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Abstract: The present article offers innovative perspective on how ESP curriculum in higher education can be explored profoundly. It ontologically views that the reality of ESP curriculum, pedagogy and assessment is complex and dynamic that cannot easily be studied. Therefore, an epistemological consequence will be that the inevitability of having a prolific tool to enable academics and researchers to turn the complex reality into manageable data in order to inform curriculum development. For this purpose, Bernstein’s framework of classification and framing (C/F), elaborated with the framework of curriculum as written, taught and experienced (C-WTE) is deliberately examined. The notion of curriculum ideology and design is outlined to provide fundamental perspective on the principle of continuum underpinning C/F theory. The elaborated framework (C/F and C-WTE) is then explored to reveal its prospective and meaningful contribution to the field of ESP in higher education. Underpinned by interpretivist philosophy, the framework supports that the complex reality of ESP education is meaningful when it is treated in favor of its nature.
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Introduction
The curriculum of higher education (HE) in Indonesia has been criticized for lacking of impacts on improving the quality of national labors (Bisnis Indonesia, 2012). This is basically an issue of relevance of curriculum including that of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) against the reality of workplace which reflects the need for continuous development to follow dynamic change of social and professional circumstances outside the education world. The curriculum of ESP in HE is unique and shall be considered different from that in primary and secondary education in terms of the nature in which HE is the last level connecting educational setting to the reality of professional world. What is asserted by Belcher (2004:165) is important to note: “A common litany of complaints includes the observation that texts used in ESP pedagogy are too far removed from the real-life contexts
that learners aim for”. Thus, studies in curriculum and curriculum design becomes essential and immediate which influences the extent to which curriculum, pedagogy and assessment are relevant to the needs of those undertaking particular educational programs.

The nature of curriculum which is dynamic has gained considerable attention from international scholars. A number of literature worldwide implies agreement on the nature of curriculum that is indeterminate, unpredictable, and therefore, complex (e.g. Kelly, 2009; McKernan, 2008; Barnett and Coate, 2005; Wiles and Bondi, 2007; Wiles, 2009). This complexity poses a challenge for HE curriculum developers in terms of how to maintain the curriculum relevant and engaging. Relevance in this case has relationship with the extent to which curriculum is close to everyday-life situations (Bernstein, 2000) which can be extended to particular professional situations and other socio-cultural contexts. Consequently, central to the notion of curriculum relevance is the process of recontextualisation and reproduction of ‘knowledge’ in order to be applicable to the intended reality which represents the nature of curriculum design, pedagogical practice, assessment strategy, and evaluation, which are integral in iterative process.

In the complex reality, regarding curriculum as simply a kind of written educational document (e.g. a list of courses or subjects) is not sufficient. Novawan (2013) elaborates Print’s (1993) and Wiles and Bondi’s (2007) as follows:

“curriculum construes all the planned learning opportunities offered to learners by the educational institution that represents a set of desired goals or values that are activated through a development process and culminate in successful learning experiences for students” (p.12)

The above definition emphasizes the notion of ‘relevance’ and ‘coherence’. Curriculum can be justified relevant when successfully experienced by the students which facilitate the expected personal-professional development concerning with the specific needs for living in the present and prospective socio-cultural contexts. Coherence relates to the sync between what is planned (written curriculum) and what is implemented (pedagogy), what is taught and what resulted from it (assessment). In this case, researching the how to achieve relevance and coherence of curriculum is extremely paramount for successful educational programs. However, fundamental for this would be that, the complexity of curriculum in this postmodern world requires a prolific tool to understand the reality in order to inform how curriculum could be developed or refined.

There have been extensive studies on how to create engaging curriculum and pedagogy, but little on how to provide sufficient data to inform the how. This is important to consider that without a thick description on curriculum reality, the development of curriculum could undergo delicate predicaments related to ideology, methodology, process, and outcomes. Therefore, the article asserts that the exploration of curriculum reality could provide empirical evidence which is crucially essential to provide sufficient data and information to inform curriculum development.
ESP Curriculum

Current development of the teaching of ESP is teacher’s awareness and concern on the complex nature of curriculum and pedagogy. Particularly in HE context, ESP becomes a strategic encounter between the teaching of international language and the field-specific content across disciplines which is perceived multifaceted. This complexity is advanced with the reality of employability embedded in either ideological or practical layers of curriculum design.

Related to this, Stroupe (2013) notes that globalization and internationalization occurred have considerably contributed to the complexity of ELT. Rapid mobility of academics and professionals across countries around the world has resulted in continuous change in socio-cultural live of people in those countries which influence social context of teaching and learning, which in turn reshapes the development of English Language Education worldwide. Far-reaching impacts of economic integration in Europe (EU) and South East Asia (AEC) have significantly encouraged the development of education and the prominence of English communicative competence in academic and professional settings. Based on the agreement among the ASEAN countries, English is chosen as the official language of communication for the purpose of ASEAN integration (Bolton, 2008; Kirkpatrick, 2010). Consequently, the proficiency of English competence of the ASEAN members relevant to the strategic sectors of AEC 2015 becomes prerequisite in order to create effective academic-professional communication across the nations. In Europe, English is formally applied as the instructional language at universities which collectively influence the development of ESP among countries Europe-wide (Fortanet-Gomez and Raisanen, 2008). Although the development reflects collective vision within the framework of convergence and comparability, the reality of curriculum in particular educational settings in a country has been enormously heterogeneous.

