

Designing an Alternative Syllabus for Junior College Students

Masayoshi Sugiura

I. Introduction

It was nearly two decades ago that Munby (1978: 1) stated that "syllabus design and content has in the present decade been receiving an increasing amount of attention." In Japan, however, the present mainstream of language teaching still seems to be concerned with methodology rather than syllabuses. This situation is well illustrated by the fact that only a few books on ELT syllabus design have been written by Japanese scholars even though thousands of English-related books are available in this country. It seems that the job of syllabus design is left to only a handful of specialists in textbook writing and publishing.

The aim of this paper is to show how to evaluate, modify and adapt the syllabus upon which the present programme is based. In the first place, the concept of "syllabus" will be examined in brief, and two categories of language teaching syllabuses will be introduced. Secondly, the present teaching context in which we work will be clarified. The existing programme is explained in depth in order to grasp what is going on at the junior college mentioned above. Some problems with the present programme will be pointed out. Thirdly, needs analysis will be made as a means to clarify students' purposes in undertaking the language course. In this con-

nection, recent studies and research findings relevant to the present teaching situation will be reviewed. Fourthly, various types of syllabuses are listed and examined as possible solutions for modifying the existing problematic syllabus. As a consequence, an alternative syllabus type may be proposed. Lastly, part of the possible content of the coursebooks will be discussed. Throughout this paper the main focus will be put on how to develop communicative competence in English.

II. Defining syllabus design

Before entering into a detailed discussion of syllabus design, we must try to clarify what it means by “syllabus” since there are several different views on it. The term may be extended to cover the notion of “curriculum”, but here in this paper, the word “syllabus” is defined as “the specification of a teaching programme or pedagogic agenda which defines a particular subject for a particular group of learners” (Widdowson 1990: 127). Sinclair and Renouf (1988) define it in the context of English language teaching as follows:

An EFL syllabus is a set of headings indicating items which have been selected, by a language planner or materials writer, to be covered in a particular part of the curriculum or in a course series. Its content is usually identified in terms of language elements and linguistic or behavioural skills. Sometimes there is a methodology built into it, although syllabus and methodology are in principle distinct. (141)

Nunan (1988a) classifies syllabuses into two main categories: product-oriented and process-oriented syllabuses. The former puts focus on the knowledge and skills which learners should gain as a result of instruction, while the latter on the learning experiences themselves. White (1988) also proposes two types of syllabus: Type A and Type B. His dis-

inction is basically the same as Nunan's (1988a): Type A is similar to product-oriented syllabuses, and Type B to process-oriented ones.

It will be useful to make a distinction between product-oriented and process-oriented syllabuses. In this short study, the discussion can be mentioned only summarily.

1 . Product-oriented syllabuses

Structural, situational and notional-functional syllabuses can be classified in this category. The following is a brief description of each syllabus type.

(1) Structural syllabuses

The most common syllabus type in this country was and still is structural or grammatical syllabuses. The use of structural syllabuses has been under criticism for a long time since the 1970s. Wilkins (1976) is one of those scholars who questioned the adequacy of this approach. He says, "... even when we have described the grammatical (and lexical) meaning of a sentence we have not accounted for the way in which it is used as an utterance" (10).

These days this syllabus has been reviewed from different perspectives. Ellis (1993) underlines the role of a structural syllabus as a means to promote "gradual mastery" of implicit second language knowledge. He also suggests that such a syllabus should be used alongside some kind of meaning-based syllabus. This is especially true in the case of adult learners who tend to analyse and appraise what they are learning.

(2) Situational syllabuses

In situational syllabuses, a series of situations will form the main organizing principle. White (1988) describes this type of syllabuses as follows:

Often, the situation will be closely linked with a practical activity or task of the kind which tourists might have to undertake.. Typically, a restricted range of

language will be covered, the emphasis being on getting things done rather than learning the language system; some attention may also be given to grammar, but usually only to the extent that it is helpful in generating further utterances of the type represented in the model (63).

This approach, which makes use of simulated situations, may be useful for those who are in immediate need of practising language items or mastering a set of expressions within a limited time.

