitenki aika lailla se joka määritää mutta että noin

muutenki että, et aikapersiinin ihan hyvin tietysti ku oli sama opettaja nii voi tehdä että niiä

kielipiaisioitaan sitte voi jakaa mihin nyt aina milloinkin sattu ja nii edelleen nythän se ei

oikeen kyllä, oo hyvä oppilaan kannalta että, onha siinän semmoista selkeyttä sitte, toisaalta en
mä usko että sitä nyt erityisesti on haluttu painottaa että se ois siitä syystä siellä en mä kuitenkaan sitä oikeen, oikeen ajattelis
U joo että ihan tämmönen käytännön, syy taustalla
A /nii enemmän joo luulisin kyllä
U tiedätkö miten se on valittu sitten aina kuhunkin kurssin se kieliooppaines
A no taaskin sen oppikirjan mukaan kyllä aika laila että et niinhan se käytännössä kyllä, kyllä menee koska meillä on nyt käytössä sammen oppikirja jossa on siis aina ihan sen tietyn kurssin kirjaan aina tietty tietty kieliooppisat ja näin mut et tietenki on olemassa siite kirjasarjoja joissa (rykäisy) joissaan tota niin on vaan yks kieliooppikirja ja sillonhan tietenki joo se onki aika jännä sillonhan on kans kuitenki jollaki tavalla jaettava niitä sitä että, mut et meillä meillä ei o o niin että, et kyllä se nii no joo oppikirja taasen on niinku tossa
U se on no kyllä yks iso, iso vaikuttava seikkakoulussa se on ihan selvi
A /aika /määräävänä, mm
U sitten tota oppimistehtävää ei erikseen täällä opetuussuunnitelmassa oso mainittu onkohan niitä kirjattu sitte johonki mualle, vai, onko tässä taas oppikirja taustalla
A eli esimerkiks niinku
U no yks yksi esimerkki siellä opetuussuunnitelmassa oli että oli mainittu et luetaan englanninkielinen kirja, jossa tietyssä kurssissa mutta tällaisia ei oo yleensä siellä mitään eritely
A niin no se (rykäisy) se on sillä tavalla niinku joo justiin tosiaan poikkeva niinku siitä, siitä muutta että tuota, niin no joo taaskin tietysti se oppikirjaha on se mitä nyt niinku lähinnä käytetään mutta tottakaa käytetään kyllä muutakin materiaalia että, mm mut tässäkin on taas sitte se että jokaisella on niinku ne, tavallaan ne omat omat et, en mä osaa sanoo onko se nyt loppuen lopuksi hyvä asia vai huono asia mutta kuitenki totuus on se että meillä on hirvemen vähän yhteistyötä siis sillä tavalla aina niinku joitenni esimese onni on niinku joitenni kanssa näin, niin mutta se että et olis ihan kaikki koolla, ja semmossa ryhmänä jota- jotakin niinku niin kyllä tosi harvinaisia ja hirvemen vähän mitään semmossia sillä tavalla, ehkä siinä halu-
M /eikä siinä oteta aikaa
A sitten tämmöseen niinkun ryhmänä kokoontumiseen ja #