Within the socio-cultural context which is signified with the unpredictable patterns of English use and acquisition, the effectiveness of ESP teaching in HE becomes more challenging. Closing in on the reality of the individual higher education institution and the pedagogical process, there has been hugely dramatic gap between one and others influenced by the institutional policy, teachers’ quality, students’ characteristics, and the learning environments. Saukah (2003) identifies that the outcomes of English language education in Indonesia varied greatly due to the diversity of English teaching quality and social contexts. This heterogeneity causes difficulty in generalization of studies in ELT nationwide. In the context of academic and professional in HE, the level of English proficiency reflected from TOEFL scores has slightly increased and has been shown higher than other Asian countries unless that in Singapore, Philippines, Brunei, and Malaysia (ibid). Nevertheless, Saukah implies that this statistic might not be applicable for generalization claiming that all higher education institutions in Indonesia have high quality of ELT/ESP programs. Another evidence is based on a 20-month observation in Indonesia, in which, Lamb (2011) expresses his understanding on the reality by using the term “divergence” to illustrate how complex the heterogeneity of English learning process and outcomes in Indonesia. He draws on empirical
evidence demonstrating that those with poor English skills were getting poorer and poorer while those with good English skills developed themselves much better.

The complexity of ESP increasingly grows in line with the ongoing shifting of identity from strong academic to more negotiated academic identity. This change is inevitable in dynamic context where the rigidness of academic identity may result in exclusiveness which is basically inferior to the notion of ESP which needs to cater for specific and contextual needs relevant to particular academic-professional context. In particular case, ESP is needed to provide students with more than English language training, by integrating professional values, characters and soft-skills relevant to social and workplace demand into the curriculum and pedagogy. However, central to the innovation in this setting is need analysis.

Studies in need analysis have been abundantly established and widely posed in the literature. This development is considered fruitful for teachers of ESP to develop professionalism in ESP teaching (Flowerdew, 2013). It is of great consensus to regard that need analysis is not only necessary to be conducted as a pre-course activity but also as an ongoing activity to inform curriculum development (Basturkmen, 2010). In this notion, need analysis allows for changes and refinements of curriculum and pedagogy on the basis of evidence obtained during pedagogical practices (process-based evidence).

Previously, Dudley-Evans and Johns (1998) suggest that ESP course design is more likely a cyclical process which involves interdependent and overlapping activities rather than linear. Since need analysis is a key part of course design, it needs to be regarded as a prolific tool which is compatible with dynamic situation. Text-based need analysis which has been very common in ESP is now considered insufficient for this dynamic setting. For fulfilling this gap, task-based need analysis suggested by Long (2005) enhances the tenet of need analysis to innovate analytical features which is appropriate to the complexity of ESP assuming the inevitability of contextual approach. According to Long, task-based need analysis allows coherence in course design since it bridges gaps between academic and professional discourses. He values more on the need for interactions between insiders (workplace experts) and outsiders (teachers) in order to achieve coherence.

Bhatia et al. (2011) share the same notion by outlining that the main challenge of ESP is more on how to achieve elaboration between academic and professional worlds in order to nurture relevance. This elaboration challenges postulations which regard ESP more exclusively limited by one-size-fits-all or one-best-way approaches (Hyland, 2006). Such approaches are irrelevant with ESP context which is unique and can be unpredictable. Having this situation, studies are necessary to develop research framework in order to be able to innovate a tool which works in dynamic nature and helps curriculum developers to see and to observe the reality of ESP curriculum holistically and coherently.

**Ideology and curriculum design**

In curriculum development, adoption of ideology is fundamentally important (Schiro, 2013; Kelly, 2009; Print, 1993) since it extensively influences how a curriculum is developed in
terms of commitment to education, educational knowledge and humanity which are reflected through pedagogy and assessment (Kelly, 2009). Developing curriculum without having particular ideology to base might result in confusion and shallow curriculum development. As Kelly’s statement (2009):

It is quite unacceptable for anyone to plan a curriculum or a piece of work, at any level but especially at the national level, without first setting out quite clearly, both for himself or herself and for others, the curriculum model adopted and reasons for its adoption’ (p. 115).

In agreement to that, Schiro (2013) lists down the benefits of being clear about curriculum ideology for educators, such as: clarifying and accomplishing curriculum and instructional goals, facilitating negotiations among differences, and acknowledging tensions within collaborative works. These benefits are especially crucial in the context where complexity of curriculum development occurs in the level of individual subject/module (nano), institutional (mezzo) and national (macro), and within individual or collective educators (nano/mezzo). With the understanding of ideology which reflects both philosophical stances and practical motifs, effective and judicious ways in curriculum development could be promoted.