(3) Notional-functional syllabuses

In this section notional and functional syllabuses are included in this type. The notional-functional approach springs from an attempt to “classify exactly what aspects of a language have been mastered by a particular student” (Finocchiaro & Brumfit 1983: 12). Thus, the issue of needs analysis is always associated with this type of syllabus. White (1988) explains this type of syllabus as follows:

The selection and grading of items for functionally based syllabuses relies on such considerations as the needs of the learners, both in terms of classroom functions and in the 'real world', usefulness, coverage or generalizability, interest or relevance and complexity of form. (82)

It is often pointed out that issues of matching notional-functional and formal selection and grading are often problematic in this type of syllabus.

2. Process-oriented syllabuses

Task-based and procedural syllabuses are included in this category. Though there are some differences in practice, the principles underlying these two syllabuses are similar. Nunan (1988a) describes them both as follows:

Both task-based and procedural syllabuses share a concern with the classroom processes which stimulate learning. They therefore differ from syllabuses in which the focus is on the linguistic items that students will learn or the com-

municative skills that they will be able to display as a result of instruction. In both approaches, the syllabus consists, not of a list of items determined through some form of linguistic analysis, nor of a description of what learners will be able to do at the end of a course of study, but of the specification of the tasks and activities that learners will engage in in class. (42)

In this process-oriented approach, learners are expected to carry out a variety of tasks, such as drawing maps, using the telephone, etc. Opinions vary as to whether this approach is suitable for teaching English as a foreign language in this country. Fuller discussion will be presented later in Section V.

III. Describing the “Freshman English (FE)” programme

The envisaged college, which is a two-year higher educational institution, has three faculties with a total enrollment of approximately 1,500. The English Faculty admits approximately 240 new female students each year. The Faculty started an English language programme named “Freshman English” or “FE” in 1987. The following is a rough sketch of the “FE” programme.

1. The yearly and weekly schedule

The present programme, as its name suggests, is prepared for freshmen students to study English over one academic year, which begins in April and ends in January. The course is composed of five 90-minute classes per week. The syllabus lists 20 units, each of which includes five lessons or components: Dialogue, Listening Comprehension, Reading Comprehension, Composition, and Conversation. The coursebooks entitled “Freshman English” (Enomoto et al 1987) contain all the five components. The basic structure of one unit is shown below:

1st lesson: Dialogue
2nd lesson: Listening Comprehension
3rd lesson: Reading Comprehension
4th lesson: Composition
5th lesson: Conversation

It takes five days or a whole week to cover one unit consisting of five components. The first and third components are conducted by full-time Japanese teachers of English, and the rest by native speakers of English.

After finishing each unit a short quiz is given in the first class of the following unit. In addition, two written examinations, i.e. mid-term and final examinations, are administered for each component during and at the end of the course. These results determine about 70% of students' final grades. The rests are determined by their classroom performance.

2. The description of each component

The following is a brief description of the five components.

(1) Dialogue

This component plays the most important part in the whole programme. Every unit begins with this component. It was 20 model dialogues that were made, and then the other components were produced, based on the "Dialogue" component (Miyata 1990).

Before attending the class, students are required to memorize the whole dialogue in this component.

(2) Listening Comprehension

This component is divided into two sections: drills and listening exercises. Each section of drills consists of several sets of 20 sentences based on important expressions treated in the "Dialogue" component. Students are

required to repeat those basic sentence patterns after their teacher until they can master them. Listening exercises are based on the topic covered in the "Dialogue" component. Most of the materials prepared for listening are scripted and tape-recorded by native speakers.

(3) Reading Comprehension

The reading materials in this component are designed so as to include useful expressions and topics dealt with in the model dialogue in each unit. At the end of each reading passage, two types of questions are provided: short questions in English and multiple-choice questions in English. Students are required to read the reading passage in advance.

(4) Composition

This is intended to check whether students have mastered how to use important expressions in each unit. This component contains two kinds of activities: translation from Japanese into English and free composition based on a given topic.

(5) Conversation

Based on the topic covered in the "Dialogue" component, students are supposed to conduct conversation with the help of native speakers of English. Related questions regarding the topic are listed in a rather random fashion, but in most cases some more supplementary materials are prepared by individual teachers

3. The syllabus organization of the "FE" programme

It is apparent that the present syllabus of the "FE" programme (see Appendix A) is based on topics or situation. This policy is written in the "Teacher's Guide" to *Freshman English*, which states that the textbooks are designed "to help students to acquire language through the study of a series of relevant topics."