U joo no niin no okei se on joo kans yks varmaan jokaisella on kauhee kiire koko ajan niinku siinällä mut toisaalta se voi olla tietytim, vähän tekoisyyki aina m- toisaalta en tiitä, ehkä aika paljon sitä että, että tuota, no no mä nyt uskosin kylläkin että et nimeämena nuremmalla polvella tässä niin niin onis enemmänjoki ho halua tehä yhteistyötä mutta sitte nää vanhemmat kollegaat niin on niin otettuus siis siihen se tapa tehä sitä työdeti ol si ja no on edelleenki se että että tehiän se tiää- jokainen niinku kyttää sitä omaa omaa siinä ja ja tehiän yksin ja halutaan tehä yksin ja toisaalta tehallän nyt mahdollistaa siis just sen että nyt voi siten koska on nää välillä opetuussuunnitelma ja ja nää niin, sitte vo tehä nii sitte omia ratkasuja ja, eikä sillä tavalla oikeestaan kukaan pääsee sanomaan että ku täällä nyt lukeet näin ja nää niin nuk hik ei tehä nää ja nää tanskai taikka nikk tehalläh nään ja ja, ehkä se on aika nimeämena tärkeä syy siinä ollu että et halutut just, just sitte semmosta, omaa, että tuota, mutta mä uskosin et se on tosiaan muuttumassa että yleensä niinku nuremmat kyllä haluaa nimeämena seh yhteistyötä ja jotenki siihen tietyisti on niin kasvanu toisella tavalla et
U mm
A ehkä se on muuttumassa. mm varmaan muuten voi näköyä sit siellä opetuussuunnitelmassakin myöhemmin että, että se rupee muotooutumaan vähän toisenlaiseksi
U mm paljon mahdollista joo, joo, yks muutos mikä on tehty yhdensänkyntelijää ja yhdensänkyntikelihden vähillä ol ommenmäen lisäys että kurssisessa kuutonen on tehty portfoliouksuri
A joo tuota niin mä en tiä senkää senkää historiaa sen tarkemmin että tota täällähän oli, oli tää kok- kokeilu siis se nyt just tää [henkilö Y:n] ne, portfolioujutet sillon niin tota se kokeilu olen nimeämena kuutoskurssista sillon ja siitä oli jotain kouluksi ja muita ja, ja varmaa sillon ajattelivat se oli jo sillon käyttössä ja kirjattu ku mä tulin niin ne ajattelivat et tähän on hyvä idea ja tuota en mä tiä se tällä sen tarkemmin mutta se oli ihan päätetty ja, ja tota niin, niin niin se oli yks niste harvoista oloista mistä mulle tavallaan sanottiin niinku että tehalläh näin pitää tehalläh tai mutta niin sanottiin että tää on portfoliouksuri tämä kuutonen ja ja nää ni et oikeestaan ei mää harkitä sillä tavalla siis myöskään rajoitettu sen kummemmin ku mä tulin että ihan ihan mitten vaan niinku, et siinkä ol tää sama vasea josta mä nyt en siinällään tiä että siinä on hyvä ja huonot puolensa mutta mut to elői sanomien joka oli oli jostain syystä ajattelut että, tosin nyt sitte on on puhuttu että sekää ei et kylläällän ihan kaiken puolin oo kauheen hyvä válttämättä eikä, eikä toimi ehkä ihan niinku, pitäis toisaalta et mut sitä eikä olanna pikkuhiljaa jossain
vaiheessa luopumassa mutta, mutta en mä sen tarkemmin taas tiitä että, joo
A minkä takia se oli sitte, sitte otettu, varmaan siit justiin että et sillön oli niitä koulutuksia ja
M sitä on aika paljon yritetty nytte tuola yliopiston puolella, niinkun ajaa läpi tätä portfolioideaa
A /mm
M /mm mmm
A että yritettäisinkö siinä kenties valmistaa oppilaita yliopistotietämän ehkä, tai jotain tämmöstä
M en tiedä
A nii seähän on muotia nyt, ollu, monissaki, monissaki oppilaitoksissa tosiaan ja ja nän, vähän
M tosiaan tuntuu että ehkä sit se os se suurin innostus taas sititse sitte häipymässä että niinhän se
A monesti on että
M mm
A asiat tulee ja menee mutta mut et sitte on tietysti hyvä jos pystty ottamaan niitä hyvä puolia
M niinku siinäki on paljo hyväv että niitä jotenki sitte soveltaa jakossaakin mut ihan puhtaaks
A viljellynähän nuo monesti on vähä semmosia et sit niissä on niitä huonoja puolia että, mm,
M mutta että mä sitte tulin ja ajatelin jaah tämä on portfoliokurssi ja ja tuota tein sen mukaan
A sitte iha ihan kyllänkin että ja se on ollu semmonen kurssi, jossa tietoen on ollu tosiaan eniten
M kuitenki niitä yhteisiä käytänöjä että, että mitenkah tehiän sitte, sen suhteen koska siinä ei oo
A loppukoetta ja, ja semmossa että se, se on niinku, vähä erlainen
M joo, se kolmoskurssihan on nyt muutunun myös sitten suulliseksi kurskiksi sitä ei tosin oo tonne
A /mm
M /mm
A opetusuuunittelmaan kirjatu ollennaka et se on suullinen kurssi
M /mm
A joo, tota, niin sekö ei oo nyt edes
M iha ihan viimesimmässä versiossa mikä, mikä on, joo se on kyllä aika jännä oikeestaan joo,
A /ei ollu viimesimmässä päivityksessä että, ihan muuta
M kautta kuultia että se on, tä tuoutos, tapahtuu
A /joo,
no se on kyllä aika ihmeellistä vois tietysti kuvitella että, että se siellä siellä lukis, se varmaan
M taas lukee siinä opinoppaassa må luleisin mut et må m är sii- siihen voi silleen vedota ku
A må niitäkään muista ihan niin tarkkaan, joo et seähn tuli tän kimmokkeen myötä myötä n
M sitten johonka, lähetitii mukaan ettota, niin niin, niin no se on sitte tosiaan semmosena
A kokeiluna että, en tiitä onko sekään mitenkaan pysyvä siitä on taas tullu sitten muualta niinku
M muista aineyrhmistä sitte, tämmöstä kommenttia että, että ku siinähän jaetaan niitä ryhmiä
A pienemmiksi että se vie sitte liikaa tätä yleistä resursia että et sitte tavallaan tämmöstä vähä
M niinku kiteyttä sitte muiuhtaa totaa että kiu yleensä on neljänkynnemenen ryhmät ja ja minkä
A takia meillä sitte ja ruotsissa seähän on englannissa ja ruotsissa niin niin yhessä kursissaa onkin
M vaan kahenyymmenen ryhmät että mehän päästään helpolla ja ja tämmöstä siin on aina, isosaa
A koulussa on niässäki niinku sillä tavalla ongelma että (rykäisy) et ei ollu niinku, tavallaan
M pelkistään yhen aineen kannalta niin niin tehtä välttämätä aina niin semmosia ratkasuja mitä
A haluais tehä, et en tiitä kuinka kaunat sita niinku, voi sitten pitää semmosena mut se on kyllä
M ollu hirveen kiva siis se on (rykäisy) # ei tähän asiaa liitty varmaan millään tavalla mutta mutta
A se on kyllä ollu nimeoama just semmonen vähän jotenki virkistävänä niinku et oppilaatki on
M tykänny siitä tosi paljon ja,
M ja siinähän on suullinen koekin myös että, sekin on toiminn sitte ihan hyvin eikö
M /joo,
A /joo,
joo et siin on nyt, ollu, jotikut on pitänyt tuota niin nimeoamaan tämmöstä niinku
M haastattelukoetta siinä kaikikelle sitte siin on ollu joillaki taas sillä tavalla että et ollu vaan
A tämmönä suullinen esitys, joka nyt on sitte niinku, arvioitu ja et niä onko jollaki ollu peräti
M molematt naamä näitä sillä tavalla mut et kuitenki et siinäs on ollu siit semmosta arviointa
A et tietoon sitä tunti tuntia riiviointia että et se, että, en mä nyt tä siis kylläähän tietenki isossa
M ryhmässäi ihan yhtä lailla tehä sit suullisia harjoituksia pariharjoituksia ja
A ryhmäharjoituksia eihän siit oo kyse mutta mut jos sen arvioinnin kannalta ajattelee niin
M kyllähän tommosta pienempää ryhmää niin oppiv tuntemaan ne ja ja voi sitten kuunmella että
A kuka ny mitenki tekkee ja ja nän että sit jos siij on neljäkynnentä niin se on sitte taas vähä
M hankala yleensä ottaa arvioinnissa huomioo ku eihän niitä sillä tavalla pysty pysty seuraamaan
A eikä kuuntelemaan eiä oppi tuntemaan eiä eikä mitä ität, että, et se ollu onsi hyvä mutta mutta
M tuota, en tiitä kaunenko se sitte, pysyy semmosena, joo oisko sit just tosiaan tän tän väliaikasuun
A takia sitte että sitä ei oo sinne kirjattu mut toisaalta ku sinnehän voi tehdä koko ajan niitä
M muutoksia niin mikä ettei tietysti tämmöstä väliaikasesti voi olla siellä että
M kuinkas usein sitä muuten päivitetään koko opetussuunnitelmaa ja englannin kielen
A /mm
M opetussuunnitelmaa nimenomaan, tehdäänko siitä jo-nyt ole tuo kehityssuunnitelman kokous
A jolloin tuli tää uusin
M joo
A joo
M /että siinä ei mitään säännöllistä
A kartoitusta omien sitä pitää kehittää, niinkuin englannin op- opettajien keskuudessa tai
A /mm
M keskuudessa tai oppilaiden tai vanhempien keskuudessa
A ei liähänä kii siit on yleensä on on siitä nyt varmaan olennaisilla sillä tavalla joka vuosi nyt
sentään puhetta että jos siihen, tulee muutoksia niin ja ne kirjataan mut että varmaan sitte monet
A on ajattelu että no ei siheit nyt o o tidu mitä muutoksia ja antaa olla sitte semmosena et seki
M on niinku aika aika jännä kyllä että, en mää tänä siheit nyt ilmeneisesti ei suhtauduta sitä sillä
A tavalla vahvasti että ehkä se on vähä sellainen niinku semmonen sivu sivuhomma joka niinku
M ajattelaa että no jokin huoku ehkä pitää jokaisia tehdä ja nii edelleen et se ei, mm ajattelaa
A kii että tää tämminen Sitä käytännön elämän pyörittäminen tässä on niinku se, tärkeempi että
M että sekö lienee sitte syyynä et tosiaan et siihen ei oo paljonkah tehty muutoksia
A /mm
M niin, voi olla joo, et tota, en niin joo on se tietystä vähä harmi jos tommonen koetaan sillä
A tavalla riesana että se ydut, monet se ehkä on sitte vähä niin että, mm
M joo kiitoksia meidän kysymyksistä
A
M /# ihann lisäkysymys tää ei itse asiassa liity mitenkään tähän meidän
M /jaha (naurahuus)
M paperiin me ei sitä kirjattu tänne mut mä sitä mietin eilen kotoa, itsekseni olla tämminen että
M /niin
M ku englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmassa ei tää koulun arvomailma, näky kauheisti että
M /mm
M et sitä, ku siitä on kauheesti ollu keskusteluja niinku mitä me ollaan luettu näättä jutua niin se on
M niinku tavallaan ollu tässä tautasta ku täät koulukohtaisia on ruuvettu tekemään että, m-eiks se
M sit niinku kuitenkaa siten niissä ainekohtasuksissa näyt tai ainekohtasissa osuksissa näyt
M niimeomaan niinku se koulun oma, arvo, maailma niinku ne arvot tavot teettä mitä sinällään
M /aivan joo
M /mm
M joo, niin
M vai riittääkö se että se kirjataan sinne yleiseen osuuteen ja, se sitte niinkun pohjaa tavallaan
M /tota joo
M näättä ainekohtasia
A /mm
M no siin on varmaan no siit on ollu ehkä jonkun verran puhettaka että esimerkkis nyt joku
M kansainvälistys joka on kuitenki nyt sitte ihan kirjattu niihin yleisintä tämmönä yhtenä
M arvotavoitteena ja tavallaan ajaletaan että no no sehän tulee siinä tietenkin ihan automaattisesti
M et ehkä siinä niinku ajaletaan aika lailla semmosta että et jokun tämmönä niin se on
M /mm
M itseään selviä no onko se sit välittämättä taas niin se on eri juttu mutta mut et ajaletaan et et se
M ihan turha ehkä ruveta sitte sitä sinne kirjaamaan no mitä sitte jotakin muita on niin, niin, jaa, en
M tä, joo mut seki tietystä on vähä huono että jos ajaletaan et jokainen aine on sitte iha iha
M erillinen koska pitäisit ne kuitenki ne yleiset jotenki näkyä varmaan sitte jokaisessa aineessa
M eihän niillä muuten oo mitää merkitystäjos se on vaan sinne laittet ehkä ne sitte näy missä,
M missään käytännön asioissa mutta, joo
M opetussuunnitelmassa ei myöskään, tai englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmaa täätä niinkun
M aineiden keskinäisiä integrointia ei oo mitenkään kirjattu mut tapahtuu semmosta, ylipäänsä
M onko teillä niinku, muiden aineiden kanssa minkälaisista, yhteistyötä
A /joo
M tuota niin siin on tuull nyt semmonen ongelma sitä oli enemmän kuulemma että tota, nyt ku on
M tää luokatay ysteeemi niin se on vaikeuttanut sitä että koska nyt on niinkun eri aikaan eri
M oppilaat eri kurssilla ja ei oo ikinä sillä tavalla että olis vaikka niinkuu kans ryhmään joilla oli
M justin saman (rykäisy) saman jakson aikana vaikka tai yleensäkin koskaan niinku yhtä aikaa
M sanotaan nyt vaikka joku englanti ja historiata tai mutta et ku oppinaa on ihan sekaa niin nii
M se on jotenki tottakai niitä nyt siltä vois niitä teemoja jotenki jotenki ottaa, mut et sillon ku ol
luokallinen niin sillonhan se oli hirveen helppoo samalle luokalle otetut samanalaisia sitähan tehtiin kuulemma täälläi aika paljo että se, mua sinällään ihan kiinnostais meili oli (rykäisy) oli tota niin peräi yks semmonen pikku kokeilu tavallaan niin tota fysikan, ja englannin tämmölästä integroinnista se oli ihan siis tämmönen niinku muutaman tunnin oppitunnin juttu joka oli kyllä ihan ielenkenkintosta mut et se on niinku justiin se hankalaa että ku ne ei oo ne samat oppitia koskaan niinku siellä että, se joo siinä tulee tämmöisiä käyttännön ongelmia että, että sinällään jonka verran on puhuttu jotakin vaikka nyt ku englannissä nyt niitä tiivistelmää esimerkiks tehäin niin niin sitte on tota niin joilla ti reaalialaineen opettajilla niin tota vaikka ollut jotain englannin kieliisi tekstejä mistä ne on teettäjä jotakin siellä reaalialainesessa jotakin tiivistelmää suomeksi ja ja siitä ollu vääh joten puhetta että täähän tukee hyvin sitte niinku tätä englantiaksi mut siin on just niitä käytännön, käytännön ongelmia nykyään et kyllä siihen varmaan olis enemmänki, innostusta mutta tuota, mm, siinä mielessä vanha luokallinen systeemi tai siinäkin mielestä monessa muussaksi mielestäkkyllä niin niin olis parempi että siinäkö oli oll niitä hyviä puolia käyttää että on tietyistä tässä inneskii sitte hyviä mutta, ne on eri