Richards (2013) provides a fruitful summary on how ELT/ESP curriculum can be developed by elaborating several well-known curriculum ideologies to outline three curriculum designs. Alternatively, curriculum can be designed by using a linear procedure comprising of content, syllabus design, methodologies, and evaluation which is called forward design. This design is content-driven emphasising the determination of content in advance. The second is central design which postulates the centrality of process and methodologies. This design is commonly known as process-driven design. The last is represented by the prominence of learning outcomes which is known product-driven design which, by Richards (2013), is called backward design.

**Forward design**

Forward design emphasises on linear and explicit procedures of curriculum design that is started from determining the content, making syllabus, deciding methodologies, outcomes, and assessment (Richards, 2013). Thus, curriculum planning is seen as an intellectual activity encompasses the analysis and selection of the important knowledge to be taught to students. This content-driven design promotes a very scientific approach to curriculum development (Burton and Middlewood, 2001) where curriculum content is central and prioritised within curriculum planning. Knowledge is therefore an objective truth which can be something ‘out there’ or accumulated from social and culture process (Schiro, 2013, Kelly, 2009). Schiro (2013) calls this as Scholar Academic model. This approach represents an ideology rooted in absolutism philosophy which believes that knowledge is an independent entity that can be obtained by using the rational mind and/or experience of reality (Kelly, 2009).
This ideology gains its popularity due to its contribution to the promotion of intellectual excellence in curriculum development (Schiro, 2013). With this approach, curriculum resulted from it might be more elegant representing the robustness of particular discipline with high level of confidence when it is to be implemented. It can also offer more room for claim that accompanied with appropriate framework and procedure, this ideology can create essential curriculum content that is necessary for initiation to intrinsically meaningful learning activities (Kelly, 2009). Since, with its nature which is decisive and fixed, it is invaluable to promote academic excellence to less adult students which are assumed to have lower level of interdependency and intrinsic motivation, or to particular disciplines which offer fixed knowledge to students (Schiro, 2013). Additionally, the accuracy of knowledge becomes priority in curriculum development that makes it position curriculum developers and academics in the ultimate role to determine knowledge selection which undermine students’ disposition. Broadly discussed, this design emphasises the instrumental characteristic that freely open to elitism since it allows certain parties to have absolute access to what should be given to students (Kelly, 2009).

Central design
Central design postulates that the complexity of teaching and learning requires a teacher to consider methodologies as the first thing needed to deal with dynamic classroom situation (Richards, 2013). This process-based design assumes that teaching and learning process should not be restricted by an emphasis on extrinsic learning, but it should be an open approach and intrinsically oriented to the development of students as the individuals (Schiro, 2013; Kelly, 2009; McKernan, 2008; Ross, 2000). As stated by Ross (2000, p. 137), ‘the curriculum should enable the student to understand the world in her or his own terms, through her or his own enquiries’. Knowledge is then something dynamic and demands continuous evolution that cannot be easily prescript as what is suggested in content and product models (Kelly, 2009; McKernan, 2008).

In this model, what is given to the students is not as important as how it is given. It concerns with the students learning environment and context, therefore, highlights the autonomy of students to make sense of their own knowledge (Schiro, 2013; Kelly, 2009; Ross, 2000). As a consequence, judgement on the effectiveness of curriculum lies on the extent to which it reflects the students’ disposition and not on the objective formulation and predetermined content. However, this process-inquiry model does have aims and direction in the forms of statements of general aim, the principles of procedure (values underpinning the process), and the criteria for assessing/judging student work (Kelly, 2009; McKernan, 2008; Ross, 2000).

Backward design
This model is interested in the prominence of clarity of direction and objective of educational program in curriculum development (McKernan, 2008). With this as the central driver, the development of curriculum requires that the identification and formulation of
educational purposes be clear, specific and measurable in order to be able to create effective and accountable curriculum. It thus emphasises the importance of understanding human behaviour in learning, sequencing of learning experiences (e.g. stimuli and response) and accountability to educational stakeholders (Schiro, 2013).

The most influential scholar in the ideology is Tyler who has formulated essential questions in developing curriculum comprising of the educational objective, content (educational experiences), teaching methods, and assessment (Schiro, 2013; Kelly, 2009; Print, 1993). Such objective-led curriculum development is beneficial effort to articulate practical and efficient procedures to allow accurate plan, continuous implementation and effective evaluation since it allows more detail piece of targeted performances together with the descriptive criteria and evaluation instruments. This approach is considered appropriate to utilitarian education (e.g. vocational, technical training, etc.) that tends to emphasis on learning performances (e.g. skills and abilities) as the instructional goals to fulfil the demands of industries and other stakeholders (Schiro, 2013; Kelly, 2009). With regards to backward design, Richards (2013) states:

Backward design starts with a careful statement of the desired results or outcomes: appropriate teaching activities and content are derived from the results of learning. This is a well-established tradition in curriculum design in general education and in recent years has re-emerged as a prominent curriculum development approach in language teaching. (p. 20)

Adoption of ideology
On the basis of studies for more than 40 years, Schiro (2013) concludes that various philosophical ideologies do exist and affect on curriculum policy and practices. He views that curriculum ideology is more than just motives behind curriculum development, but each ideology has its own philosophical root basing curriculum studies either epistemologically or ontologically. As a consequence, profound curriculum development requires clear understanding on the ideologies and proper interpretation of particular situation in order to deploy them appropriately.