The "FE" programme is not only based on topics or situations, but is

also structurally organised. In fact, the important expressions and structures used in the first lesson are to be found in the succeeding lessons in each unit. In this regard, the "Teacher's Guide" states that "repetition is one of the most important aspects for language learning particularly by a child. A child hears the same expressions over and over again, and repeats them on various occasions thereby reinforcing or correcting the analyses he has made." This linguistic view that grammar should be learned unconsciously is quite similar to the audio-lingual approach, which is based on habit-formation theories.

Appendix A shows how the teaching materials are arranged in the *Freshman English* coursebooks. In each unit, one specific topic or situation is set, and related grammatical items to be learned are listed. In other words, a series of topics or situations form the main organizing principle in the coursebooks. The other four components are based upon the topics and grammatical items which are used in the first component. The analysis reveals that this programme is not only based on topics or situations, but also on structures or grammar.

IV. Discussing the "FE" programme

"In recent years, a major trend in language syllabus design has been the use of information from and about learners in curriculum decision-making." (Nunan 1988a: 13) It is regrettable, however, that the envisaged junior college has not conducted any systematic or official needs analysis since it was established more than 40 years ago.

1. Needs analysis and the existing programme

It has been increasingly important to adjust language courses to the needs of students working at different levels of proficiency and with a variety of objectives in mind. Our educational situations and conditions have

changed since the original syllabus of the “FE” programme was introduced several years ago. What is particularly noticeable is that the number of students in senior high schools is decreasing in proportion to the recently declining birthrate. In addition, they have become increasingly concerned about what they should learn in class at college. If we do not pay adequate attention to what they have in mind, they may end up losing interest in learning here and choose other competing educational institutions. Herein lies the necessity to grasp their needs and meet their expectations. It is highly desirable to obtain information about students’ needs and to use the data for modifying the present syllabus.

The first step to understand our students is a needs survey. Two different types of needs analysis are proposed by language syllabus specialists: objective needs analysis and subjective needs analysis.

2. Objective needs analysis of the target students

Objective needs analysis is useful in that factual information, such as age, nationality and mother tongue, can be obtained without depending upon such methods as questionnaires and interviews. Nunan (1988b) explains this type of analysis as follows:

Objective needs analysis results in content specifications derived from an analysis of the target communicative situations in which learners are likely to find themselves. Being derived from an analysis of the target language situation, they can be carried out in the absence of the learner. (44)

The following is the findings of the objective needs analysis of the envisaged learners: The number of the students in one class is 27. The learners are all Japanese female students, ranging from 18 to 19 years of age. They have learned English as a foreign language for six years at junior and senior high schools and are majoring in English at this college. They are at roughly the same proficiency level: their average score in TOEFL is

approximately 360. The TOEFL results show that they are lower-middle learners who have acquired basic knowledge of English grammar, but their listening and speaking skills are far from satisfactory. This is mainly because the entrance examinations to most Japanese colleges and universities are based on grammar and reading comprehension. Another reason for their failure to develop communicative competence is that they have virtually no opportunities to use English out of their classroom.

3. Subjective needs analysis of the target students

Subjective needs analysis is not only useful for obtaining valuable data about students' needs, but also effective in motivating students to learn a foreign language. Nunan (1988a) underlines the importance of this type of needs analysis in the following way:

One of the purposes of subjective needs analysis is to involve learners and teachers in exchanging information so that the agendas of the teacher and the learner may be more closely aligned. This can happen in two ways. In the first place, information provided by learners can be used to guide the selection of content and learning activities. Secondly, by providing learners with detailed information about goals, objectives, and learning activities, learners may come to have a greater appreciation and acceptance of the learning experience they are undertaking or about to undertake. (79-80)

We obtained the data from 27 students at the beginning of a class by getting them to complete a questionnaire according to a three-point scale. The questionnaire (see Appendix B) is adapted from Nunan 1988b. The findings are summarised as follows:

The envisaged learners desire to acquire the ability to perform with some degree of fluency in English. To be more specific, they want to acquire the ability to communicate with English speaking people with more ease. Among the so-called four language skills, most of them wish to develop listening and speaking skills, both of which have been neglected at

the high school levels in this country. They answered in the survey that they hope to be able to enjoy films and TV without depending upon Japanese subtitles.

