INTRODUCTION
Lesotho's education system has been and is, like countries', undergoing a drastic curriculum metamorphosis. It has transited from Cambridge Overseas School Certificate (COSC), which was made up of Cambridge GCE O-Level which was marked and graded by examination council of Lesotho (ECoL) since 1989 (Moea, 2022a), into Lesotho General Certificate of Secondary Education (LGcSE) (ECoL, 2011). With the existence of the belief that education is the key to success due to the fact that education is perceived as a way to enlightenment and opens door for the future, Lesotho has begun the implementation stage of the integrated syllabus which is pioneering on reviewing the whole primary and roll out of secondary education curricula (Moea, 2022a). This is with the aim of rendering education at these levels accessible, relevant, efficient and of the best quality (Ministry of Education and Training (MOET), 2009).

Focusing on the current curriculum and assessment policy of Lesotho of 2009, Raselimo and Mahao (2015) assert that the new-fangled Curriculum and Assessment Policy (CAP) can be esteemed as a change in education policy purposes from being inequitable and examination-oriented. In the light of education history, from Basotho education to colonial education era, on to attaining independence in 1966, there was an imperative for Lesotho to transform its education to make it applicable and appropriate to its nationwide needs (Moea, 2022a).

The reform expected teachers to forego their ancient and traditional teaching practices that fragment knowledge and teach concepts and processes of the related disciplines in isolation (MOET, 2009). Teachers were to embrace teaching tactics that inspire and mould learners’ understanding of the world that: (1) the world is constructed of things that do not occur in segregation; and (2) there are undistinguishable linkages in the midst of entities that form a grand system of life (Chere-Masupha et al., 2021). This style of teaching was estimated to make learners conceptualise the world as an expansive grid of multiple networks and sub-networks of associations amongst its living and non-living, and physical and non-physical bodies. Learners were as well projected to appreciate the associations amongst the fundamentals that formulate these networks and the roles they play to preserve these intricate structures (Chere-Masupha et al., 2021). The policy (CAP) phased out the subject-specific curriculum in favour of integrated curriculum. Summative assessment practices which were principally in a system of tests and examinations had to be discarded in favour of incessant and formative assessments (Chere-Masupha et al., 2021). According to this policy, teaching and assessment were not to be measured as isolated; assessment was to be fundamental to teaching (MOET, 2009). In addition, rather than concentrating on the attainment of sheer knowledge, teaching and assessment were to apprise both a teacher and a leaner about the development of a learner in gaining new skills, attitudes and behaviour (Raselimo & Mahao, 2015; MOET, 2009). The policy also influences teachers to use teaching approaches that fit in multidiscipline; design learning responsibilities in such a way that, for their effective achievement, would necessitate a learner to apply knowledge from more than one discipline (Chere-Masupha et al., 2021). Drawing on the CAP's (2009) document, such teaching approaches comprise project-based learning, task-oriented learning,
learning portfolio and research-based learning (MOET, 2009).

Lesotho's education system is organized in conjunction with formal and informal areas. Informal education happens to address the educational needs of youth and adults who are not able to go through the formal education situation and it offers primary and secondary level education (MOET, 2016). The Lesotho integrated curriculum was gradually introduced in phase pilot model from 2012 at Grade 1. In 2016, primary or lower basic education level was completed. The existing curriculum was stretched to junior secondary or senior basic education in the years 2017 to 2020 (MOET, 2016).

The curriculum characteristically recommended and necessitated a paradigm shift in the Lesotho education system. It touched at the core values and patterns of the traditional curriculum (Mokotsi, 2020).

In secondary schools in Lesotho, Literature is offered as Literature-in-English in the school curriculum, just as is the case with Nigeria, Ghana and other countries where such a subject exists. However, in Lesotho, regardless of how versatile it is, Literature in English is categorised under the field of Social Sciences as an elective, fighting for space with subjects like the ICT, Accounting and Economics, which learners normally opt for instead of Literature because they claim it is a failing subject (Moea, 2021).