According to Schiro (ibid) there are possible alternatives of curriculum ideology adoption. The first is to follow the concepts dualistic—to refer to the position of educators which is only value one ideology which is considered true or good and the others are wrong or bad. The next is relativistic which is understood as a philosophical stance with the absence of absolute scale that appreciates all ideologies and that believes that they have the equal right for claims. While, contextual is an ideology adoption that is based on the understanding of contexts and deciding which of the available ideologies will be appropriate to the context. The last is hierarchical, educators hold only one ideology considered to be the overarching ideology and employ others to support the overarching ideology.

Schiro (ibid) suggests that adopting ideologies need to be flexible, situational and contextual. Reflecting on his experience, he asserts that different combinations of more than one with different emphasis can be useful method for curriculum development.
Introducing Bernstein’s theory

Universality of Bernstein’s theory
Extensive studies and reviews have widely examined and legitimated the contribution of Bernstein’s theory to educational fields especially in providing a language of description for curriculum development (e.g. Mangez and Mangez, 2011; Sriprakash, 2011; Au, 2008; Daniels, 2006; Tsatsaroni et al., 2003; Morais, 2002; Singh, 2002; Sodovnik, 2001; Singh, 1997).

The most precious aspect of the theory is its uniqueness compared with other frameworks. Other frameworks tend to be limited by ideological and methodological constraints, but Bernstein’s framework can universally be applied in elaboration with such constraints. Bernstein (2000; 2003a; 2003b) is interested in closing in on the reality of curriculum and pedagogy in the level of codes and rules in order to expose the nature while others focus on looking at the phenomenon in order to know the reality. Therefore, the framework of classification and framing is frequently considered complicated since it works in the hidden level of curriculum (Cause, 2010; Morais, 2002). According to Bernstein, the nature of curriculum can profoundly be understood by observing the nature of relations between (power) and relations within (control) which are built up on codes and rules. Curriculum development in his perspective is inseparable with the nature of power and control occurred. Understanding the nature of power and control is then vital to understand the reality of curriculum, and extremely important to prospect how changes and refinements can be initiated as studies of McLean et al. (2013), Stavrou (2011); Sriprakash, (2011), Morais (1999), and others.

Bernstein’s theory is basically compatible with the exploration of ESP curriculum, moreover, enhances the exploration in unique way. The characteristics of ESP curriculum which are complicated and problematic is appropriate to the situation whenever the framework is needed. The situation in ESP curriculum is a crossroad related to knowledge discourse, methodologies, process, and assessment, which opens opportunities to cater for local needs which are specific, at the same time nevertheless, demands scholarly and widely consensus on the theory and practice in various settings. Dilemma of knowledge discourse, for instance, between wide and narrow angled, linguistic-oriented and content-oriented, and issues on how academic and professional knowledge discourse could be elaborated, can be figured out by using the principle of continuum between strong classification (closeness of knowledge) and weak classification (openness of knowledge) which gives new nuance on curriculum design and the tenet of need analysis.

The characteristics of pedagogy in Bernstein’s perspective is understood in the continuum of strong and weak framing which is relevant and compatible with pedagogic practices adopting various methods (e.g. traditional, text-based, interactional, communicative, content-based, genre-based, task-based, etc.). Closing in on the reality of power relations in pedagogic practices can expose motifs and impacts of pedagogy which is reciprocal between policy makers, teachers, and students. For policy makers, the data can be
valuable for sustainable curriculum change and refinement. For teachers, the theory describes the pedagogical process from the perspective of students. Teachers are helped to combine analysis and imagination to emphatically involve in students learning experience in case-by-case basis which is appropriate to the dynamic nature of need analysis (Basturkmen, 2010; Long, 2005).

The principles of classification and framing
Bernstein’s C/F is basically prolific to explore the reality of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment holistically and profoundly. Different from Bloom’s taxonomy which facilitates curriculum developers to focus on knowledge design, Bernstein’s C/F provides a means to deepen the hidden, therefore somewhat untouchable, aspects of curriculum such as those related to power relations.

The principle of classification (C) is useful to observe relations between discourses, practices and agencies which reveal the nature of social division of labor representing power on it. This power is usually associated to ideology, politic, and economy influencing curriculum policy which determine voice and identity of curriculum. Thus, the nature of power may also describe to which extent the voice and identity represented on knowledge discourse of curriculum related to students’ experience. Strong classification (+C) of knowledge discourse may illustrate that curriculum emphasizes on strong academic content or product and somewhat undermines students’ dispositions. Weak classification (-C), on the other hand, indicates that knowledge discourse is open for negotiation during the process of pedagogical practice.