oikeestaan ihan viei myös tämännen yksi kysymys joka ei siinänsä kuuluvahkakotista mihäärän tähän mutta mutta me, meillä tässä yksi pävi olkovestä puheet tästä käsitelystä niinkuen kielen oppimisesta niin onko, puhatteke te yleensä niinkun keskenänttä että onko täällä kouluja joku yhteinen semmonen taustalla oleva käsitys kieltenoppimisesta vai onko kellukin opetajalla sitten omat ja heijastauksen se vaan sitte niinä opettajan, omissa, metodissa opettea

no tässä tulee tas tää sama en mä nyt tietytä korostooko mä vähä liikkaaksi tätä tämmöstä sukupolvien välisä kulua mutta siis sehallon olemassa siitä ei päästä mihinkään että

nuorempien kesken niin niin kyllä me puhutaan aika paljon justiini tämmöisiä ihan ihan yleisiä justiin kieltenoppimiseen kieltenopeutukseen liittyviä asioita ja ja vertaillaa ja työtapoja ja ma-
materiaaleja vaiheillaan ja ja siis sillä tavalla ja tehään ihan ihan konkreettista yhteistyötä ja
puhutaan paljo mutta sitten taas on se että vahennamat on tottunut tekemään omalla
tyyliään varmaan heill on ihan omat käsitelykseen niitä asioista ja ja tuota niin se kulttuuri

kahyä niinku siinäkin että on vahennamat kolleegat puhuu säästä joo kaivaa puhuu säästä ja
tota puhuu jostaki, tota ruuanlaitosta ja kaikenmaalainen niin asioista ehhä jostain elokuva

miokä on käyttä kattomassa mutta ei vahingoissaan miistään vaikkapa kieltenoppimisesta ja kun
taa sitten nuoremmat kyllä niin niin ihan välistuneilla ja hyyppytenneilla ja muuta niin tavallaan

puhuan ihan niin kuninkiu lainausmerkeissä asiaa että että tota, että siinäkö on ihan tämmönen

kulttuurotuttua, että ehhä vahennamat niinku kokee sen silleen että että tota välistunnit ja mut

niin ne on semmoista niinku pelkkää rentoutumista varten miehellään ja ei haluta niinku

lämmöisiä että jokainen mitettä itkeseen, sitte ne asiat ja tota nuoremmat tas sit haluua niinku

sillä tavalla, toisinaa vahtiaat, niinku, no tietien siitä nyt juurauaksi ja muuta mutta siis että niinku

niinä kuitenki on ihan toisenlainen sitte se se ote tai silleen semmanen jotenki, se on, joo mut et

koja ajanhan se muuttuu enemmän niinku, sillä tavalla, kuitenki semmoisen, men u mielestän

postiiviseen suuntaan tietyistä ku mä nyt ajattelen niin että, että tulee enemmän sitte yhteistyötä

sit just keskustelua tommosista asioista ettei nyt tarviikaan niinku ite, ite kaikkea sitte vaan,

niin näissäki käi, trendit vaihtuu kuitenki, tämmöisiä et tulee aina, uusia teorioita miten,

/miöttä /mm

/parhaiten kieltä oppia ja

/kyllä joo nyt mä juistin kuulun tota, no juistin nyt tänään kuulun että tota (rykäisy) tampereella

yks, englannin oppetaja norssissa kirjantekijä täälle blue planetin yks tekijä en muista kylla nime

nyt, oisko silik oisko se no joo no kuitenki niin ol olinonu että kaikkeihän tärkeintä siis

lukioiskanin niin on se tuulla on hauskaa että tuota että tää tää on on sitten sitte mä just

ajattelin naurekselin tuola tai naurekseliin kyllä nyt nuntu niinku pista sydämessen että

että nameemaan täälä lukiossa kyllä välillä väähän tuntuu siltä että millonkahlen tääl on viimeksi

hauskaa että tuota vähä vähä sillleen et no se nyt on ainakin tommonen kulma kuulemma nyt sitte

hänenn mielestä tämmönen uus, tai no en tii onks se uus mut kuitenki tämmönen, trendi joka

pitäs nyt sitte olla että, ilmapirri

/viuhdettä joka paikkaan koulu kuljua myöten,

/en tiä

/minun puolestani, voimme varmaan, päättää tähän niin päätet jatkamaan, toimeessasi

/ijo, /kiitosia oikein paljon

/ijo
THE INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER B, TRANSCRIPT OF SECTION 4

M joo, sitten siirtytsimme tämässä vähän yksityiskohta-asempiin kysymyksiin tästä ihan englannin kielen, opetussuunnitelmasta sen muutoksista ja, näin pois päin, ja tuota, minkä arvelette vaikuttaneen siihen että, englannin kielen opetussuunnitelma on kutistunut, olko se nyt kahdestakymmenestä kahdesta sivusta kaksisivuisesti, vuodesta

B /no yks, (naurahdus)

M kahdeksan seitsemän vuotta niinkuin tähän päivään

B no yks on ainakin se että se bee bee englanti jät pois, (naurahdus) elikä siinä on jo puolet kunsia jääny pois, ja tota, ja sitten toinen on se s- justiin tämä askeinen, mitä sanoin että että me valtaan pelätään dokumentoida, että, mm, mä en tiedä millä tavalla te tutkijoja näette opetussuunnitelman, kuinka yksityiskohtainen sen pitäs olla ja mitä kaikkea siitä pitäs käydä ilmi, meistä se on ehkä vaan tämmön, tämmön on toisiaan tämmön hyvin yleisluontoinen, ja sitten näät tämmiset meijän, o o kollegoiden välist sopimukset on niinkuin niitä (naurahdus) niitä tärkeempää jota me ei kirjata,

M aivan.

