SYLLABUS DESIGN FOR ENGLISH COURSES

Bambang Irfani
Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Raden Intan Lampung
bambangirfani@yahoo.com

Abstract

The planning of courses including designing curriculum and syllabus is often ignored in English language teaching and teacher training. Harmer (2000) states that decisions about course content are very often not taken by teachers, but by some higher authority. Even many institutions present the syllabus in terms of the main textbook to be used - by a certain date, teachers are expected to have covered a certain number of units in the book. At the same time teachers are often provided with a list of supplementary material and activities available. Yet, the graduates of such programs as English teacher training are often required to carry out course design task without having received sufficient training to do so. As a matter of fact, course design requires specialized expertise which can be gained through learning and practice. Designing courses is unlike preparing one's own teaching as it should be understood by others who will use the design. Therefore, it is very urgent to equip the English teachers with the basic competence of course design.

Key words: syllabus design, English courses

A. Rationale

Curriculum and syllabus are two major documents necessarily prepared in a course design task. Where a curriculum describes the broadest contexts in which planning for language instruction takes place, a syllabus is a more circumscribed document, usually one which has been prepared for a particular group of learners (Dubin and Olshtain, 1986). In other words, a syllabus is more specific and more concrete than a curriculum, and a curriculum may contain a number of syllabi. A curriculum may specify only the goals – what the learners will be able to do at the end of the instruction – while the syllabus specifies the content of the lessons used to lead the learners to achieve the goals (Krahnke,

1987). Content or what is taught is the single aspect of syllabus design to be considered. It includes behavioral or learning objectives for students, specifications of how the content will be taught and how it will be evaluated.

The aspects of language teaching method which are closely related to syllabus are the theory of language, theory of learning and the learner type. The choice of syllabus should take those three aspects into consideration. Furthermore, to design a syllabus is to decide *what* gets taught and in what order. For this reason, the theory of language explicitly or implicitly underlying the method will play a major role in determining what syllabus is adopted. In addition, a theory of learning will also play an important part in determining the syllabus choice. For example, a teacher may accept a structural theory of language, but not accept that learners can acquire language materials according to a strict grammatical sequence of presentation. While the basic view of language may be structural, the syllabus, in that case, may be more situational or even content-based. Learner type is another variable in the choice of syllabus of syllabus. Learner types can be seen in practical and observable terms, such as type of cognitive activity, life style, aspirations, employment, educational and social backgrounds and so on ((Krahnke, 1987).

The choice of a syllabus is a major decision in language teaching, and it should be made as consciously and with as much information as possible. According to Krahnke (1987), there are six types of language teaching syllabus including:

1. *A structural (or formal) syllabus*. It is one in which the content of language teaching is a collection of the forms and structures, usually grammatical, of the language being taught. Examples of structure include: nouns, verbs, adjectives, statements, questions, complex sentences, subordinate clauses, past tense, and so on, although formal syllabi may include other aspects of language form such as pronunciation or morphology.
2. *A notional/functional syllabus*. It is one in which the content of language teaching is a collection of the functions that are performed when language is used, or of the notions that language is used to express. Examples of

functions include: informing, agreeing, apologizing, requesting, promising, and so on. Examples of notions include size, age, color, comparison, time, and so on.

3. *A situational syllabus*. It is one in which the content of language teaching is a collection of real or imaginary situations in which language occurs or is used. A situation usually involves several participants who are engaged in some activity in a specific setting. The language occurring in the situation involves a number of functions, combined into a plausible segment of discourse. The primary purpose of situational language teaching syllabus is to teach the language that occurs in the situations. Sometimes the situations are purposely relevant to the present or future needs of the language learners, preparing them to use the new language in the kinds of situations that make up the syllabus. Examples of situations include: seeing then dentist, complaining to the landlord, buying a book at the bookstore, meeting a new student, asking directions in a new town, and so on.
4. *A skill-based syllabus*. It is one in which the content of language teaching is a collection of specific abilities that may play a part in using language. Skills are things that people must be able to do to be competent in a language, relatively independently of the situation or setting in which the language use can occur. While situational syllabi group functions together into specific settings of language use, skill-based syllabi group linguistic competencies (pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, sociolinguistic, and discourse) together into generalized types of behavior, such as listening to spoken language for the main idea, writing well-formed paragraphs, giving effective oral presentations, taking language tests, reading texts for main ideas or supporting details, and so on. The primary purpose of skill-based instruction is to learn a specific language skill. A possible secondary purpose is to develop more general competence in the language, learning only incidentally any information that may be available while applying the language skills.