Framing (F) theory basically offers devices to describe the nature of relations within pedagogic practice which signify the reality of control over pedagogic discourse. The reality of control related to instructional activity is called Instructional Discourse (ID), while related to teacher’s social conduct the term used is Regulative Discourse (RD). Instructional discourse (ID) regulates how knowledge is selected, sequenced, and taught to students, as well as how pacing and criteria are applied in teaching which is underpinned by discursive rules. When these rules are explicit and strong (+F), students are helped to be aware of what they learn and acquire with limited autonomy. When these rules are weak (-F), only teacher who knows ‘what’ and ‘to what extent’ students learn but space is abundant for autonomous learning.

Regulative discourse (RD), on the other hands, is fortified by hierarchical rule that regulates social conduct of teacher (e.g. character, manner). Thus, this rule control the how social relations between teacher and students. When the role of teacher is clearly distinct to that of students, hierarchical rule is explicit (+F). Thus, relation between them is as rigid as between super-ordination and subordination because the teacher ‘formally’ applies didactic roles (Nyambe and Wilmot, 2008). However, when it is difficult to distinguish teacher role from that of students, hierarchical rule is implicit (-F). The rules within pedagogic discourse are interrelated each other where ID is embedded in RD while RD is considered more dominant than ID (Bernstein, 2003b; 2000). They regulate how meanings are to be put
together in the pedagogical setting and role as the means of acquiring the legitimate knowledge (Bernstein, 2003b).

As previously addressed, C/F framework is complicated. However, this framework has fruitful potentials to be elaborated with other frameworks in order to enhance manageability. For instance, the framework has been found compatible and prolific when elaborated with the framework of curriculum as written, curriculum as taught, curriculum as experienced (C-WTE) (Novawan, 2013). In curriculum studies, these phrases are commonly associated to what constitutes curriculum. It is essential to retain that this framework is not intended to dichotomize curriculum domains exclusively, rather it aims to support C/F framework to make the nature of relations more explicit. The words written (planned), taught and experienced are commonly used in the literature for curriculum coherence. Thus, the framework of C-WTE can be used to observe the relationship between what is planned, what is taught and what is experienced by students. As a framework, C-WTE could be applied universally in various educational contexts and settings since the issues of curriculum relate to these three dimensions and the relationship between them. Moreover, C-WTE is an overarching framework that facilitates educators to comprehend the nature of curriculum as the whole, moreover, Bernstein’s C/F is more explicit when interpreted by using this framework.

In elaboration, C/F and C-WTE view curriculum in the tenet of curriculum-in-action which considers that curriculum is cyclical process. Thus pedagogic and assessment practices are fundamentally dynamic process of curriculum development. Within this framework, curriculum policy is seen in evaluative tone—to which extent what is officially planned and stated reflects the reality of teaching and learning process, which refers to the notion of coherence.

**The principle of continuum**

Since Bernstein’s framework construes that the reality of curriculum is built up on codes and rules, this formula does not postulate curriculum ideology dualistically, rather it views the conflicting ideologies as a line of continuum with two sides having relationship each others. Bernstein’s theory does not position itself on particular philosophical stances rather it provides a tool to enable policy makers and educators to explore the reality of curriculum deeply and heuristically. Hence, there is concern that elaborations between and within theoretical and empirical evidence is more important to encourage paradigm transformation and to open opportunities for curriculum studies contextually but universally without being trapped in ideological debate.

In the view point of continuum, the nature of curriculum is assessed in terms of to which extent curriculum is integrated (Figure 1). Integrated type represents curriculum which is designed with emphasis on process in which strong academic identity is negotiated signified by weak boundaries between discourses, practices, and agencies. On the other side is collection type which is characterized by strong academic identity with strong boundaries between discourses, practices, and agencies. This type is commonly known as performance
**curriculum model** which emphasizes on content or product, while integrated type is usually associated to **competence curriculum model**. Collection type is more precise, linear and utilitarian, while integrated type is non-linear, iterative and egalitarian. In terms of sources, collection type tends to be deductive since curriculum is best created on the basis of predetermined content or outcome. Integrated type, on the other hand, promotes inductive approach envisaging that the sources of curriculum can be found through pedagogical interactions within the socio-cultural context of learning. The utilitarian, precise and deductive approaches, albeit having strength in efficiency and accountability, have significant downsides in that they are inadequate to cope with dynamic learning contexts to be truly ‘educational’ (Kelly, 2009; McKernan, 2008; Barnett and Coate, 2005; Ross, 2000). On the other hand, egalitarian, imprecise and inductive approaches are considered inefficient in practice. They demand sensitivity and ‘judicature’ in order to be able to align curriculum and pedagogy to particular extent of freedom in letting the process and space frame the students’ learning (Ross, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Type</th>
<th>Integrated Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative ideology</td>
<td>Progressive ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance model</td>
<td>Competence model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product-driven design</td>
<td>Process-driven design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. The continuum of curriculum*

Curriculum as written

The term *curriculum as written* has long been used in studies in curriculum evaluation. The notion is basically referring to what is officially planned (Kelly, 2009) based on particular procedures in individual subjects/modules, departments, and institutions, offered to the society in written forms (Print, 1993) such as prospectus and syllabuses (Kelly, 2009), school handbooks, and module/subject handbooks.