B että tää on varmasti, ainut syy

M niin tää on varmaan vähän semmonen ikuisuuskysemyys että, miinkälinen se pitäis olla ja #

B /nii

M mitä mitä se mitä mitä pitää sisältää mitä siitä pitää käydä ilmi, mm,

B mutta,

M siitä se varmasti johtuu,

M näin on, #

B /mut se ei merkitse etteikö meijän, tuota englannin kielen opetus koko aikaa öö kehittyis ja pysyy sähä tasa siis meijän opetussuunnitelmaan kirjattu asiat eivät kuvusta siitä että meijän opetus ois jäänyt paikoilleen (naurahdus) taika taikka se taikka sitä ei yhdessä kollegiaalisesti kehitettä

M mm, aivan, no, tuota tuota miikähän on teidän näkemys siitä että tässä teidän kohtaan englannin kielen opetussuunnitelma de ei ole yleistä osiota erikseen, missä määriteltää yleiset englannin kielen opetuksen tavoitteet esimerkiksi, sellaista ei ole että on, on sitten näät niinkuin kurseittain

B öööö me on varmaan (naurahdus) menty ruotsiin perässä elikä ruotsisMi ruotsiin, suunnitelmaa de ilmeisesti ensiks ja, ja sit ne- nekään ei oo laittaneet plus sitten semmonen asia että tuota, koska englanti ja ruotsi de pakollisia kieliä, niin me ollaan ilmeisesti nähty että se semmonen yleinen osuus niinku ranskasssa joka aikaisemmin oli huomattavasti heräyvmpi ja pitkä ja, mm ja tuota, mitenkä mä nyt sanosin semmonen hyvin omahaatuinen, niin me ollaan käsittettä että tällä yleisellä osuudella, on näissä bee kaks ja be bolmei kielliss tämmön niinku markkinointiarvo, elikä, pitää houkutella oppilaat ylitsemaan bee kaks ja be bolmei kieliä, koska siinä luvataan että ranska on ee uun kieli ja ja sitä tarvitaan siellä ja sitä tarvitaan täällä ja ja muuta että valitkaa nyt tämä ranska (naurahdus) samaten espanja ja, ja miksei saksakin ja venän ja muuta, de ollaan varmaan, ihan toisiaan laiskuuttame ajateltu että kun ne de pakollisia kieliä ni me de tarvita tämmöist markkinointiosuutta siellä (naurahdus)

M selvä, ää miikähän mahtaa olla ra- tämmöen ratkasun taustalla että kursesi englannin kielen kursesi aihepiirit on kuvattu vain otsikon muodossa. niitä ei ole sitten sen tarkemmin, selitetty, miten miten de päättyyd tämmöen, ratkaisuun

B nii, meille ei oo varmasti ollu kauheen selväät et ketä varten tämmön opetussuunnitelmaa tehdaan, ketäs varten näät, nää kuvukset pitäs olla sitten laajempia,

M joo, sitähän voidaan tietyt miittä mut se ei oo tavallaa meidän, nii että tuota,

B /nauru b

M te ootte kokonen et se ei oo ollu tarpeellista niitä #

B /nii me ollaan koetti et se ei oo ollu tarpeellista, koska tuota, ei meijän meijän oppilaita ei lue opetussuunnitelman tieteenkään,

M mm

B nii ni, me ei oo me ei oo varmaan niinkun katsottu sitä tarpeelliseksi, (naurahdus)

M aivan, että, mahdollisimman vapaat kädet sitä käytännössä soveltaa sitä

B /nii, /nii aivan oikein mahdollisimman vapaat kädet ja joka kerta vähän eri tavalla, plus sitten että sitten niistä mm, tota yhteen veto pistetti sitten näitten oppaaseen, ootekö te tämmöen saanu

M se e, e #

B /mm ni tääl on tämmöset virheen lyhetyt kurssiselostukset, niin niin tota, niin me ollaan sitte
tietysti valmiiks typistetty niitätä toneksi eli tästä ne lukee,

M

di eitää on täällä on nyt sitte niiniku tämmönä suppea opetussuunnitelma heille,

M

ainavan

M

jossa, jossa heille on hyvin riitää nämä kurssien, (naurahdus) otsikot pakollisista kielistä,
mutta jokui, sanotaan liikunnan soveltava kurssi, niin niinä täyttää selostaa, mitä tehdään ja
missä tehdään ja kuinka paljon tehdään ja ja niin edelleen jotta ne jälleen valitsisivat sen,

M

aha, #

B

/nii (naurahdus) mutta kun nää- tään kun täällä on pakollinen aine niin ne vaan kattoo että ahaatio
että tota, kakkoskurssilla syvennätään siihen ja kolmoskurssilla syvennätään tähän ja, ja niin
päin pois ja ne ottaa ne automaattisesti, (naurahdus) elikkä ai nain sutti englannissa on se sei-
selisikka ja kasi kurssi, jotka ei oo pakollisia nythä on kuu kurssia pakollista, niin niin tuota siinä
sitten äää valtakunnallisissa syventävää voin sitte vähän laajemmin varmasti runoilla että
mikä, mikä niitätä aihepiiri on ja mikä ne on tärkeitä, ne on siksi tärkeitä että, se
yliloppilastutkinto perustuu kuitenkin kahdeksaan kurssii, eikä vaan siihen kuuteen
pakolliseen,

M

ainavan

M

mm, että jos, jos sitä, tärkeyttää ajattelis ni se löytys niiniku sitätkän että niin sitä pitää sitte
varmaan, meijän vähän laajemmin kuvata

M

mm, mikä muuten mahtaa olla syyäni siihen että on jääny täällä laukinnainen aihepiiri ainaakin tuosta
kirjatusta opetussuunnitelmasta pois eli, [kunta X] näkökulma

M

joka on ollu aikasemmin niinkö

M

kyllä, siinä kuntakohtaisessa oli joka kurssin #

B

/no siinä oli pakko ollakin varmasti joo, se on varmaan jääny
ihani sitä varten että, jälleen kerran se on automaattisesti meillä noissa, oppimateriaaleissa. siel
oen harvine hyvin käsitylyt suomi, ää ja suomen esiteleminen, sekä näissä alemmissa kurssissa
että nyt, justiin tänä päivänä, käsitetään tuolla kasi kurssissa tättä, suomen esitellyä ni se se
automatillisesti sisältyy sit

M

joo, mitenhan on mahtau sujnyö tän kurssin kaks aihepiiri amerikkalaiseen elämäntapaan
tutustuttaminen

B

jälleen oppimateriaaliin pohjalta, (naurahdus) ihan sieltä,

M

joo

B

ja se on meille helppo opettea ku meil on aina niitä vaihowoppilaata, ja he antavat sitte
 tämmösen autenttisen lisän sinne

M

mitenhan teillä syntyy sitten näää, syventävien ja soveltavien kurssien aihepiirit, mitä miten ne
valitaan

B

meil ei oo muuta kun valtakunnallisesti syventävät vaan se seittemän ja kaheksan ja niinhä
vaikutta jälleen materiaali, ja ja

M

/entää sitten näää siitä eteenpääi sinne kahteentoista asti

B

/no siitä eteenpääi, no siitä
eteenpääi on sitten, on tota, aam yhdeksäinen on se tuikikurssi, joka on siis ykkösiille ja
kakkosille, võöm kieliper ja mm ja muun kertauskurssi, heikommin menestyville, ja sitten se
kympikurssi on abikurssi, jossa tuota, oo harjoitetaan sitä yliloppilastutkinto varten, ja
sittenen yks- toista on vissiin tänä vuonna vissiin se syntyperinen opettajan pitämä
keskustelukurssi,

M

onko nii- oo niinkuin millä perusteella teillä on sitten valittu onko opettajien kesken, suunniteltu
että tämmösiä ja tämmösiä kurssije, sitten järjestetään, vai onko ope-

B

/on, opettajien kesken nimenomaan, joo,

M

selvä,

B

jooy kyllä

M

joo, ää, mikäähän on vaikuttanut teidän näkemyksen mukaan siihen että näihin kurssikohtaisiin,
opetus- kursssi-, tai englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmaa ei oo kirjattu näitä kurssikohtaisia
tavoteita

B

ne on aikasemmin ollu siel on ollu varmasti ihan yksityiskohtaisesti mitä rakenteita käydään
läpi ja muuta mut jälleen ni me ollaan katottu että (naurahdus), että kun, oppilaat ei täta lue tättä
opetussuunnitelmaa ni mikä heijän, ääm että kekkä varten me kui- kirjattas ne tänne (---)

M

joo, ää,

B

kylähän tääällä jotaki-, ni mistä mistä kurssista oli puhe äske

M

no ihan yleensä näistä et siellä, tais kahdesa nyt en ulkoo muista missä niitä oli mainittu,
tavotteet, joo kurssissa neljä muun muassa, on tämmönen tavote asetettu kun oppilaan
perehdytäminen a- aktiiviseksi yhteiskunnan jäseneksi,