The Literature in English syllabus in Lesotho is designed to offer a basis for tertiary courses in Lesotho and elsewhere, as well as laying foundation for jobs and moulding professions that require empathy, communication and analysis skills (NCDC & ECoL, 2018). Literary works help learners to use their imagination, enhance their empathy for others and lead them to develop their own creativity (ibid, 2), thus a dire need to have Literature in English in schools’ time-tables. The study of Literature in English at schools inspires learners to penetrate through the imaginary worlds and discover, scrutinise, and echo on both present and everlasting subjects as well as their eccentricity and humanity. The critical intellectual skills exclusively offered by the study of Literature consist of: cultivating an inquisitive mind, reconnoitring personal and communal issues, and cross-examining and dealing with obscurities and manifold perceptions (Ministry of Education Singapore, 2019).

The idea in Literature education is not just to retrieve an answer from a learner, it is to get a thoroughly thought out and creative response. In this case, the job of a teacher seems to be not simply for knowledge transference but also lead them to become competent readers (Mendelowitz, 2017). However, it seems teachers of Literature in English are unaware of the ideologies underpinning their subject curriculum and teaching methodologies thereof (Moea, 2021) hence dearth of knowledge about how to go about its teaching, thus making it a failing subject. Therefore, this paper sets out to unveil the dominant ideology in the context of Literature in English teaching in Lesotho syllabus. It focuses on section three of the syllabus; the syllabus aims and objectives. It unambiguously focuses on section 3.1- the seven syllabus aims. The reason for this focus is that these aims are a trench in which the teaching outcome, the assessment objectives and what is expected of the learner are drawn on. They are going to be interpreted based on the four curriculum ideologies; responding to the questions; what is the dominant ideology and the least applicable ideology in the teaching of Literature in English and what is the implication of the dominant ideology and the least applicable ideology in the teaching of Literature in English?

LITERATURE REVIEW
First, it should be understood that scholars have had different explanations of what curriculum is and how they operationalize it in different situations though an overlap may be traced. There is available a multiplicity of concepts of curriculum since educationists give their own different interpretations of the content and functions of curriculum (Tholappan, 2015). Tholappan perceives curriculum through the lenses of Philip Phenix, Hilda Taba and Albert Oliver. As Tholappan states, Oliver refers to curriculum as the educational program consisting of the three fundamental elements; studies, activities and guidance. Philip Phenix describes it as a carefully thought out scheme of values which constitute the aims and objectives or purposes of education. Then Hilda Taba looks at curriculum as the function of the public school, listing the three functions as preserving and transmitting cultural heritage, serving as an instrument for transformation of culture and functioning as a means for individual development. Curriculum, with Latin roots – ‘currere’ means running of the course (Pinar, 2011) which may translate into a racecourse. In an academic environment, our curriculum – the race course, becomes prescribed and described as the program of study, made up of a series of individual courses (Djur & Kalu, 2018). Toombs & Tierney (1993) cited in Djur and Kalu (2018) correspondingly describe curriculum as a planned design for learning negotiated by capability in the light of their expert knowledge and in the context of societal prospects and student’s needs.

Based on the foregoing articulations of what a curriculum is, certain definitional aspects may be highlighted. One, curriculum is a standards-based arrangement of premeditated experiences where learners run-through and attain expertise in content, practical and functional learning skills. Two, curriculum is the fundamental chaperon for all educationalists as to what is important for teaching and learning so that every single learner access rigorous educationally practical experiences. This says that the structure, organisation, and contemplations in a curriculum are fashioned in a quest to augment learner’s education and expedite teaching. In this light, it is suffice to say that a curriculum must encapsulate the obligatory objectives, approaches, resources and assessments to efficiently maintain teaching and learning. Therefore, there is a need to understand the ideologies underpinning every curriculum. (F. Bana et al., 2022)
Ideologies in general are belief systems that provide the value premises from which decisions about practical educational matters are made. Curriculum ideologies are defined as beliefs about what schools should teach, for what ends, and for what reasons (Mäkinen, 2018) and reflect various epistemological stances regarding schooling, teaching and learning, childhood, knowledge, evaluation and education in general (Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014). Insofar as an ideology can be tacit rather than explicit, it is fair to say that all schools have at least one ideology—and usually more than one—that provides direction to their functions. Generally, scholars of curriculum studies, predominantly those functioning from a critical standpoint, have long acknowledged the necessity for cross-disciplinary discussions, and notwithstanding the forces to sanctify, “rigorize” and fashion a novel academic, therefore, many have espoused an interdisciplinary approach to some of the furthermost essential and meaningful interrogations fronting humanity and its inferences for instructive practice and policy (Razfar, 2012).