Although the concept of *written curriculum* is rarely discussed in scholar arena, it is clear that curriculum becomes more observable, practical and accountable or public in the forms of written. Exploring *curriculum as written* can provide rich information on what is at the bottom of educational program which reveals ideology, vision and direction of the curriculum. Information on to which extent the curriculum offers specialized ESP content, how field-specific content will be incorporated, whether the skills are integrated or not, to which extent non-academic dimensions of curriculum are included, etc., can be explored from written curriculum. In Bernstein’s perspective, these data can be represented with the nature of knowledge discourse and structure (Table 1).

On the basis of classification principle, curriculum reflects particular characteristics in terms of to which extent the knowledge is “given a special otherness” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 10). When a curriculum offers knowledge discourse with strong degree of otherness, meaning that the academic identity predominates, knowledge discourse is strongly classified (+C) indicated by closeness of content. When the degree of otherness is weakened (-C),
academic identity is negotiated with the reality outside classroom (mundane), knowledge discourse is open. The nature of written curriculum, whether it is close or open, helps prospect deep understanding on the reality of reproduction of knowledge and learners’ autonomy. Curriculum with close content is particularistic which is underpinned by the notion of education in depth which signifies the essence of and strong demand on scientific knowledge acquisition. With open content, a curriculum is more universalistic which construes the emergence of education in breath which promotes the inevitability of giving spaces for students’ autonomy to decide their learning. Within the notion of education in depth, the socio-cultural context of learning is characterized by mechanical solidarity which reveals strong academic/professional boundary. While, in education in breath, individual relationship is more important which is known as organic solidarity. With regards to this, specific ESP is particularistic and general ESP is universalistic. Within this continuum, the variations of discourses or registers are natural reality of ESP which is meaningful when exposed as the way they are.

Table 1. The continuum of knowledge discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection type</th>
<th>Continuum</th>
<th>Integrated type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Mundane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularistic</td>
<td>Universalistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education in depth</td>
<td>Education in breadth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical solidarity</td>
<td>Organic solidarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific ESP General ESP

Gavioli (2005) in her study of corpora for ESP learning highlights Biber’s work which places the various registers in continuum line. According to her, Biber does not view the variations of discourses as one is sub-corpora isolated from the whole, rather one has relationship with others in continuum. Thus, general ESP and specific ESP are interrelated. This way of thinking is relevant to Basturkmen’s (2010) work on narrow-angled and wide-angled of ESP course where the nature of ESP knowledge variations is seen in a continuum line. According to her, none were at the very end of this continuum.

Curriculum as taught

In Bernstein’s framework, curriculum as taught encompasses pedagogic practice as the manifestation of curriculum as written. An important way to observe pedagogic discourse is by closing in on the nature of pedagogy in terms of the instructional discourse (ID) and regulative discourse (RD) in a continuum manner (Table 2).

Instructional discourse helps identify the reality of teacher’s control over instructional activities in classroom. In the continuum of collection type, teacher strongly controls which knowledge should be taught, in what instructional sequence, and how pacing and criteria strategies are implemented. This pedagogic practice indicates the adoption of
strong framing strategy (+F). Within this pedagogic practice, instructional discourse is explicit to students, nevertheless, the involvement of students is limited and undermined by teacher’s role. The presence of syllabus and lesson plan prepared by teacher becomes strongly influential for pedagogical process that teacher tends to stick to the plan. Flexibility in this case is limited by the teacher’s loyalty to the written curriculum. At the other end of continuum, teacher weakly controls instructional activities aiming to give students more space for autonomous learning. In this case, instructional discourse is implicit since teacher’s control over the selection, sequence, pacing and criteria of knowledge is less dominant (-F). The teaching and learning process is characterized by flexibility the teacher has since teacher focuses on the “big picture” of the course rather than specific objectives in every unit of lesson. Thus, providing students with spaces for self-regulatory learning is more important than delivering knowledge.

Another discourse is regulative discourse which regulate how teacher manage control on social conduct such as character and manner. A class revealing a strong boundary between teacher and students indicates the adoption of strong framing of hierarchy (+F). In this, teacher didactically demands respect from students and differentiation between him/her as a teacher and them as students. Since teacher hierarchically control the class, students’ disposition is prone to be hidden but teacher’s values are exposed explicitly. Traditional approaches which emphasize the prominent role of teacher and incline to lack of student-centredness usually apply strong framing of regulative discourse. On the other hand, when a teacher associates him/her self to the students role in learning where he/she tends to be perceived as nice and less decisive and tough, the reality represents weak framing (-F). The teacher decides to behave more personalized to the students by increasing the degree of proximity of pedagogic practice. This strategy is characterized with the importance of social relation to facilitate self-regulatory learning to let students expose their values and voices.