B

mm
M että mistähän semmonen tavote on on syntynyt, miten, se on johdettu
B ää, se on kurssi joka käsittelee nimenomaan tuota, yhteiskuntaa ja sen, suomia oikeuksia ja
velvollisuuksia ja niin edelleen,
M eli siitä aihepiiristä
B /aihepiiristä suoraan tullu niin, mm
M /joon. 60, miksi teidän koulussa on katsottu tärkeäks
mainita opetussuunnitelmassa jokaisen, kurssin kohdalla tää opettettava kielioppiaines
B tä kuka sen on täällä aloittaa joku muu kieli on varmaan aloittaa (naurua) sen takia, varmaan
siitä on yritetty saada semmonen kattava esitys niinkun mmemmä misemmästä pakollisesta
viimeiseen pakolliseen, että, että tota,
M onko se sitten enemmänkin opettajia varten
B niin varmasti on opettajia varten jou, jou varmaan, ja nyt kun meille tuli uusia opettajia tään
syksynä niin, yks näistä huolellisesti, luki sitte koko meijän koulun opetussuunnitelman kesällä
ja me (naurahdus), kaikista aineista että tota, mmrom että ehkä se sitten, hänelle oman aineensa
kannalta hän tuli ruotsin opettajaksi niin, niin anto sitten viitteitä että mitä missäkin kurssissa
opetetaan kielioppia,
M jou
B jou varmasti se on opettajia varten yksinkertasesti
M millä perusteella on valittu tai kohdennettu, tää kielioppiaines kuhunkin kurssii
B ihan oppimateriaalin perusteella
M jou oppimistehtävistä ois kysytyt ja onko näitä kirjattu, sitten jonkinään muualle kun niitä
varsinaisia oppimistehtäviä ei o sinne opetussuunnitelmaan, listattu sen kummemmin
B /mitä-
mitä tarkotat oppimistehtävällä
M ää, siellä on yhdenä kursissaa mainittu tämämenen että luetaan englanninkielinen kirja,
B jou
M että sen tyylisiä
B jou. eli tota se on, tämämenen portfoliokurssi
M jou, tiety-
B mm. mm. onhan täällä harjoitellaan kuullun ja luetun ymmärtämistä rakenteita, jatketaan
vaativamman kirjallisen ja suullisen viestinnän harjottelua
M jou, me, ei niitä tahtoa ihan niinku kategorisoida oppimistehtäviä vaan enemmän niin kuin
tämämenen, kielien osa-alueiden painotukseks taas sitten, että tämämeniä konkreettisissä
B /nii siis onko-
oppimistehtäviä kuten esimerkiksi, vaikka kirjoitamman kirjoittaminen tai, tai haastattelun
tekeminen tai, kuten esimerkiksi tuo kirjan lukeminen,
B jou
M niin me, niinku tehtiiin tämämenen (naurahdus) jako sitten
B jou jou ihan tota, no tota, mm. no jos te (naurahdus) haastattelusite kaikki meitä englannin
opettajia ni voi olla että, että näistä, tulis huomattavasti pitempää selosteta joka ikiset kurssin
kohdalla, elikkä nyt, kun tässä kimmokkeeessa on olut mukana must tuntuu että jokainen, lisäis
näihin, näihin tuota siitä suullistamisesta jotakin, elikkä pienen, suullisen esityksen pitämisen,
jo kolmannesta kursiista lähtien, oikeaan kakkokurssilla ne joutuu tekemään jo, pitämään jo
omasta harrastuksestaan tommosen pienen, muutaman minuutin suullisen jutun ja, ja
kolmanneessa, on sitten, keskustelut ja ryhmäkeskustelut ja debattit ja sitin muut jotka, on vaan
tänne jääny kirjaamatta, mm
M mm, selvää, kursissa kuus on tehty portfoliokurssi mikä mahtaa olla siinä taustalla
B sitä varten et ku se en tämämenen kulttuurikurssi ni siinä annetaan, oppilaille mahdollisimman,
niinku vapaat kädet itse valita, että jokaisen portfolio on hyvin yksilöilin ja hyvin erillainen,
elikkä ensinnäkin tuo kirja, saa olla melkein pitää vaan kun sen hyväksyttää opettajalla ja sit
sinne saa laittaa omia, omia tuotoksia kuten novelleja ja, runoja ja, sitten, tuota, sillä
kurssillahe myöskin pitävät tämämenen pitemmän suullisen esityksen, yleensä pareittain jostakin
kulttuurin alueesta ja laittavat sen rungon sinne portfolioon ja, ja tuota, mm sitten he panevat
sinne elokuva-arvostelun taikka teatteriarvostelun tai konserttiarvostelun, televisio-ohjelma-
arvostelun tai jonkun tällä jokin eli te se on siis,
M jou
B heille tämämenen niinkun, hyvinkin produktiivinen kurssi
M aivan, onko siinä ajatteltu jotain tietytä tavoitetta tai, tulevaisuudessa että mihin tällä,
portfoliokoulutuksella tähdätään
B mm, no ehkä siihen itsesarviointiin, elikkä heidän täytyy niinkun itse pystyä päättämään mitä
he panee sinne portfolioon, niistä omista tuotoksistaan, ja sitten tota, yks selkeä tavote on se
etta, että he ensimmäistä kertaa lukevat tämämenen, närinkin pitkän, tekstikokonaisuuden ku
kokonaisen, kirjan ja kokevat siinä sen et he hallitsee kieltä, ymmärtämättä nyt ihan joka ikistä sanaa että tää nyt on yks tavote että, rohakasta heitä niinkun lukemaan englannin kielistä tekstiä, laajemmaltakin

M tuo kurssi kolme oli muutettu suulliseksi mutta, mistähän se johtuu että sitä ei oo sinne kuitenkaan dokumentti kirjattu eli opetuussuunnitelma
B no, se on vasta viime vuonna tehty ja (naurahdus) ja tota, tätä ei oo sitten siltä kohdal- kohdalta päivitetty
M eli täää on nyt toinen opetusvuosi kun sitä, opetetaan
B /tää on toinen opetusvuosi se on siis, yhte- se on yhteent kansan vasta opetettu eliikä viime keväinä, koska meil on aina vasta siiellä viidennessa jakossa tai kuudennessa jakossa tä englannin kolma- kolmas kurssi, niin tota, se oo pitäny viime, toukokuussa kaikkien muitten kiireitten ohella sitten tänne kirjata (naurahdus), se on pelkkä, pelkkä tota, tommonen lipsahdus
M joo, ääm (---) täällä, englannin kielen, koulunne englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmassa ei mainita ei oppinai- aineiden välisestä integroinnista sen kummemmin mitään, tapahtuuko sitä käytännössä onko englannin kielellä, mahdoll- teli mahdollisutta yhteistyöhön muiden oppiaaineiden kanssa
B nii, se on semmonen ikuisuuskysymys joka tietysti olis hirmu ihana joka toteutuis mutta, meillä ei oo, joo, me on jyrityt sitä, ns tuota englannin viitoskurssissa, missä on tätä teknillää ja tiedettä ja fysikkää ja sun mutta semmosta, ja sitten me ollaan sitä, mm jossakin, no niin tossa portfoliokurssissa, aa oo, ja oikeestaan sillä tavalla että jos he pitävi tuosta, mm oo, maalautaasteesta niitä omia esityksisäniä niin sillon, he saavat apua sitten meijän kuvaamataidon opettajalta ja, ja täällä tavalla sii asiantuntija-apua nyt joka tapauksessa mutta, ei meillä oo mitään peru- perusteellisia, noita integraaatioontilmiä, varmaan johtuen sitä tästä meijän lukion koosta, et meil on siis kuussaan eläväntä oppilasta ja kaksasta kurssia (naurahdus) sin se tota, vaatis niin, hikisen urakan sitten niitten kurssien yhteenvetuamiassa että, meil ei oo siihen ollu yksinkertaisesti energiaa, et se on tämmöstä hyvin satunnaissta, eliikä sitten toisimpään niin, din joku historian, kurss on saatettu opettaa englanniksi, joku maantieen kurssi on saatettu opettaa englanniksi, joku, kuvaamataidon kurssi on saatettu opettaa englanniksi et englantia on niinku käytetty tämmönen välineaineena sitten, näis- näitten muitten kurssien sisällä eliikää me on, yks kaks kolme, neljä opettajaa on käynny tään tämmöen, tce-koulutuksen, teaching content through language, ja tota, mm ja ovat niinkun, suurinpiirtein yhden kurssin vuodessa pitäneet sitte englanniksi,
M aivan
B mm, että tämmöstä integraatiota on ollu mutta ei muuta
M mm, mitenähän koulunne oma arvomaailma mahtaa vaikuttaa englannin kielen opetussuunnitelmamaa, ja-, ja jos niin minä, siiellä
B /no, nii, no tota, yks semmonen painopistet- alueista on, taikka meijän toiminta-ajatus on kansallisesta pohjalta kansainvälisyteen, ja tuota (rykäisy), tuota tuota. mm kyllä ytt varmasti se (naurahdus) siis englannin, opetussessa ei oo ollu minkään näköisiä tämmöisiä niinku motivoointgelmia eliikää, jokaaineen nykyajan nuori tajua että, että mm, pystyäseen kommunikoimaan nykyisessä (naurahdus), nykyisessä kansainvälisessä maailmassa niin englantia hän tarviseet, et siin ei olla, ollu niinku mitään tällasta, tällasta tota, miettimistäkään
M (---) onko teidän koulussa englannin kielen opetajilla jokin yhteinen käsitys kielen opettamisesta ja oppimisesta vai onko oppitajilla omat
B mm, yhteinen käsitys
M niin onko teillä joku niinkun että näin, meidän koulussa ajatellaan että oppilaat oppii englannin kieltä että, #
B /ei ei semmosta voi olla ei ei hyväen aika voi olla me ollaan, monet on opettettu sis, vähintään yli kaaksy vuotta niin kyl se varmasti on se (naurahdus) aika meijän käsityksiä muottouttaan ja ja tota, mm
M oma kokemus vaikuttaa #
B /oma kokemus vaikuttaa varmasti aika vahvasti joka ikisen, niinkun tämmöseen toteuttamistapaan
M minkälainen teillä itseelläneen on käsitys kielenoppimisesta ja opettamisesta
B mmm, sis, sis missä mielessä käsitys (naurahdus)
M mm ää, millä tavalla niinkun, mi- parhaiten oppii, englannin kieltä
B englannin kieltä, no sis kielnenopetushan on tämmönen, interaktiviinen aine kaiken aikaa, eliikää tota, mitä enemmän ne oppilaat voi niinkun itte tehdä olla äänessä, öööm kirjotta reagoida, ja ja niin päin pois sitä paremmin ne tietenkin oppii, mikä on taas ongelma taas meijän, isossa lukiossa missä saattaa neljäykkentä olla tai neljäykkentäkolme on ytt yhellä meijän
englannin opettajalla kakkoskurssilla, eli tässä olisi sihnetapaus että olis tota, semmosia kahdenkymmenen pintaan nämä ryhmät, jossa vois sitte helposti aina, aina tuota niin niin luokan sisäisestä mm, jakaa jakaar ryhmien ja pareihin ja pista i op://'aoppita ninkun töihin ja ja muuta mut
kun sitä neljääkymmenetkölmä rupea niinkun, uuเดเสsnienejärjestelmään niin niin menee tähän
tällasee niin tuhottomasti (naurahdus) aikaa, että sitten tota, joutuu frontaalipotustakin tekemään ei siinä mikään auta, enkä mä sitäkään sitten kokonaan sulkis pois eli tota, oö
opillaan on kuitenkin sillä tavalla konservatiivsia, että jotkut tiettym, asian sanotaan nyt vaikka
kieloppiasiat ni ne tykkää siitä että että heille, pistetään ne pakettiin ja sanotaan että se on nyt
niinkun tässä ja sitä harjottellaan ja sillä siisti, varskin oö pitkän mattikan, lukijat jotka on
muutenkin tämmösiä ninkun loogisia ja systeemaattisia ja muuta, niin mä en panis pois tätä
tämmöstä, än äs oö luonevoitaa tyyliä, tietyissä asioidissa kun ei sitä oo liikaa vaan vaan sit on
vaan siis, sillän tällön ja selvitetään joku kokonaisuus ja ja sitten vahvistetaan sitä harjottelulla
ni ni, ne on kokeneet sen hyväntä, ja varskin mutokkielsiä ninkun ruotsissa ja saksassa nih
väristä vielä enemmän mutta, kyllä englannissä myöskin, mutta että nkyjäjä opettajahan on
yhä enemmän tämmönen ninkun, työnohtaja ja työnjakaja että hän niinkun, mm kkeet ne
tehtävät ja, ja on sitte siellä se kiertävä asiantuntija ja konsul- konsultti jonka johon
turvavuttaaan ja kysyttään neuvoo sanoja ja niin päin pois,