5. *A task-based syllabus*. It is similar to content-based syllabus in that both the teaching is not organized around linguistic features of the language being learned but according to some other organizing principle. In task-based instruction the content of the teaching is a series of complex and purposeful tasks that the students want or need to perform with the language they are learning. The tasks are defined as activities with a purpose other than language learning, but, as in a content-based syllabus, the performance of the tasks is approached in a way that is intended to develop second/foreign language ability. Language learning is subordinated to task performance, and language teaching occurs only as the need arises during the performance of a given task. Tasks integrate language (and other) skills in specific settings of language use. They differ from situations in that while situational teaching has the goal of teaching the specific language content that occurs in the situation – a predefined product – task-based teaching has the goal of teaching students to draw on resources to complete some piece of work – a process. The language students draw on a variety of language forms, functions, and skills, often in an individual and unpredictable way, in completing the tasks. Tasks that can be used for language learning are, generally, tasks that the learners actually have to perform in any case. Examples are applying for a job, talking with a social worker, getting housing information over the telephone, completing bureaucratic forms, collecting information about preschools to decide which to send a child to, preparing a paper for another course, reading a textbook for another course, and so on.
6. *A content-based syllabus*. It is not really a language teaching syllabus at all. In content-based language teaching, the primary purpose of the instruction is to teach some content or information using the language that the students are also learning. The students are simultaneously language students and students of whatever content is being taught. The subject matter is primary, and language learning occurs incidentally to the content learning. The content teaching is not organized around the language

teaching, but vice versa. Content-based language teaching is concerned with information, while task-based language teaching is concerned with communicative and cognitive processes. An example of content-based language teaching is a science class taught in the language that the students need or want to learn, possibly with linguistic adjustments to make the science more comprehensible.

In practice, of course, these different types rarely occur independently of each other. Almost all actual language teaching syllabi are combinations of two or more of the types of syllabus described here.

B. Types of English Syllabus

1. The Structural Syllabus

The structural or grammatical syllabus is doubtless the most familiar of syllabus types. It has a long history, and a major portion of language teaching has been carried out using some form of it. The structural syllabus is based on a theory of language that assumes that the grammatical or structural aspects of language form are the most basic or useful. When functional ability, or ability to use or communicate in the new language, is a goal of instruction, the structural syllabus can be said to embrace a theory of learning that holds that functional ability arises from structural knowledge or ability.

The content of the structural syllabus is language form, primarily grammatical form, and the teaching is defined in terms of form. Although the definition of language form and the most appropriate "grammar" to use in pedagogy have long been disputed, most existing structural syllabi use some form of traditional, Latin-based, descriptive/prescriptive grammatical classification and terminology. The usual grammatical categories are the familiar ones of noun, verb, pronoun, adjective, singular, plural, present tense, past tense, and so on. The domain of structural syllabi has tended to be limited to the

sentence. That is, the sentence is the largest unit of discourse that is regularly treated. A classification of sentence types usually includes semantically defined types such as statements or declaratives, questions or interrogatives, exclamations, and conditionals, and grammatically defined types such as simple, compound, and complex sentences.

A good deal of morphology can also be found in structural syllabi, such as singular and plural marking, the forms marking the tense system of the language, and special morphology such as determiners and articles, prepositions and postpositions, gender markers, and so on. Morphology also deals with vocabulary, specifically formal aspects such as prefixes and suffixes.

A key feature of the structural syllabus is that it is "synthetic" (Wilkins, 1976; Yalden, 1983). Synthetic syllabi require analyses of the language (content), such word frequency counts, grammatical analysis, and discourse analysis. The syllabus designer uses the elements isolated as a result of the analyses to make up the content of the syllabus. In most cases there are rules, patterns and grammatical elements, usually with guidelines for their combination and use. Because of their synthetic nature, structural syllabi assume a general theory of learning that holds that learners can synthesize the material being taught in one of at least two ways. First, the analyzed information - the rules and patterns-are available as the learner attempts to use them in linguistic communication. The learner uses the information either to generate or produce utterances or discourse, or to check the accuracy of production. Second, analyzed information is transformed from analyzed, possibly conscious knowledge, into the largely unconscious behavior that makes up language use.