Table 2. The continuum of pedagogic discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection type</th>
<th>Continuum</th>
<th>Integrated type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implicit instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stick to the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-guided learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-regulatory learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden student disposition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncover student disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical in control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal in control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal regulative approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personalized approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describing pedagogy by using framing principle can be invaluable to deepen understanding on particular pedagogic approaches, like genre-based. In the dynamic ESP, genre-based may develop more linguistically-oriented which postulate that genre has fixed patterns leading to the application of product-based approach. Nevertheless, genre-based teaching can also refer to the theory that genre is a social action which is dynamic and is an
“on-going guest” (Tardy, 2006; Johns, 2008, p. 237). In these variations, the theory of pedagogic discourse provides a framework to obtain thick description focusing on the nature of instruction and the nature of teacher’s social conduct. The reality of both discourses prolifically supports teacher to enhance understanding on the characteristics of particular genre-based pedagogy which may be different dependent on the institutional setting and other socio-cultural context.

Curriculum as experienced

Curriculum as experienced represents the nature of impacts resulted from the implemented and taught curriculum. Observing these impacts is crucial to know the students’ experience of pedagogic discourse. In this case students’ disposition becomes the main source of evidence for curriculum refinement. Morais and Antunes (1994) suggest the notion of socio-affective dispositions and categories them into simple (e.g. obedience, respect and loyalty) and complex dispositions (participation, cooperation, organization, initiative, responsibility, creativity, and critical thought). Knowing the reality of students’ dispositions enhances teacher’s professional development in that the prevailing strategy needs to be confirmed with students’ feedbacks. The more complex students’ dispositions that can be identified, the more relevant the students experience of pedagogy. Nevertheless, negative dispositions (e.g. disobedience) can become precious feedback to identify irrelevance of knowledge discourse or pedagogic discourse.

According to Bernstein (2000), successful pedagogic practice is dependent on the students’ possession of recognition and realization rules which can be signified by students’ disposition and performance in doing tasks and tests. On the basis of Daniels’ work (Bernstein, 2000; Escandon, 2012), Bernstein argues that the possession of recognition rules does not rely on pedagogic practice rather it is tacitly acquired in everyday-life that is manifested into ‘voice’ that regulates orientations to meaning. Bernstein (2003b) suggests there are specific codes to distinguish two orientations to meaning: privileged to refer to priority of relations within a context and privileging to refer to recognition of relations between contexts. Strong classification of curriculum orients students to recognize privileged relations. On the contrary, weak classification encourages orientations to meaning that focus on relations between contexts (privileging). Realization rules, moreover, are dependent on the interactional feature of ID and RD (Bernstein, 2000). Different from recognition rules which recognize voice and identity, realization rules select meaning and realize them into production. With privileged orientation, students select and realize what is inside pedagogic context, while, privileging orients them to select and realize more than inside the context.

However, the weaknesses of ESP pedagogy are frequently about the assessment strategy which is predominated by the notion of assessment of learning vis a vis assessment for learning. The first is underpinned by the importance of test to know the students’ performance, while, the latter concerns with helping the students to know their learning process and progress. With a focus on assessment of learning, pedagogy is lack of evidence on students’ disposition which reveal their authentic experience of learning. Therefore,
assessment for learning is necessary which is represented by particular approaches which emphasis metacognition, enquiry-based learning, interaction, scaffolding, and feedbacks. Barnett and Coate (2005) provide useful insight on this by proposing to use three spaces to reveal students’ disposition: epistemological space, practical space, and ontological space. The first refers to pedagogical activities which emphasis on providing the students with a variety of theories and frameworks in order to give autonomous opportunity for them to advance their understanding of content. The second suggests that curriculum elaborates academic and non-academic, dominant and non-dominant, and visible and invisible to facilitate students ‘to accomplish actions’ (p. 164). The last space envisages that students develop metacognition for meaningful capacity building through self-awareness, self-confidence, self-critique and self-direction.

Table 3. The continuum of assessment practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection type</th>
<th>Continuum</th>
<th>Integrated type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of learning</td>
<td>Assessment for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on the absences</td>
<td>Feedback on the presences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent assessment</td>
<td>Divergent assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to external standard</td>
<td>Depends on student uniqueness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible learning</td>
<td>Invisible learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-oriented</td>
<td>Metacognitive-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileged orientation to meaning</td>
<td>Privileging orientation to meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum identity

The framework of classification and framing prolifically supports teachers to describe the reality of curriculum identity. The identity represents the nature of curriculum in terms of relevance, coherence and innovation. The nature of relevance indicates the extent to which students’ disposition reflects their recognition of knowledge discourse and its realization in pedagogic practice. In case of students’ success in recognizing and realizing knowledge, aspects of curriculum which contribute to the success are the nature of knowledge discourse, pedagogic discourse, and assessment practice. Deliberate analysis of knowledge discourse and pedagogic discourse by closing in on the nature of power relations will result in thick description on the reality of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment which reflect relevance to the students’ disposition.

The analysis of coherence is identified based on the nature of relationship between curriculum as written (C-W), curriculum as taught (C-T), and curriculum as experienced (C-E). Having C-W characterized with weak classification, for instance, ESP curriculum tends to offer more universalistic vision in which the otherness of knowledge is negotiated in particular extent. It is logic to assume then the appropriate pedagogic discourse applies weak framing which allows for flexibility or mixed pedagogical approach and provides much
space for students’ autonomy to negotiate their learning on the basis of their own needs. In line with this, the nature of students’ experience will coherently reflect particular assessment strategy characterized with less convergent method and focus on the development of metacognitive skills of students, as an instance.