The results of the questionnaire show that many of them are interested in visiting and staying in countries where English is spoken. The college sends 42 students to take part in the homestay programmes lasting 4 weeks at University of California at San Diego in the United States and also two groups (the number of students is not fixed) to Sheffield University and Leeds Metropolitan University in Britain at the end of the first academic year, i.e. from February through March. All the classes in those places are organised by the language schools or extension centres affiliated with these universities. It is, of course, optional for students to attend these programmes.

According to this survey, most of them want to obtain a certificate for English proficiency by passing a qualifying examination called "STEP", which is designed to assess Japanese learners' English proficiency, with more emphasis on speaking and listening skills than most traditional entrance examinations. This is the most popular and widely accepted test among high school and college students. It is believed that if they are successful in attaining a certain degree of English proficiency as measured by this "STEP" test, their job prospects will become a little brighter.

After they graduate from college, a majority of them want to gain employment in a company where English is required, but in actuality, most of them are obliged to do office work and have little further contact with English.

4. Setting the purposes for learning English

Once needs analysis is conducted, learners' purposes in undertaking a given foreign language programme or course become clear. The recent sur-

vey reveals that the target students are at roughly the same proficiency level and have roughly the same needs. Since they are highly homogeneous, it is relatively easy to identify their learning purposes.

Nunan (1988a: 80) cites some of the purposes which learners, teachers and syllabus planners have articulated in the Australian Adult Migrant Education Program. These purposes are designed for those immigrant learners who learn English as a second language in Australia. It is obvious that some are not relevant to our teaching context, where English is taught as a foreign language. Taking this factor and the recent needs analysis findings into consideration, we should like to propose the following five general purposes, which are applicable to the "Freshman English" programme at this college:

- to develop proficiency in English
- to develop an appreciation of the target society and culture
- to communicate socially with members of the target or host community
- to develop the survival skills necessary to function in the host community
- to establish and maintain social relationship

V. Selecting a syllabus for the "FE" programme

After the description of purposes, the selection of a syllabus type is an essential part of the syllabus designing process. Various types of syllabuses can be considered as possible solutions for modifying the existing problematic syllabus. It is necessary to discuss some of them and consider their merits and demerits as an alternative proposal.

1. Which type of syllabuses?

Several types of syllabuses have been mentioned in Section II. Here in

this section, they will be examined in relation to the present context, and a discussion will be conducted as to which syllabus type will be more suitable for the "FE" programme

(1) Product-oriented syllabuses?

It would be unwise to use one of the three types of product-oriented syllabuses, i.e. structural, situational and notional-functional syllabuses as a single main operating structure for our programme. They have demerits of their own if they are adopted alone.

Structural syllabuses are not desirable. This is not because they are of no value, but because most students at our college have learned English, based on such syllabuses at high schools. Moreover, they have already acquired some basic grammatical knowledge, as is indicated in their TOEFL scores. What they all lack is strategic and sociolinguistic competence. They are required to know language 'use' rather than 'usage' (Widdowson 1978).

As is indicated earlier in Section II, situational and notional-functional syllabuses also have problems especially when we think of grading materials. It would not make sense to avoid teaching linguistic forms. Those students who are aspiring to obtain a certificate for English proficiency may be at a loss when they find that they are not learning enough grammar in the classroom.

(2) Process-oriented syllabuses?

Though they are relatively new and have various advantages, process-oriented syllabuses, including procedural and task-based ones, are not suitable for the present teaching context in which English is taught as a foreign language, not as a second language.

Firstly, process-oriented syllabuses depend too much on negotiation between the teacher and learners over content and activities and aims. It is certainly important for teachers to grasp learners' needs, but we should be

aware that students have only a vague idea of their learning strategies because of their lack of exposure to language learning. Besides, if teachers go too far in this direction or do not sufficiently explain their teaching strategy, students may think that they have no confidence in teaching. Considering that students are accustomed to a teacher-directed environment in this country, it would be too radical to choose such a learner-led syllabus. White (1988) states as follows:

A learner-led syllabus, by contrast, will take the direction determined by the learners, so that it is impossible to predict in advance exactly what route the syllabus will follow, since it is the pace and direction set by the learners that will dictate its shape. (95)

Secondly, it is far more difficult to select and grade context in process-oriented syllabuses than any other traditional approach. Nunan (1988a) suggests how difficult grading content is in this approach.