Schiro (2013) contends that any approach to the school curriculum derives from a curricular ideology, that is, a curriculum ideology functions as a podium or prism from which the understanding and interpretation of the title role of education can acquisitely be contrasted. In his opinion, there are four major curricular ideologies: the Scholar Academic ideology, the Learner-centred ideology, the Social Reconstructionist ideology, and the Social Efficiency ideology (Mnguni, 2018; Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014; Mnguni, 2013). These ideologies can be articulated or fortified by school organisations, by institutions, or by individuals. According to Schiro (2013), these ideologies are approximately analogous to the educational, occupational, individual, and communal aims and objectives for education. Each individual curriculum ideology is supplementary to the same kind to an educational subgroup of a culture than to an objective; each possesses an impression on educators’ rational concerning the nature of knowledge, the curriculum intent (aims, goals, and learning objectives), teaching strategies, learning, learners, and evaluation methods (Ashour et al., 2012). They also affect learners since the primary values and beliefs of each ideology not only impact what is imparted or taught but also methodologies and purposes of why it is taught (Schiro, 2013).

It has also been exposed that curriculum ideologies play an imperative role in the accomplishment of any transformation movement (Ashour et al., 2012). The reason for developing adequately up-to-date curriculum is to safeguard that teachers have the technical know-how of what they need to impart to their learners. This necessitates a curriculum to set down goals, objectives and teaching and learning resources to be engaged and operationalised during the teaching and learning process. It also interconnects what learners should be acquainted with, do, and permit teachers to attain aims and objectives set out in the curriculum (Schiro, 2008).

The Scholar Academic ideology all comes down to academic disciplines (Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014; Mnguni, 2013, Schiro, 2008). This means that the goal of this ideology is induction of the child into an academic discipline- learning to think and behave like university academicians do and that a curriculum embodies a portion of a discipline. The worlds of intellect, knowledge and the academic disciplines are viewed as roughly equivalent in terms of both what they include and exclude (Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014). In this ideology, teachers are viewed as mediators between the curriculum and the learner, presenting a discipline to learners, rather than creation of new knowledge and as transmitters of a discipline (Schiro, 2008). For this to happen, teachers need to have three kinds of knowledge, being knowledge of the discipline, curriculum knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. The Scholar academics are concerned more with the curriculum content than with the child. For them, a child is a product of his mind and is as thus a creature of intellect.

This ideology further asserts that knowledge enables one to understand the world (in contrast to giving people, for example, the ability to do things etc.) and that knowledge takes the form of both content and process (Schiro, 2013). It means both what which is known and the way in which something is known. The aim of education for these ideologists is to encompass their disciplines by introducing them to the young (Mnguni, 2018). This involves recruiting young members of a discipline first by having them move into it as learners and later raising them up in its hierarchy as teachers and later as scholars respectively. This ideology is identifiable in a curriculum document if such a document fits well with objective oriented courses like Mathematics because the objectives are laid out for both the teacher and the learner (UKEssays, 2018). Also, the fact that this ideology focuses on the competency of a particular discipline, and gives the learners the freedom to learn the subject without external influences will be identifiable in such a document.

In the Social Efficiency ideology, the child is not the foremost focus. Rather, the emphasis is on developing skills obligatory for society’s needs (Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014). As a result, the child is regarded as a prospective adult member of the society. This ideology believes that the purpose of schooling is to meet the needs of the society by training youth to function as a future mature contributing members of the society as thus, it inclines more on social productivity (Mnguni, 2018, Schiro, 2008). This means that, the goal of these ideologists is to train the young in the skills and procedures they will need in their workplaces and at their homes in order to lead productive lives and perpetuate the functioning of a society (Mnguni, 2013). Teachers manage instruction by selecting and using educational strategies to help learners acquire behaviours prescribed by the curriculum (Schiro, 2008). Instructions are guided by clearly articulated behavioural objectives, and learners may require a lot of
practice to gain and maintain mastery of skills. Social efficiency educators’ first job is to determine the needs of society. Things that will fulfil these needs are called the terminal objectives of the curriculum (Mnguni, 2018). For this ideology, the educated person is one who meets the terminal objectives of the curriculum and thus fulfills the needs of society (Schiro, 2008).