2. The Notional/Functional Syllabus

The notional/functional syllabus is the best known of contemporary language teaching syllabus types. It is, however, also the object of a great deal of misunderstanding. On the one hand, while notional/functionalism has been referred to as an "approach" (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979: Widdowson, 1979), it has never been described as anything other than a type of content of language instruction that can be taught through a variety

of classroom techniques. On the other hand", notional/functionalism has been closely associated with what has been called "communicative language teaching" (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979; Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Widdowson, 1979), a rather amorphous view of language teaching that has been referred to as a method but is really a collection of different approaches and procedures clustered around notional/functional content.

Because of its broad scope, its confusion with instructional method, and its own lack of definition, notional/functionalism is difficult to describe clearly. A narrow perspective is taken here, viewing the notion-al/functional movement only in terms of a means for defining instructional content. In this sense, notional/functional syllabi have much in common with structural syllabi in that both are subject to a variety of interpretations and can be associated with a variety of methodologies.

At its simplest, notional/functionalism is, in Richards and Rodgers' (1986) terms, a theory of language. It holds that basic to language are the uses to which it is put. If language is seen as a relationship between form and function, notional/functionalism takes the function side of the equation as primary and the form side as secondary. For example, rather than regarding the future tense form (with *will*) in English as basic and discussing the uses to which it can be put (e.g., talking about the future, making promises) as secondary, in a functional view of language, notions such as *future* and functions such as *promising* are considered basic and the future tense form is discussed as one way of realizing these notions and functions. Other interpretations and applications have elaborated on notional/functionalism, but the most basic point of the movement in language teaching is that categories of language use rather than, categories of Language form have been taken as the organizing principle for instruction.

3. Situational Syllabi

The situational syllabus has a long history in language teaching, but situational content has mostly been used as an adjunct to instruction that is primarily focused on language form and structure. Many "methods," from

grammar-translation to Berlitz to modern integrated textbooks, have used examples of the language being learned in situations and settings. These range from short dialogues to lengthy themes with casts of characters acting and behaving in complex ways. Many collections of conversation or communication activities are organized in terms of situations.

It is important to realize that there is not just one situational syllabus, but many, differentiated by type of informational content and type of linguistic content. Alexander (1976) has distinguished three types of situational syllabus, differentiated by type of information: "limbo," concrete, 'and mythical. The limbo situation is one in which the specific setting of the situation is of little or no importance. Alexander gives the example of introductions at a party, where the setting of the party is largely irrelevant, and what is important is the .particular language focus involved. The concrete situation is one in which the situations are enacted against *specific* settings`"(p. 98), and what is important is the setting and the language associated with it. Ordering a meal in a restaurant and going through customs are examples of concrete situations. The mythical situation is one that depends on some sort of fictional story line, frequently *with* a fictional cast of characters in a fictional place.

Among the different linguistic focuses that can be found in situations is the grammatical focus, with which situations are presented *in such* a way that particular structures or sets of structures are emphasized. It. is possible to imagine a pronunciation focus that emphasizes particular pronunciation problems. Another is a lexical focus, whose emphasis is on some set of vocabulary items. Situations may emphasize functions, such as introduction or apology, or notion, such as time or color or comparison. Finally, situations may be constructed to present various types of discourse or interactional phenomena.

A related way to distinguish situational syllabi is to consider whether situations are presented to students in the form of completed discourse, or the students are expected to create or modify parts or all of it. Many situations are presented in full, and students are then asked to play out the same situation using their own language and, possibly, settings. On the other hand, situations can be

presented as role plays, in which the students are expected to create, supply, or fill in much of the language that occurs in the situation.

4. Skill-Based Syllabi

Much less is known about the skill-based, task-based, and content-based syllabi than about the types already discussed. This is especially true of the skill-based syllabus, a type that has not been previously identified as a separate kind of instructional content in the literature on language teaching. The term "skill" in language teaching has generally been used to designate one of the four modes of language: speaking, listening, reading, or writing (Chastain, 1976). Here, however, the term is used to designate a specific way of defining the content of language teaching.

A working definition of *skill* for this volume is a specific way of using language that combines structural and functional ability but exists independently of specific settings or situations. Examples are reading skills *such as skimming* and scanning; writing *skills* such as writing specific topic sentences and certain kinds of discourse (e.g., memos, research reports, work reports); speaking skills of' giving instructions, delivering public talks, giving personal information for bureaucratic purposes, asking for emergency help over the telephone; and listening skills such as getting specific information over the telephone, listening to foreign radio broadcasts for news or military information, taking orders in a restaurant, and so on. Another, and more traditional, way of viewing skill-based instruction is what is called competency-based instruction. Competencies are similar to behavioral objectives in that they define what a learner is able to *do* as a result of instruction. Extensive lists of competencies have been developed for adult ESL (refugee and immigrant) programs in the United States.