The problem for the task-based syllabus designer is that a variety of factors will interact to determine task difficulty. In addition, as some of these factors will be dependent on characteristics of the learner, what is difficult for Learner A may not necessarily be difficult for Learner B. (48)

Thirdly, process-oriented approaches focus more on “the various classroom activities which are believed to promote the development of skilled language use” (Nunan 1991: 86). Sheen (1994) states, however, that advocates of the task-based syllabus provide neither concrete examples nor findings on the effectiveness of pedagogic tasks in the normal language classroom. There is room for further investigation on this point.

2. A tentative syllabus type: hybrid syllabuses

It is possible to conclude that there is no single type of syllabus most suitable for the present situation. In fact, many of the coursebooks current-

ly available attempt to integrate topical and notional elements as well as grammatical and functional ones (Nunan 1988a: 89). The following is a summary of some practical approaches to syllabus design.

Not a few scholars have suggested that a hybrid or proportional syllabus should provide a valuable compromise. One of them is Cunningsworth (1984: 23), who advocates putting grammatical or structural elements into functional syllabuses by citing the following reason: "Structural and functional syllabuses do not seem to be opposed to each other, as they have sometimes come to be seen, but are better considered as complementary." He also says that "a functional syllabus with a cyclical progression is more suitable for adults who are learning English for particular purposes and expected to put what they learn to practical use in the near future" (29-30).

Johnson (1982) argues that those students who are already familiar with much of the language's grammar "need not suffer from the lack of an organised and graded structural presentation – for such students it is a case of re-representation, rather than initial introduction, of grammatical structures" (94). White (1988: 47) also says that a functional syllabus in current use takes "communicative functions as the leading element, with structural organization being largely determined by the order already established by the functional sequence."

Thus, the syllabus organization to be proposed here is a hybrid one with a notional-functional syllabus as the main structure. It is not determined solely by grammatical considerations, but has to take communicative categories into account. There is not necessarily any connection between functional and structural components; each could be quite independent of the other. It follows that some attention may be given to grammar as well in this approach.

What is particularly noticeable in the coursebooks is the drill section included in the “listening Comprehension” component. In the language laboratory class, students are requested to repeat invented expressions listed in the section. The problem is that in these drills no content or situation for each sentence is provided, and students are supposed to attain linguistic habits through those mechanical drills. Such sentences which are arranged at random should be replaced from the new syllabus by those which can be transferred to real-world communicative language use.

VI. Deciding the content of the coursebooks

Once the syllabus type is defined as a hybrid one, the next step will be to decide the content of the course.

The five components of this programme may vary in the emphasis they place on functional and structural elements. The “Dialogue”, “Listening Comprehension” and “Conversation” components can give priority to function over structure. In the “Reading Comprehension” component, the syllabus will be topic-based and pay attention to both the structural and cultural features of the topic in question. In the “Composition” component, the syllabus can combine all the features mentioned above. It follows that in some components functional teaching predominates and structural aspects are secondary, or vice versa in others.

1. Sequencing dialogues

The problem with this approach is that it is difficult to grade or sequence communicative functions. As is discussed above, the grading and sequencing of the proposed syllabus will be less obvious than in a purely structural syllabus but more obvious than in a process-oriented syllabus. For lack of space, the following discussion on the grading of teaching materials will be limited to the first and most important section, i.e. the “Dia-

logue" component.

Two factors will be taken into account in deciding the sequence of teaching materials: the content of dialogues and needs of students.

When we have dialogues as main materials for listening and speaking skills, the research findings presented by Nunan (1988a) and Brown & Yule (1983) are especially relevant to our teaching situation and might be used as a guide to the sequencing of content. Brown & Yule (1983) suggest that taking short turns is generally easier than long turns. In other words, the shorter utterances are, the easier to follow. As regards listening texts, Nunan (1988a) concludes with the following statement:

... a listening text which involves more than one speaker, which is not addressed to the listener, and in which the topic is unfamiliar to the listener will be more difficult to comprehend than a monologue on a familiar topic which is addressed to the listener. (58)

In summary, dialogues will be arranged in the earlier units of the coursebook as follows: a dialogue which is shorter; which includes shorter turns; which involves fewer participants; which deals with more familiar topics.