Social Efficiency ideologists believe the most efficient achievement of a curriculum's terminal objectives results from applying the routines of scientific procedure to curriculum making (Schiro, 2008). In this line of thought, three things that play an important role are the concept of learning which is the change in behaviour, creation and sequencing of learning experience (the cause, action, stimuli which lead to the desired effect, reaction and response) and accountability of the client for whom educators work - willing to take responsibility (Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014; Schiro, 2008). The Social Efficiency ideologist accept as true that the aims of assessments are to assess to which level changes in the learners' enactment are taking place (UKEssays, 2018). Assessments are given recurrently and are used as a chaperon for the teacher to expedite progression in the learner.

The learner-centered ideology proponents are of the view that education and curriculum must focus on child-centred institutions in contrast to the teacher and principal-centred schools of the conventional nature and hierarchy (Schiro, 2013). In this case, parental expectations are minimised and learner's expectations are maximised. This is perceived through the fact that knowledge comes through the interaction of an individual with the surrounding world, both innate and social (Alanazi, 2016; Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014). The ideal school has been created to assist in growing or developing the natural organism and school is integrated—schools focus on positivity, emotions, intellect, social skills, and physicality (Schiro, 2013). The developmental growth of learners in terms of their conformity with the laws of their being should become the educator's very objective (Schiro, 2013, 2008). The focus of the proponents of this ideology is not on the needs of society or the academic disciplines; on the contrary, they centre on the needs and disquiets of every individual. They believe schools should be gratifying places where people develop as expected and logically in accordance with their innate characteristics (Alanazi, 2016). That is to say, let learners learn to write by writing, sing by singing and reason by reasoning (Schiro, 2008).

Learner-centred ideology requires educators to design school curriculum that envision school as a place where learners engage in self-directed and cooperative learning activities (Alanazi, 2016). In the constructive setting, learners learn from their own discoveries, whereas with practice theory, learners are transformed and shaped by their transactions alongside others and their physical setting (Mnguni, 2017). Learners are invigorated to be inventive and come up with novel ideas, and the assertiveness and positive self-image are treasured.

Schools that follow this type of ideology, would have a curriculum that is chock-full with diverse activities for learners to explore the chance to experience an extensive display of dealings (UKEssays, 2018). Learners use prior knowledge to solve problems. Implementing this ideology encourages learner interest in a subject and is a great way to stimulate academic growth and create a sense of enjoyment and enthusiasm in the class (UKEssays, 2018). A curriculum that is learner-centred is more probable to concentrate on the needs of the learners, which permits the educator to see areas that need consideration.

Lastly, there is the Social Reconstruction ideology. Social Reconstructionists are conscious of the problems of our society and the injustices done to its members; racial discriminations, gender-based inequalities, social prejudices and economic inequalities (Mnguni, 2018; Schiro, 2013). They view curriculum from a social perspective. First, they assume that the current society is unhealthy; second, they assume that something can be done to keep society from destroying itself and, third, they assume that actions must be directed toward reconstructing society along the lines suggested by the vision (Schiro, 2008). They therefore assume that the purpose of education is to facilitate the construction of a new and more equitable society that offers maximum satisfaction to all of its affiliates (UKEssays, 2018; Alanazi, 2016). The aim of the Social Reconstructionists is to rectify the situation by eliminating, from their culture, the aspects they consider undesirable, substituting them with social values they take as desirable and, by so doing, reconstructing their culture so that its members will attain maximum satisfaction of their material, spiritual and intellectual wants (Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014; Schiro, 2008).

In summary, the Scholar Academic ideology deals with preserving “cultural literacy” by having learners study the content and approaches of inquiry of traditional academic subjects. The Social Efficiency ideology targets at professionally carrying out a mission for society, providing knowledge and skills that provide learners with the aptitude to operate in society. The Learner-centred ideology puts the learner at the centre of the didactic attempt and is concerned with assisting each learner develop into a unique individual who possesses a hale and hearty self-concept. The Social Reconstruction ideology endeavours to aid learners appreciate the catastrophes society is faced with, cultivate a value standpoint in the direction of those predicaments, and pick up how to act to boot out the crises, in this manner bringing into existence a better society (Schiro, 2013). It is therefore important that teachers are aware of the existence of these ideologies underpinning their subject curriculum for better teaching practices. This is therefore the impetus for this study to help Literature in English teachers to better their art of teaching well informed in ideologies underpinning their subject. Previous researches have been made on different subjects and contexts (Mnguni, 2018, Mnguni, 2017; Marulcu & Akbiyik, 2014; Mnguni, 2013).
Nonetheless, to the best knowledge of the researcher, none was done in Lesotho context focusing on Literature in English. Therefore, this study is a necessity in assisting teachers.