Furthermore, drawing on the link between what is planned, what is taught and what is experienced will enable teacher to prospect particular innovation with regards to the nature of relevance and coherence. For example, when C-W is characterized with strong classification and C-T is weakly framed, and students mostly indicate hard recognition and realization of knowledge. Consequently, an innovation can be nurtured based on the logical inference in that strong classification which demands the completion of targeted knowledge requires more explicit instructional strategy to let the students acquire it. However, to decide whether innovation is needed to refine the nature of C-W or C-T will require thick description on the students’ disposition. For this, task-based need analysis which is integral to pedagogic practice can be very valuable to confirm students’ disposition.

Table 4. The analysis of curriculum identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Questions to explore</th>
<th>Findings in the perspective of continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-WTE</td>
<td>C-F</td>
<td>Academic ⇄ Mundane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Particularistic ⇄ Universalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education in depth ⇄ Education in breadth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical solidarity ⇄ Organic solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-W</td>
<td>How does the nature of knowledge discourse reflect the reality of power?</td>
<td>Explicit instruction ⇄ Implicit instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stick to the plan ⇄ Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher-guided ⇄ Self-regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hidden student disposition ⇄ Uncover student disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical in control ⇄ Horizontal in control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal didactic approach ⇄ Personalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-T</td>
<td>F-R</td>
<td>Assessment of learning ⇄ Assessment for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback on the absences ⇄ Feedback on the presences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convergent assessment ⇄ Divergent assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to external standard ⇄ Depends on student uniqueness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visible learning ⇄ Invisible learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive-oriented ⇄ Metacognitive-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Privileged orientation to meaning ⇄ Privileging orientation to meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-E</td>
<td>C-F</td>
<td>General Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The nature of relevance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent the students recognize knowledge discourse and realize it within the teaching and learning process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The nature of coherence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the nature of relationship between curriculum as written, curriculum as taught, and curriculum as experienced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The nature of innovation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How can innovation be initiated with regards to the nature of relevance and coherence?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

This article has attempted to elaborate literature in the field of education and ELT/ESP in order to show the relationship between both and the relevance of both to contribute to the development of ESP in HE context. The first issue gaining attention from the academics of both fields is about the complexity of ESP curriculum. The article outlines that this complexity has encouraged shifting of identity of curriculum that basically reveals the genuine nature of ESP which is dynamic and required sustainable change to be relevant with students’ needs and the socio-cultural contexts. This shifting confirms the inevitability of studies related to curriculum framework aiming at developing research features which are prolific for the analysis and evaluation of curriculum.

Inseparable from curriculum analysis and evaluation is curriculum ideology which is fundamental pillar to base curriculum design. This article postulates that the understanding of curriculum ideologies is crucial for policy makers, curriculum developers, and teachers, but, moving on the adoption of those ideologies and turning them into practice without being trapped in the philosophical debate is far more important. In educational literature, there are three commonly addressed namely content, process, and product. Schiro (2013) offers a perspective to understand and adopt curriculum ideology which is fundamental insight for understanding the elaborated framework addressed in this article—C/F and C-WTE. An expert of curriculum development in language teaching, Jack C. Richards, interprets the ideology of content, process, and product in more practical and procedural ways by using the terms—forward design, central design, and backward design. These phrases basically imply that Richards intents to highlight the methodological aspects of curriculum design in ELT context. Bernstein’s theory of C/F, elaborated with the framework of curriculum as written, taught and experienced (C-WTE), is postulated to be a relevant tool to observe the complex reality of ESP curriculum. This article thus encapsulates that the elaborated framework is plentiful providing ESP curriculum developers with ‘the language of description’ which becomes fruitful data to inform ESP policy and practice and to promote relevance and coherence between the three domains.

Albeit the conception to distinguish English for General Purposes (EGP) curriculum from that of ESP is still blurred, Dudley-Evans and John (1998) pinpoint that ESP tends to grow differently from EGP. While EGP inclines to be isolated within the linguistics theory which is generalizable, ESP tends to follow practical aspects of language teaching against the specific needs of learning in particular socio-cultural context. Therefore, ESP may have different approaches in curriculum development, materials design, pedagogy, testing and research (Nunan, 2004). Still the main concern of ESP is always around need analysis, text analysis, context analysis, and preparing students to experience authentic learning which enables them associate their language learning to the real work situation. In other word, ESP is much more dependent on the presence of conceptual analysis which in turn highlights the prominent role of agency in the teaching and learning process within specific socio-cultural context. Thomas and Reinders (2010) note that there is a strong link between socio-cultural theories in ELT/ESP and educational theories such as experiential and authentic learning,
learning as discovery, and other constructivist and social constructivist theories. The elaboration between these educational theories into ESP curriculum is necessary especially within the complexity of ESP in which single and isolated framework is not sufficient describe multifaceted and hidden aspects of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.
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