The other consideration is needs of students. Since learners are at the centre of this approach, their needs (see Appendix B) should take precedence in organizing the syllabus. Thus, the situation in which functions are performed will be closely linked with a practical activity or task of the kind which students might have to undertake when they visit an English-speaking country. Some attention will be given to grammar, of course, to the extent that students can generate further utterances in different situations.

2. Defining dialogues

To implement a hybrid syllabus which is partly based on the

notional-functional approach, I would attempt to give a goal statement which would cover the learning purposes mentioned in Section IV. The following is a sample list of communicative goals, which are to replace the existing ones, for the first five "Dialogue" components. They are described as functions which are accompanied by related situations (topics) and important lexis. Each unit is organized under a general heading.

Units & Topics	Functions	Language
1 . Introducing Yourself	Introduce people; get to know someone; express likes & dislikes;	<i>What (How) about ...?, How long ...?, find time to..., How do you do?, Let me introduce, I like, etc.</i>
2 . In Class	Ask for and give opinions;	<i>agree and disagree; ask follow-up questions;</i> <i>What do you think about ...?, I (don't) agree, Excuse me, but, I'm sorry,</i> <i>Would you mind ...?, etc.</i>
3 . At a Restaurant	Order meals; make and reply to requests; make and reply to offers.	<i>feel like...., be ready to, something light, What would you like ...?, Here you are, etc.</i>
4 . Telephoning	Making calls; leaving messages; making arrangements	<i>Hello, this is, Can/May I speak to ...?, Thanks for calling., Can I take a message?, etc.</i>

5. Shopping

Getting and giving help; getting information;
asking prices

*Excuse me. Could you help me?, How
much ...? Do you have ...?, No, thanks.*

I'm just looking, etc.

(Based on Blundell, J., Higgins, J. & Middlemiss, N. 1982, and Swan, M. & C. Walter. 1984)

Dialogues will be made based on the above-mentioned goals (functions) and topics. They should include more frequent and more authentic expressions.

There are some other sociolinguistic factors to be considered in designing dialogues. As is discussed earlier, the overall situation is set in an English-speaking country, the language to be used in the dialogues is colloquial Standard American English or RP. The keys and the genres are varied according to individual dialogues. It goes without saying that much emphasis is placed on social norms of interaction and interpretation since most Japanese learners are at a loss how to communicate in a certain culture.

VI. Conclusion

The envisaged college is praiseworthy in that it created a new type of syllabus ahead of other educational institutions nearly ten years ago. It is revealed, however, that it has failed to understand two important points. One is that students have different needs for learning English from what they had in the past. The other point is that we should take sociolinguistic factors into consideration when we analyse and produce language teaching syllabuses.

It is asserted that the last important phase or step in the process of

designing a syllabus is evaluation of the course. Yalden (1987: 94) says as follows: "Without feedback, one would end up with extremely rigid course outlines, and this is exactly what one is trying to avoid in contemporary course design." White (1988: 148) also stresses that "evaluation is now seen to be an integral part of language curriculum development" Formative evaluation can be used as feedback to syllabus designers and teachers in general, and changes should be made when learning results do not prove satisfactory. It is absolutely necessary to use every opportunity to get feedback from students as well as from other staff members. This is exactly what should be done after designing and implementing a syllabus.

References

- Blundell, J., Higgs, J. & Middlemiss, N. 1982. *Function in English*. Oxford: OUP.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Teaching the Spoken Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cunningsworth, A. 1984. *Evaluating and Selecting EFL Teaching Materials*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Ellis, R. 1993. 'The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition' *TESOL QUARTERLY* 27/1: 91-113.
- Enomoto, Y. (ed.) 1987. *Freshman English* 2nd ed. Nagoya: Nagoya College.
- Finochiaro, M. & Brumfit, C. 1983. *The Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*. Oxford: OUP.
- Johnson, K. 1982. *Communicative Syllabus Design and Methodology*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Miyata, M. 1990. 'An Integrated Approach to ELT—Designing a New Curriculum and Original Coursebooks—' *Bulletin of Nagoya Junior College*

No.28: 159-176.