METHODOLOGY
In pursuing the current research, the researcher adopted a qualitative approach. This approach is best-suited for this study because qualitative researchers investigate meanings, interpretations, symbol and the processes and relations of social life (Babbie, 2014). Qualitative research is a broad term encompassing different data collection and analytical approaches with the aim of providing cultural and contextual description and interpretation of social phenomenon (Lambert & Lambert, 2012). This research method was preferred because of its flexibility for this analysis which is document based- analysing the LGCSE Literature in English syllabus. According to Andrade et al. (2018) document analysis (DA) is a procedure which covers the identification, verification and consideration of documents which relate to the object investigated. They further signpost that its main function is to contextualise facts, situations or points in time and to lead to the adoption of new panoramas in other environments; it should take a factual reflection from the original source, and allow the localisation, identification, organisation and evaluation of the information contained in the document, thus compromising a systematic process of the collection, treatment and analysis of information’ (p. 2). Investigation in DA requires assessment of the context of the document's production; that is, of their authorship, nature and provenance; analysing the perception of the producer of such a document and place of their production (Dalglish, Khalid & McMahon, 2020). It was appropriate to do this analysis in order to unveil issues of concern to the researcher because the researcher was analysing a document- the LGCSE Literature in English syllabus.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The first aim of LGCSE Literature in English is ‘to develop the ability of learners to communicate accurately, appropriately and effectively in speech and writing’ (NCDC & ECoL, 2018, p. 2). Literature is the art of language and it cannot exist without language. This is because it involves language learning and it is an indispensable means for learners to learn English especially in countries where English is not a first language. Asking learners to examine sophisticated or non-standard examples of language makes them more aware of the norms of language use (Ezekokoli & Igubor, 2016). This aim is aligned with the Scholar Academic ideology because it is based on the idea that the purpose of education is to teach students basic knowledge from many different disciplines, which will give them the needed skills to be successful (Schiro, 2013). Having developed these two skills may even elevate such a learner to being an author or even an orator or poet or dramatist or even a litterateur. This notion is still echoed and emphasised in Scholar Academic ideology- recruiting young members of a discipline first by having them move into it as learners and later raising them up in its hierarchy as teachers and later as scholars respectively. The two skills emphasised by the aforementioned aim are language skills which are interdisciplinary because they cut across in all the disciplines and operate in all other disciplines (UKEssays, 2018). The aim further encourages learners to embrace the discipline in a way that creates new learning experiences. Similarly, this aim can be traced in Social Efficiency ideology. An individual attains an education by learning to implement the roles one must perform to be socially functional (Schiro, 2013). Education is thought of as the knowledge needed to help the learner become a productive member of society by imparting practical and useful knowledge learned in the classroom (UKEssays, 2018). The aim emphasises the practical communication skills necessary, accurate, appropriate and effective for one to be efficient in a society; reading and writing.

The second syllabus aim is ‘to develop the ability of students to understand and respond imaginatively to literary texts from different periods and cultures’ (NCDC & ECoL, 2018, p. 2). Literature is regarded as the encyclopaedia of a nation's civilisation and culture; reflecting the psychological structure of a nation, spiritual pursuits, cultural customs and other aspects of ideology from different facets (Moea, 2022b). It is an expression of culture because it documents human knowledge, belief and behaviour (Nworah & Nwabudike, 2014). Literature possesses a historic value if reading it offers an occurrence to contemplate about the bygone times, how things eventually transform, and how the world has progressed into what it is today. A historical value occasionally corresponds with cultural value; if a work is categorically from the past, then it can offer us a perception into a culture so far back that we can correspondingly meditate about how that culture might be a foundation for our own (Moea, 2021). There is an element of cross-disciplinary knowledge in this case. The study of the body of different cultures and different periodization rendered by the different texts offers a historical insight which propels one to know about the history of different cultures including theirs, a literary mark in the territory of History as a distinct discipline. Therefore, it aligns with the Scholar Academic ideology because the Scholar Academic ideology deals with preserving “cultural literacy” by having learners study the content and approaches of inquiry of traditional academic subjects (Mnguni, 2017; Schiro, 2013). The same aim crosses over to the Social Efficiency ideology. Literature mirrors directly or indirectly the society of the writer and unfolds as a panorama of the society by giving detailed and dramatized descriptions of the social life of the people and disclosing the contradictions and strains in a society (Duhan, 2015). This is the case because ‘understanding different cultures' may enhance a better outlook of societies and understand one's role in a society per the demands of the respective period and culture. In
this regard, the Social Efficiency ideologists advocate that three things that play an important role are the concept of learning which is the change in behaviour, creation and sequencing of learning experience (the cause, action and stimuli which lead to the desired effect, reaction and response) and accountability of the client for whom educators work- willing to take responsibility (Marulec & Akbiyik, 2014; Schiro, 2008). Therefore, by learning about historical aspects of the author's world (stimuli) the learners react and change into being better citizens. There is also an element of learner-centeredness through self-actualisation characteristic. The aim articulates that the learner is to develop an ability to respond imaginatively to literary texts which is a skill that emphasises the growth of an individual, each in harmony with their own unique intellectual, social, emotional and physical attributes.