M

aivan.

B

tot, sim- tottakai, sitä paremmin ne oppi mitä enemmän ne panee itte tekemään

M

mm, tehdänkö teidän koulussa sidosryhmien ja opettajien, parissa kartotusta siitä että miten
englannin kielien opetusuunnitelmaa pitäisi kehitä

B

ei kyllä se jätetään varmaan meijän ihan englannin kielien opettajien varaan (naurahdus)

M

ei, ihan opettajien kesken sitten.

B

/joo, ei, joo, kyllä kyllä joo

M

joo, ja vielä sitten ihan viimeisenä kysymyksenä tämmönen että (naurahdus) mistähän mahtaa
johtua että vuosisin yhdessänkytneeljä yhdessänkytkkehdeksään ei ole juurikaan muutetut tuota
englannin kielien opetusuunnitelmaa

B

no just siitä että kun (naurahdus) kouluemässä on niin kaueen paljon kaikkea niin me
huokastsin helpotuksesta kun me saatiin tämä sillön valmiiksi (naurahdus) oli tässä kuitenkin
aika, mm aika siis niinku semmonen puurtamina, jos aatellaan kaiken kaikkiaan tätä, yleistä
osaa ja alkuosaan ja muuta niin me varmaesti, niinku opettajakuntaa aatтелii että se on nyt siinka,
ja nimenomaan herättiin sitten viime keväästä että, seinh osi pitäyty joka ikieni, vuosi niinkun
päivittää ja katuo että mihinkäs me ollaankaan sitoututta, täällähän puhtaan nimenomaan siitä
itsearvioinnista ja rohkasevasta arvioinnista ja kannustavasta suhtautumisesta ja mistä kaikesta
ni seinh päitä tavallaan, katsoo niinkun joka vuosi,

M


B

mutta ei se oli varmasti tämmönen helpotuksen huokaus että no se on nyt siinka (naurua)

M

niin, jonkinlainen työväysymyshäkä (naurua)

B

/jonkinlainen työväsymys että (naurua) et si- sitä se siitä se
johtuu mut nyt me ollaan herättä tähän tietoisuuteen ja ja nyt meil on oikein hyvin toimiva
opsyrhmä näköjään, joka, siellä viime keväästä poimi jo tämmösen, täällän tuota, opettajan
itsearviointisuodenn, esille ja pari meidät vastaamaan kaikkiin nihin ää ja ja nyt tään syksynä
sitten niin niinku kerroin ni pari viikko sitten kokoonnuttiin pohtimaan niptä meijän
arviointiperusteita aineissa ku aineissa, ja mitä, ymmärtään sovetavalla kurssilla ja ja
arvioidaanko se, ässällä taikka hoolia että hyväksyty ja ja ja niin edelleen, että me ollaan nyt
tekemääsä parannusta (naurua), opetusuunnitelman päivittämisessä

M


niin.

B

oisko sella ollu vielä jotain tarkennusta

U

no, tässä keskustelun aikana oikeestaan semmonen vaan tuli mieleen ku sanoitte että, että
opillaan ei tätä opetusuunnitelmaa näe, ja opettajilla on paljon sitte niinkun teilläkin
semmossi kirjaamat- mia omia menetelmiä että, kuka teillä on mieleessä kun te kirjottate tän
opetusuunnitelman siis tavallaan kemennel, se tehdään vai onko se vain virallinen dokumentti
joka on pakko tehdä

B

niin me ollaan sitä varmasti itsenkin pohdittu en kenelle se tehdään, se opetusuunnitelma
mm, tekevätkö opettajat sen tosillensa vai, vai vai, tehdänkö se tonne
koulutuslautakunnalle (naurahdus) vai tota, kenelle se tehdään että, meil ei varmaesti o
kaueen kauheesti ollu edes selviillä kemennel tehdään

M

mm, tunteuks siitä että siitä pitäisi tulla selvemmät, ohjeet sitten jostain tain