- Munby, J. 1978. *Communicative Syllabus Design*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nunan, D. 1988a. *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: OUP.
- Nunan, D. 1988b. *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nunan, D. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology: a textbook for teachers*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Sheen, R. 1994. 'A Critical Analysis of the Advocacy of the Task-Based Syllabus' *TESOL QUARTERLY* 28/1: 127-151.
- Sinclair, J. M. and Renouf, A. 1988. 'A lexical syllabus for language learning.' In Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (eds.), *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*, London: Longman.
- Swan, M. and C. Walter. 1984. *The Cambridge English Course, Book 1 Teacher's Book*. Cambridge: CUP.
- White, R.V. 1988. *The ELT Curriculum: Design, Innovation and Management*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: OUP.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1990. *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Wilkins, D.A. 1976. *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: OUP.
- Yalden, J. 1987. *Principles of Course Design for Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Appendix A

Unit	Situation	Important Expressions
1.	Before Class	not bad, we'd better, be late for, How come?, It's my turn to, you know, sound good, see you.
2.	In Class	a bit, go on, you all, how to, once again, this time,

- after someone.
- 3 . Between Classes around, What about?, rarely, How long?, find time to, keep oneself adjective, what to do with, that way.
- 4 . At the Cafeteria feel like, be ready to, come on, something light, Here you are, Let's see, cheer up, be not so sure about.
- 5 . About Majors join you, pleased to, yeah, no kidding, let one know, Why don't you?, go and do, make it.
- 6 . Part-time Work directly, have nothing to do with, part-time work, a nice arrangement, fair deal, hard to come by, hit on.
- 7 . Glider Club would like to, That's too bad, have a good time, so far, you bet, take off, scare someone, one of these days.
- 8 . Going Shopping What's new?, nothing much, Morris who?, all about, you mean, things like, good for, keep one company.
- 9 . In a Train on someone, end up, thanks to, in disguise, be upset about, put up with, might as well, get used to.
- 10 . At a Store take time, Here comes, help someone with, go well with, something like, This is it., become someone, take it.
- 11 . At a Coffee Shop be reluctant, hang out, reasonable, be ready to, I'll have. abrupt, start ...ing, from now on.
- 12 . Going to Movie grim, What's wrong?, forget about, tell, one of those, nothing of the kind, in advance, just in

- case.
13. Going to Concert be in town, No wonder, make head or tail of, that is, relate to, nearly, no big deal, have no choice.
14. Watching TV with the Family hardly, come up, last, miss, care for, a couple of, put up with, tempting.
15. Outing with Family get away from, once in a while, exactly, be afraid, That means, get lost, stop in, take a look.
16. Spectator Sports now that, act up, pastime, cut it out, speaking about, be embarrassed, give a ring.
17. Cultural Differences be stuck, Why is it that?, only so many, stand out, That's how, Are you saying?, to the extent that.
18. Politics up to, due to, on the part of, virtually, misguided, do something, drastic, crooked.
19. Social Problems incident, nasty, persistently, be frustrated, in terms of, be concerned about, That's because, a mountain of.
20. Economic Problems twice as much as, beyond the limits of, ought to, blame someone for, be independent of.

Appendix B

We would like you to tell us which of the following uses of English are important for you. Please put an O in the box beside each to tell us if you think it is 'Very useful', 'Useful', 'Not Useful'.

	Very useful	Useful	Not Useful
1 Stay or live in an English speaking country.	11	16	0

2	Study in an English speaking country	6	20	1
3	Get a good job.	16	7	4
4	Get a certificate for English proficiency.	20	6	1
5	Watch TV or listen to the radio.	14	11	2
6	Read newspapers or magazines.	12	10	5
7	Read novels	8	13	6
8	Communicate with native speakers	21	6	0
9	Become a translator or interpreter	9	8	10
10	Read better	17	7	3
11	Speak and listen better	23	4	0
12	Write better	11	15	1

N.B. The numbers under 'Very Useful', 'Useful', 'Not Useful' indicate how many out of the 27 respondents answered in the affirmative.