The third aim is to develop the ability of a learner to enjoy literature and appreciate its contribution to aesthetic, imaginative and intellectual growth (NCDC & ECoL, 2018).

The numerous forms of literature establishing themselves in the form of poetry, fiction, prose, drama, etc., reveal before our eyes the enigmas of the immense optimistic world. Literature widens the horizon of the readers and support them to deliberate out of the box (Moea, 2022b). Apart from being a cradle of entertainment and information, it has also become, to a certain degree, a tete-a-tete striker in the contemporary society (Duhan, 2015). Similarly, the Learner-centred ideology is based on the premise that the learner should be at the center of the curriculum, and the needs and interests of the learners are the driving factors of how education is driven. Learners are encouraged to be creative and come up with new ideas, and the self-expression and self-worth are valued. The individual learner's ability to 'appreciate' the contribution of literature to 'aesthetic', 'imaginative' and 'intellectual growth' tally with the concepts of learner creativity and broaching novel ideas which will mark intellectual growth through their mature self-expression. The ability to appreciate literature for its 'imaginative and intellectual growth' yokes this aim with the Scholar Academic ideology. This is because Scholar Academicians hold the belief that knowledge gives people the ability to understand their world and that knowledge is capable of being transmitted from one human being to another and it is a representation of reality, not reality itself (Schiro, 2008).

This also allows academic knowledge growth and pushing one to end up being a scholar of the discipline.

The fourth aim is that the syllabus aims to develop the ability of learners to explore areas of universal concern, which will lead to a better understanding of themselves and others (NCDC & ECoL, 2018). Literature is significant since it kindles the mind. We acquire the aptitude to appreciate the world we populate from an exclusively different outlook (Moea, 2021). It offers us the aptitude and the power to see the world with a renewed mind by examining values and attitudes in literary texts thus cultivating themselves in value judgement (Bobkina & Dominguez, 2014). Some of the communal leitmotifs of literature like adoration, war, terror, solitude, and growth attach the reader with these subjects and aid cultivate an understanding of self as well as others. This it does through allowing us to appreciate humanity. Humanity is all about assisting and taking care of people who need compassionate regard, love and our kindness (Azcona, n.d.). This aligns with the Learner-centred ideology which acknowledges self-worth 'understanding of themselves' and ability to develop judgments as an individual.

The aim also aligns with the Social Reconstruction ideology. Proponents of this ideology submit that society is flawed by injustices like racism and gender and economic inequities. They believe that the main goal of a school curriculum should be to educate students on how to correct these injustices (UKEssays, 2018). Social Reconstructionists therefore assume that education, if revitalised along the lines they recommend, has the power to educate people to analyse and understand 'explore' social problems 'areas of universal human concern', envision a world in which those problems do not exist, and act to bring that vision into existence (Schiro, 2013). Because this aim also has a part on also understanding 'others', it places such a learner as part of a society which is emphasised by the Social Efficiency ideology- that education is thought of as the knowledge needed to help the student become a productive member of society by imparting practical and useful knowledge learned in the classroom, allowing such a learner to be a fully-fledged member of society who understands their role in society and humanity.