Not all native speakers of a language are equally competent users of language. Also, individuals have varying competence in the different skill areas. For example, even though anyone reading this book may be considered a

speaker of English, including many native speakers, not all are reading with the same degree of efficiency. Some are more "skilled" readers than others. At the same time, one person may be a particularly skilled reader but perform extremely poorly when required to carry on an emergency conversation on a mobile radio. Or someone who is an inefficient reader may be adept at getting people to buy waterbeds.

The ability to use language in specific ways (settings and registers) is partially dependent on general language ability, but partly based on experience and the need for specific skills. Language skills may, in fact, be limited to specific settings. Many waiters and waitresses in restaurants, and other workers in similar jobs, have learned only the English skills needed to carry out their work in the restaurant. They have learned a specific second-language skill. Preparing students to undertake higher education in a second language often involves teaching them specific skills such as note-taking, writing formal papers, and skimming and scanning while reading.

5. The Task-Based Syllabus

The task-based syllabus is relatively little-known. It is largely based on work by Krahnke (1981, 1982), Candlin and Murphy (1986), and Johnson (1982). The defining characteristic of task-based content is that it uses activities that the learners have to do for noninstructional purposes outside of the classroom as opportunities for language learning. *Tasks* are distinct from other activities to the degree that they have a noninstructional purpose and a measurable outcome. Tasks are a way of bringing the real world into the classroom.

Task-based learning is sometimes similar to situational learning, but the content of the situations is provided by the students themselves. Tasks are also not static; that is, they should involve a process of informational manipulation and development. They should also involve informational content that the language learners do not have at the beginning of the task. Another characteristic of tasks is that they require the student to apply cognitive processes of evaluation, selection, combination, modification, or supplementation (so-called "higher-order thinking skills") to a combination of new and old information. In task-based instruction,

language is not taught *per se,* but is supplied as needed for the completion of the task.

An example of a task is to have the students develop a guidebook to their school or instructional program for actual use by other students. Immigrant students might research the availability of health care in their community and develop a guide to using health care facilities. In an academic setting, students might work on a paper or report that is actually needed for a content-area class. Beginning students might tackle the process of applying for a program or job, obtaining the forms and information necessary to complete the process.

The intent of task-based learning is to use learners' real-life needs and activities as learning experiences, providing motivation through immediacy and relevancy. The focus on processing of new and old information in an interactional manner stimulates transfer. Language form is learned through language use.

Task-based learning is structurally geared toward language learning or acquisition because the tasks are part of a language learning environment or program are chosen in part for what they will contribute to language development, and are implemented in a way that provides as much experience and feedback as possible. The language needed to carry out tasks is not provided or taught beforehand, but discovered by students and provided by teachers and other resources as the task is carried out.

6. The Content-Based Syllabus

Content-based language teaching has been in existence for some time, but has only recently been recognized as a viable way of teaching language as an end in itself. In concept, content-based teaching is simple: It is the teaching of content or information in the language being learned with little r direct or explicit effort to teach the language itself separately from the content being taught. In practice many programs using a content-based approach have also included an instructional component specifically

focusing on the target language, but such specific language instruction is not regarded as the primary contributor to target language acquisition.

Recent developments in content-based teaching are closely related to the broader issue of attempts to provide effective instruction to LEP children in public schools in the United States and Canada. One solution to the problem of limited school language proficiency has been some sort of controlled immersion in the language of the school or society. "Immersion" essentially has meant that students are given content instruction in a language they may not control well or at all; that is, they simply go to school in that language. When under taken responsibly and informedly, immersion can maximize the students' comprehension of both the target language and the content material.

The potential for the success of immersion was established by controlled research carried out in Canada (Lambert S. Tucker, 1972). In this research program, students were placed in school subject classes, starting at the kindergarten level, that were taught in languages other than their first. The results of the research demonstrated that such students had learned both the content being taught and the language in which it was taught, and that cognitive development was not slowed by such an experience.