B

/tuntus, jaa. kyllä

varmasti, joo, ja mitä se sitten kaivattin oö niin tuota, pikkuksen taaksepäin tässä meijän jutussa,
mennäkseni, oö kun viime lauantaina siis ei nyt vaan, si- sitä edellisennä oli nyt pitkästä aikaa
tämmönen kaupunkikohtaan elikkä siis kuntakohtana vesopäivä, ja me siellä sitten, olikohan
meitä kolmesta kielenopettajaa siellä oli niitä työpaajoja vaikka kuinka paljon niin, niin yhdessä sitten työpajassa, mm pohdittiin, että miten herveen hyvä olis että, vielä edelleen kaupungin saman kielen opettajat kokoontuisivat ja pohditsivat, että me ollaan nyt kauheen kauan olut tällä, ihan vaan oman koulun sisällä,

mm

ja tota mäkin muistan silloin kun mä tänne tulin, sittemänkytyvulla (naurahdus), niin tuota vähän välillä monta kertaa vuodessa niin niin, oo kaupungin tämmönä yhdysoptattaja kokos, kaikkien koulujen englannin opettajat koolle ja se oli sitte, hyvin hedelmällistä mm, niin tota, keskustelua, että miten teillä näin meillä ja, tämmöstä ajastujen vaihtoo ja, ja semmosta, että sitä me nyt ihan selvästi kaivattui, mutta ku se yhdysoptattaja, järjestelmä purettiin, niin niin ei me sitten, ei oo ollu ketään kokoontusujaa (naurahdus)

mm

koulut on jätetty niinku aika lailla omilleen tämän asian kanssa

/kyllä, kyllä, hyvin hyvin omillensa, että tota tehdäänkö me asioita musta oli herveen kiva kuulla nyt me mennään sitten käymään tuolla voi jonmaalla kun, kun heillä on tämmönä moderni kielistudio ni musta oli herveen kiva kuulla asioita mitä te tekee siellä kil- kielistudioissa, ja me ollaan nyt saamassa uus kielistudio ja me halutaan kauheesti kouluttauuta, siihen mitä me voidaan kielistudioissa tehdä, ku meijän, vanha studio, vuodella seittemänkymentäkö, on niinku sillä, mm rääämätäispisteessä, ja elikää me, ollaan, pelkäävän sydämin viety sinne, aina joukkou kunnentelemää yyookuunteluella (naurahdus) mutta ei oo uskallettu oikein mitään muuta tehdä, eikä siellä oo voinkaan tehdä nii täi tämmöitä että kykyttäen, kaksi, oppilasta yhteen taika kenties neljä ja, puheineksusteluta ja sun muita tallasia ei ollenkaan et tää on niaitä, iankaikkisen vanhoja tampereita ni, taika, mikä se nyt sähköasohaa, ni tällasta kaikkea että kun koulu tuota mm kaupungissa on nyt vaan, cyngaeus ja voimossa, norssi nyt on niin, omassa rauhassansa ja me, siis tän verran vaan lukioita ni ei ois herveen kiva niinkun, toisiaan, vaihtaa ajatuksia vähän niinkun, ehän sitä ku- kukaan estää mutta et jo ei oo tämmöitä, niinkun luotua järjestelmää että joku toimis kokoontusujana niin, opettajat on niin työllistettyjä ei ei kukaan sitte

niin, siihen ei enää sitten

/sitte ryhdy jos ei oo, oo toisiaan tämmöitä,

joo

puiittee, mm ootekoko te verranneet minkään muun koulun opetusunuinittelmiä #

tää on itsesisässä case study elikää tapaustutkimus ihan, tän tutkimuksen luonteenkin, vuoksi

/aaha, /joo,

tää paisus, niinkun, liian isoksi et jos me ruvettas vertaan vielä niinku muiten, et se ois kyllä

liian, joo, /joo, /joo

tietysti hyvin mielenkiintosta kattoo et minkälaisia eroja sitten, mutta me ollaan nyt otettu

/nauura) , /nii, nii

teidän koulu sitten niinkun tämmöseks, joo,

/tämmöseks case studyks, joo joo, joo

/joo,

joo,

just joo, joo,

et tällä tavalla

et kyllä ilmeisesti toisiaan nin tämä dokumentti kertoo herveen vähän (naurahdus) meijän, meijän varsinaisista, opetuskäytänteistä sanotaanko niiin,

nii,

mm

tää on kuitenkin sen verran, inhimillistä työtä sillä tavalla että tällä saamme, kehitystä tapahtuu koko ajan mutta sitte, nii dokumentti #

/nu, /nu, /se vaan ei näy tästä nii, joo etää että siis, joo

joo, no meijän täytyy varmaa mennä itseemme ja mieltää että kenelle me tämä todella tehdään, tätä opetusunintelma. oo sen verran vaan vihjeenä että, että jos te olisitte tutustuneet muiten koulujen ne olis ollu vielä hintelämpää (nauura), meijänkin on aika hintelä kielten kohdalta mutta, mutta ne ois ollu ehkä vielä hintelämpää, mä jouduin sen viime keväänä tekemään kun me tätä omaa, omaamme sitten työstettiin, hiki hatussa yöta päiväin sinne, koulutuslautakunnalle että

siellä on kyllä perusteissa annettu niin, vapaat kädet että loppujen lopuks, se on sitte ihan jokaisen koulun, oma asia että miten se on katsottu sitte,
B nii, joo mut kyllä raamit sais olla ehkä pikkusen, ää tuota, mm tiukemmat eli pitäs niinku luetella mitä siitä tulee käydä ilmi
M mm, jotta te, sitä ootte kaivannu enemmän
B /nii, sitä, ollaan kaivattu enemmän et mitä mitä siitä tulis käydä ilmi ni varmasti sieltä sitte ne asiat (naurahdus) löytys, joo, joo, että näin
M no,
B (naurua)
U /kiitoksia paljon
M kiitos paljon
B kiitos teille
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M ihan tämmönä kysymys että pidetäänkö opettajien ja sitten koulun sidoksryhmien parissa kartotuista säännöllistä kartotuista sitä että, että miten opetussuunnitelmaa pitäisi kehitä

P tota, sanotaan että se on niinkin hyvin toimivan opetussuunnitelman elinehto että sitä peilataan aika ajoin vanhempien kanssa ja oppilaiden kanssa ja niiden tahojen kanssa jotka esimerkiksi liittyvät sitte kouluan, yrityselsämä ja

M /onko lukioissa muuten vielä säännöllisiä näitä

vanhempainiltoja tai tallaisia, kokoontumisia

P /on paljon ja # en mä tiedä onks sillä nyt mihinkään, varmasti vielä on uudessaki koululaisissa tulee olemaan se että että koulun ja kodin yhteistyön, yhteistyötä, tulee tulee harjottaa säännöllisesti elikää se o- tarkottaa sitä että vähistään täytty pitää ne vanhempainillat, mitenkä ne sitten järjestetään käytännössä niin se on, asia erikseen mutta että,

M /mm

et kyllä, mä en, en tuota, pidä mahdollisena sitä että joku koulu ei järjestäisi vanhempainiltoja

M mm

P olen tosin kuulu että helsingissä kun o-, on, on kuulemma hirveen huonosti ollaan kiinnostuttu näistä vanhempainiloista että siellä, sitä on on niinku vähän ju ruvettu kahittamaan mutta, ainakin meillä vanhemmat käyvät vielä hirvit- hyvin ei nyt hirviittävä hyvin tienkään mutta käyvät vielä hyvin vanhempainilloissa että, että niin kauan kun kun nämme että vanhemmat ovat kiinnostuneita tästä, tästä tuota, opinahjosta jota heidän lapsensa käyvät niin, niin sehän on koululle kunnia-asia ja tienkä hyvä asia että sinne tulee vanhempi paikalle

M kyllä, ja sitten mikä mahtaa olla teidän käsitys sitä että vuio- teidän koulussa ei vuosien yhdeksänkymmelja ja yhdeksänkymkideksan välillä o omenomaan englannin kieleen, opetussuunnitelmaan tehty paljon muutosia että se on pysynyt muta burjin samanlaisena

M niin. oö, jos mä nyt sen verran mä tossa kun kun marja-leena leksin kerto tästä teidän haastattelusta hän ilmeisesti korosti kovasti että kun oppimateriaalit ovat niin hyviä että

M mm

et tuota, on on, nähty, nähty niinku hyvin helpoksi, pitää sitä opetus, opetusta niinku niis- niin niissän rameissa että, että tuota ja sitten mutta, mä olen myöskin siinä että jos astuaan jotaan englannin kielen opetussuunnitelman kokonaisuutta kun siellä on niin paljon niitä, kursseja jo olemassa luonnostaan et siel on kuus pakollista kursseja kaks valtakunnallista täydentäävää kursseja sihen ei tarvita oikeestaan paljon enää lisää siellä on varmasti hyvä olla se

M /mm

keskustelukurssi siten varmaan tutkikurssi heikomille aineksen # ja sitten mahdollinen apikurssi jolla repataan jos nyt halutaan niin sitten to- puhua todennäköisesti ylioppilaskirjoituksista niin

M niin

P niin varmaan löytä, niissä koulussa joissa on satsaattu niin ku englantinkin niin ne on just tämmöisiä prepaahkursseja et mä nyt en tiedä että onko niillä mitään tekemistä englannin kielen opetussuunnitelman jalostumisen kanssa jos järjestetään prepaahkursseja vaan sitte

M /mm

oppilaille että, ja kun sekä liitty hyvin, hyvin tuota rängeisti vaan sitten että ne menestyisivät hyvin ylioppilaskirjoituksissa eikä suinka niin että heidän englannin kielen oppimis ja

M /mm

oppiminen laajentui nyt sitten vähän uusiin uusiin elementteihin että, et se, musta se on, on