The fifth aim is to develop the ability of learners to appreciate different ways in which writers achieve their effects (NCDC & ECoL, 2018). According to Moea (2022b) literature exposes one to different writing styles through engaging with writings of different scholars. As a result, one's writing ability is enhanced. Every writer cleverly weaves his value and view of the world in their work through writing. Then the reader gets an exposure on how to pass the message across through employing different writing styles copied from other published authors. The linguistic principle supports the significance of literature as a basis and a cornucopia of candid accurate texts that offers the learner tangible specimens of a catholic array of styles, text types and registers. Maley (1989) cited in Bobkina & Dominguez (2014) points in this sense that literature deals with a potpourri of language forms and varieties— ranging from slang to formal—as well as various subject matters. According to Bobkina Dominguez (2014), numerous authentic features of the written language like the construction and function of sentences, the multiplicity of conceivable structures, and the dissimilar ways of linking ideas are offered at various levels of difficulty in literature. This brings to light the fact that literature encompasses an insightful variety of expressions, discourses and writing styles. Therefore,
working with literary texts, teachers expose learners to real language in use—formerly projected for native speakers—thus allowing them familiarisation with the target linguistic formulas and expansive roles. This tallies with the Learner-centred ideology and Scholar Academic ideology. In the learner-centred context, appreciation takes place when an analytic mind and critical thinking are nudged in the independence of reading and analysis. Also, learners work in a constructive setting where they find meanings and understandings themselves, on their own.

The Learner-centred ideology takes on a constructionist approach which assumes that learning is constructed based on learners’ experience and interactions. Teachers help to facilitate the learner's growth through experiences by acting as a bridge between the learner and the environment. With the Scholar Academic ideology, this aim becomes similar to the first aim discussed above. Appreciating different writing styles may even propel one to end up being a litterateur.

The sixth aim is to develop learner's ability to read widely and understand how reading contributes to personal development (NCDC & ECoL, 2018). Literature bonds transmission of information and meaning construction (Bobkina, 2014). Likewise, it is to be well thought-out that in the literature-based classrooms the reader is situated in a participatory and vigorous interactional starring role, manipulating the literary language and making sense of it. That is to say, the learner is obliged to fully engross in content-based focused learner heart-to-heart conversations in English and thus enhancing being on the go, independent and dominant in the learning process, and to develop as an individual as much as in their interactions with the others and with the institutions (Education-News, 2020). This notion aligns with the Learner-centred ideology because it advocates for the growth of an individual learner. Learner-centered ideologists believe that learners have the capability of educational growth within the correct environment and they also acknowledge that the learner must be the driving force that actualises the change. They believe schools should be gratifying places where people develop as expected and logically in accordance with their innate characteristics (Alanaz, 2016). In this case, literature in English subject offers a conducive environment for development of innate characteristics, as thus contributing to personal development.

The last aim is to develop the ability of learners to comprehend that creative writing is a means of self-expression and personal fulfilment (NCDC & ECoL, 2018). ‘Literary texts help to stimulate the imagination of students, to develop their critical abilities, and to increase their emotional awareness, as much as their pleasure in reading’ (Bobkina, 2014, p. 250). The more we read, the more we learn about not only the subjects that matter to us, but also the styles that we find engaging. Reading literature also helps us to speak and write with more confidence in ourselves and our own personal voice. It has to be borne in mind that the replication of the age is contingent on the value of the mind in which it is echoed (Austin, 2022; Duhan, 2015). If a literary work is to be arbitrated by the eminence of this consideration, it is apparent that it is determined by the quality and nature of the reflecting mind (Sharma, 2020). The poet expresses his feeling and those who read his poem are engrossed and feel as one synchronically with him and themselves. According to Duhan (2015) if literature expresses societal sympathies, it is as thus naturally destined to work out some constructive stimulus on our mind and attitude. A stimulating poem crafts overall effect on society. It arouses our feelings and enthusiasm for welfare (Sharma, 2020; Duhan, 2015). Therefore, this style of self-expression may be passed on to the learners and make them express themselves efficiently and at the same time feel fulfilled. This aim focuses more on self and therefore it aligns with the Learner-centred ideology. The Learner-centred ideology is based on the premise that the learner should be at the center of the curriculum, and the needs and interests of the learners are the driving factors of how education is driven (UKEssays, 2018; Schiro, 2013).

This ideology holds to the idea that each learner has the potential to excel when allowed to properly interact with their environment hence being best suited in this case of this syllabus aim.

Despite the fact that the amalgamation of curriculum ideologies represents substantial appearance rationality and coherent charm, quite a lot of distresses cannot be unheeded. In as much as preceding studies have testified that educators may possibly have definite favourite ideologies, they largely do not upkeep curriculum ideologies echoed in a curriculum. Subsequently, so long as instructors are not ready to implement integrated curriculum ideologies in a balanced way, rudimentary teaching strategy and pedagogical practices could tilt towards not affording the concepts the magnitude of time they deserve and as a result, dismally miscarry in an attempt to make learners’ understanding and learning of main literary concepts clear, as well as the nature of place of Literature in schools and in societies.

Mciet et al. (1998) cited in Phosisi (2019) warned that there had not been sufficient enquiry authenticating data that amalgamation of the ideologies will yield the sought after effects. Without documented evidence that integration of the four curriculum ideologies will produce better-quality learner performance as well teaching practices in Literature in English, slight or no transformation can be anticipated. For that reason and being grounded on the discoveries of the present study, the researcher contends that Literature in English as a subject could be operationalised and instrumentalised to upkeep societal integrity, as well as social and commercial empowerment, without fundamentally disassembling didactic and systematic standards, structures, guidelines and practices (Marulec & Akbijik, 2014). It is deceptive again to think that communal impartiality promotion and alleviation of social ills may be achieved through the principles of
learner-centred and Scholar Academic ideologies, while those of Social Efficiency ideology would safeguard that operative educational standards, organisations, guidelines and practices continue in tact (Mnguni, 2013). This therefore necessitates a balance as far as Social Reconstruction ideology principles are applied in LGCSE Literature in English syllabus and pedagogy.

CONCLUSION

Summary

This study intended to establish the dominant ideology in the LGCSE Literature in English syllabus and is the implication of the dominant ideology and the least applicable ideology in the teaching of Literature in English. It employed the qualitative document analysis of the syllabus. According to the findings, it is evident that the LGCSE Literature in English syllabus has all ideologies represented however in different degrees; the Learner-centred ideology dominating and the Social Reconstruction least represented. The results reveal that the Learner-centred ideology is hegemonic over other ideologies, appearing in six aims, followed by the Scholar Academic which appears in four aims, followed by the Social Efficiency appearing in three aims and lastly, the Social Reconstruction appearing in one aim.

Implications

Learning of this syllabus proves that a product of Literature in English will be someone who is creative, independent and equipped in high order critical thinking and analysis. Also, the findings imply that the study of Literature situates a learner, to a certain extent, as a member of society and also one who can function as a scholar in various disciplines. However, per the findings, there is a lot more to be done as far as Social Reconstruction is concerned. Learners seem to be furnished for being individualistic in their development instead of also balancing areas that will enhance ability to discern social concerns and even be in a position to alleviate them. This poses a huge challenge on how to balance the purpose of curriculum as the one that serves as preparation for tertiary education, furthering personality development as well as preparing for the world of work.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There exists a possibility that teaching of LGCSE Literature in English may not meet the curriculum imperatives related to issues of human concern and values because of the nature and fashion in which curriculum ideologies are integrated as evidenced by the findings in this study. Additionally, it is to be expected that educators will find it rather perplexing to fulfil and carry out the curriculum at the same time adopting instructional ways and means that gratify all of the four ideologies. Thus, teachers may be in the dark about which curriculum ideology philosophies must be embraced contained and conducively catered for by their direct teaching setting and amid diverse learning situations. Therefore, learners in various schools may be trained based on the dissimilar circles of principles distinct curriculum ideologies. This absence of reliability and uniformity may eventually have a way to encumber the curriculum objectives achievement. As a result, the researcher endorses further research to determine the extent to which teachers can integrate multiple curriculum ideologies in their teaching of Literature in English and what methodologies will they find appropriate in their teaching while at the same time striking some balance amid the ideologies. Also, teachers should portray an understanding of these ideologies and be helped to balance the ideologies in their classrooms as well as the NCDC designing syllabus aims in such a way that will help teachers in their quest to balance the ideologies. Failure to do this, may breed problems because learners will be skewed to one side and be imbalanced as per the demands of education objectives.

LIMITATIONS

The first limitation of this study is that the researcher confined himself to only document analysis and did not include the teachers to investigate whether they understand the ideologies thereof making the results biased. Also, there is also the limitation of focusing only on one part of the syllabus, not the whole syllabus document. Also the usage of only the document narrows the scope of the results. In the same manner, there seems to be no research in this line in Lesotho especially in Literature education thus rendering it under-researched. Therefore, more research and more methodologies may be undertaken to widen the findings and research coverage.
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