M /niin

tota ottaen huomioon sen että eihän tää koulun opetus voi olla pelkkään englantia ja, ja sitten kun ois, yksi tavotehan on myöää se että lisätään englannin kieliä englannin aineenopetusta että

M mm

P annetaan opetusta myös englannin kielellä että, että englannin kielellä on muu- (naurahdus) on on varmaan rehellisti sanoa että niin mahtava dominanssi jo nytkin olemassa että, et mä en ymmärrä ymmärrä että minkä takia sielä nyt erityisesti täytty sitten vahvistaa englannin osuutta kursseja lisäämällä

M no, jojo tää kysymys ei oikeestaan välttämättä tarkottan sitä että, että miksei kursseja osa

M /joo

P vaan mi- et niinku sitä että niin sanottua sananmuodoessa tapahtunutta muutosta ei ole että ne on aika, että sillä kiu yheksyneljä tuli ne kurssi ja tällöin päätettiin et tätä ja tätä kirjataan sinne

M /niin joo joo joo /joo joo joo joo
niin, siihen ei oikeestaan että kurssin sisäisiin, asioihin sitte muutoksia tehty että
/joo, joo, joo joo joo /joo, no mä joo mä mun täytyy
sanoa että mä en en tota, ehtiny kerta kaikkiaan edes paneutua ja lukemaankaan sitä
/joo

sillä tavalla laviitte et mä, voisin nyt lähteä arvioimaan että onks siinä nyt sitte, sitte tota, ti-
stilistisiä ta-tarkistuksia tehty tai ei oo tehty että, että mä nyt en näe paljon mieltä siinäkään että
käydään vaan muutamia ilmauksia sitten muuttamassa jos se opetus kuitenki pyörii entisellään
ja samalanisena että ehkä semmonen rehelliysys on kuitenkin parempi että, et ja ja se on
varmaa ihan totta kyllä että tiedin tästä niinku omastaksi systeemistä että, että löytyy ehkä
löytyy paremmin niinku tämäsiä elementtejä tähän tähän opetussuunnitelman koulukohtaseen
kehittämiseen, muissa aineissa ku kielissä
/mm

jos me ajattelaa nyt esimeks historiiaa mä ajattelen esimerkiksi, esimerkiksi tuota äädinkielä
tsietä löytyy vaikka sekin nyt on kieli mut siinähan nyt löytyy kuitenkin kirjallisuudeet ja, ja ja ja


/niin

tuota puhetaidot ja ja kaikki tämäiset että, että, jos, minusta semmonen yks kehittämisseunta
 tietenkin on tää, tää kommunikatiivinen mutta, periaatteessaan musta sitä pitäis laitaita
jokaiseen niinku site englannin kursseihin mukaan että, ee, on jotenkin, jotenkin niinku vähän
/mm

naurettavaa, ridiculous jos sielä sitten on yks kurssj joka on vähän että english in communi-at
communicative skills tai jotain tämäiset että, että, tuota, varmastahan se yks semmonen nätti
/mm

rönys ois sielä en mä sitä yhtään sano mutta, mut tuota, ja, ja ja ihan niinku siihen liittyen että,
et semmonen päällimmäinen huomio mulla on että, että tuota,Jos puhut nyt tosiaan tämäsiä
kun olette vertaillut niitä eri eri vaiheettain niin
/mm

englannissa niin niin, yleensäkin varmaan kielissä niin niin tuota sitä on, sitä niin sanottaa
täsmennyistä taikka tarkentumista taikka täydentymistä niin, ehkä sitten suhteessa vähemmän
kun on esimerkiksi siten äädinkiellessä meillä ja, ja ja tota matemaattisluonnoniteellellisissä
aineissa heistä nyt ei oo, mieltäny sit tavallaan niinku sit opetussuunnitelmatyötä niin, niin
olennaise- oleelliseksi että että se tarkottas sitä että joka vuosi täytyy tehda tämmöisiä merkittäviä
/mm

kohennuksia siihen vaan, vaan tuota, ehkä pitäis sitä todennäköisesti, aikaa pelkistetyn
pelkistettyynäkän ja, ja kun se lihaksihan se muuttuu siten opetuksessa sekin täytyy tieten aina
muistaa et me voidaan paperille kirjoittaa mitä tahansa mutta, todellisuudessa piut paut välittää
siiht ja yksähän, yksähän tämmönen suuri pulma täällä hetkellä todella on se että koulut ovat
tehteen mitä satumamempia opetussuunnitelmia sitten niitä ei kuitenkaan toteutta että
/mm

 että, tämänen tietyy rehelliysyskin siinä että, luvataan sitä mitä on tarkotus toteuttaakin
niin se sekin ihan lähtökohtana terve ja kelho

selfvä, ja ihan viimeisenä kysymyksenä mitä on tapahtunut b-englannille

b-englanti on poistunut

ö, juu, syy on

syy on syy on tota se sitä että siiä ei oikeastaan ole enää semmoista, semmoista, välineellistä arvoa
koska, meillä tuota, tää päätöztutkinnoi ei tällä hetkellä tunnista enää kuin kahdenlaisten kielen
tutkinno ne on ne pitäkät kilet, no ruotsissa on tietenkin se keskipitkä vielä mut englannissa ei
ole enää keskipi- keskipitkä tutkinnoa olennaan vaan on sitten lyhyt, eli meidän täytyy joka
tapauksessa kirjoittaa joko pitäkän lyhyt jonka ne voivat tänä tänään tehdä vaikka ne on eis
kuinka lu- lukenen sen pitkän kussin ne voivat kirjoittaa sitten lyhyen kussin kuitenkin siinä
aineessa ja tää on must enemmän semmonen (rykäisy) semmonen tuota, opetusmenetelmällinen, tai ope- opetus tuota, po po po mikä se nyt ois semmonen oikea termi
niin tuota, ratkaisu siihen että et kun on niitä jotka ovat tulleet sitä b-englantia mitä nyt
varmaan tässä ajat takaak ki että kun oppilaat tulevat b-englannin kautta lukuoin niin, tietenki he
/mm

tietenki heistä huolehditaan ja, ja nyt tuota, yks faktahan on tietenki se että me ei voida tässä
maalimmaksa mitään sille että oppilaat saa englantia tuutin täydeltä joka puolella, olii niillä b-
englanti tai a-englanti niin niin tuota sitä tulee tuutin täydeltä ja, joku roomannen, joka tänne nyt
lukuoin tulee niin, esimokes hänen b-englannin kielen, numeronsaha ei varmasti ole viis eikä
kuus vaan se on yhdeksänkaa taimmenen ja, vaikka nää numerot falsoikai kuinka paljon niin
/mm

kyllähän siinä jotain tietenki taustalla on että, meillä on muistakaani tuli viime vuonna, olik
niitä, kuudesta kun meille kakssatakymmenen suurinpirttein otetaan sisälle tuliko siinä
kuudesta, kuudesta tuota kymmeneen henkilöä, sellasia jotka jotka jolla oli, tää tää tuota lyhyt englanti me opettajat te- tämä tämä tuota, diagnosoi tiin ja sitte tietenki sovittiin opettajien kans et he selvittää kukin missä ryhmässä missä näitä b-englantilaisia on että

M
et mikä heidän, heidän todellinen englannin taitonsa on ja sitte ruvetaan tukitoiniin niitten
osalta että me olemme varautuneet siihen että autamme niitä jotka ovat b-englantia tulleet niin
alkuvaiheessa tää, tähän tuota tukeen, sitte tietysti se toinen mahollisuus on että perustetaan
sitte lyhyen englannin ryhmä, mut ei kukaan halua sinää- sitäkään sitten tehdä et, et mieluunmin

P

M
kyllähän siinä jotain tietennä nähdään se että tuota, et kuitenki tavotellaan sitä a-englannin taso
nikä mikä siinä on että

P
onko niissä kovin suurta, tasoeroa sitte olla onko huomattu

M

P
/no se #, no mä en pysty sitä sanomaan kyllä että mu- mulla
ei riitä siihen, rehellisesti kompetenssi mutta, sen perustee li mitä, mitä tuota opettajat kertovat
viime syksynä niin, niin, ne oli oikeastaan yllättävän vähäisiä sitte ne erot siellä että elkah se
enemmän oli oppilaiden arkuutta että ne kuvitelti että eihän me osata mitään, muihin verrattuna
kun me on luettu vaan b-englantia että, et tuota, varmaan enemmän tuommosta, institut-
institutionalista pelkoa kun todellista pelkoa siitä mitä he osasivat

M
selvä, minä kiitän teitä että teillä oli aikaa, näinkin pitkään haastatteluun että

P

/no niin joo