This type of evidence, and the need to educate large numbers of non-English-speaking children in the United States and Canada, gave support to bilingual education programs in both countries as a solution to the problem of educating children who do not speak the language of the educational system. The goals of bilingual education programs have been to keep non-dominant language speakers in school, to ensure that their cognitive development continues at an acceptable rate, and to give them ability in the community language that they did not have proficiency in, leading, ideally, to bilingualism.

C. Choosing and Integrating Syllabi

The term *syllabus,* as used here, does not refer to a document guiding the teaching of a specific language course, but to a more theoretical notion of the *types* of content involved in language teaching and the bases for the organization of language courses.

In the preceding chapters, six types of syllabus content were defined and described as ideal or isolated types. In actual teaching settings, of course, it is rare for one type of syllabus or content to be used exclusively of other types. Syllabus or content types are usually combined in more or less integrated ways, with one type as the organizing basis around which the others are arranged and related. For example, many foreign language courses are organized around a structural syllabus, with each unit or chapter focusing on several grammatical features. Accompanying the grammatical focus and organization, however, are other types of content, usually situational (dialogues) and functional (how to introduce yourself).

Basic syllabus design involves several questions. The first question concerns the types of content to include or exclude. The second is whether to combine various types of syllabus content or to rely on a single type. The third, assuming that more than one type of content will be included, is whether to use one type as basic and to organize others around it, or to sequence each type more or less independently of the other. In discussing syllabus choice and design, then, it should be kept in mind that the issue is not which type to choose but which types and how to relate them to each other. Before this issue is discussed, three factors that affect the choice of syllabus or content in language teaching—program, teacher, and students—are examined.

Program Factors Affecting Syllabus Choice and Design

The major determinant in choosing a syllabus type for second language teaching must be the goals and objectives of the overall instructional program; that is, the type of knowledge or behavior desired as an outcome of the instruction. This truism has not been consistently

recognized. For example, for a number of years it has been widely accepted that ability to function communicatively in a second language is a desirable outcome (among others) of foreign language instruction in secondary schools and at the college level. The emphasis in much of this instruction, however, has remained on the structural and formal aspects of language, presumably under the assumption that one kind of knowledge (structural will lead to the other (ability to function). Yet ample evidence has shown that more direct routes to functional ability are possible, using a variety of types of instructional content such as situational, skill, and notional/functional content. Thus the relationship of the goals of instruction to the content of instruction has not always been direct.

Clearly, another factor that will affect the type of syllabus or syllabi that can be chosen is the instructional re-sources available. Resources may include elements such as time, textbooks and other materials, visuals (films, slides, pictures), realia, and out-of-classroom resources such as other speakers of the language, radio and television programs, films, field trips, and so on.

A final program factor affecting the choice of instructional content may be the need to make the instruction accountable to authorities or measurable by external measures—usually tests. The influence of tests on the content of instruction is a well-known phenomenon. Teachers and instructional programs often teach toward a particular kind of knowledge if it is going to be tested, even though the knowledge may not be what the students really need.

Teacher Factors Affecting Syllabus Choice and Design

Along with the more general program factors, teachers play a role in determining what the content of language instruction will be. A truism of teaching is that teachers tend to teach what they know. A teacher who is not familiar with the formal aspects of a language will not be likely to try to teach a grammar lesson, but might, for example, focus on the social uses (functions) of language or how it is used in various situations. On the other hand, the science teacher with one student who does not speak the language of the classroom may go ahead and teach

science in the best way possible (content instruction) rather than try to give the student a special language lesson.

Some research in teacher practice suggests that language teachers do not accurately describe their own practice (Long & Sato, 1983), have contradictory and inconsistent beliefs about language teaching (Krahnke & Knowles, 1984) and tend to repeat their own experiences as students when they become teachers. As a result, teachers can have a powerful influence on the actual syllabus of a classroom even if the official or overt syllabus of the program is entirely different.

Student Factors Affecting Syllabus Choice and Design

Facts about students also affect what instructional content can be used in an instructional program. The major concerns here are the goals of the students, their experience, expectations, and prior knowledge, their social and personality types, and the number of students in a given class.

Ideally, the goals the students themselves have for language study will match the goals of the program. When this is so, the question of goals is easy to settle. Sometimes, however, programs and students have different goals. For example, one instructional program was designed to teach the English of the broadcasting profession at a vocational school. The program administrators assumed that the students' language learning goals were tied to the professional training they were receiving. Many students, however, were more interested in attaining general English proficiency to pre-pare them for even better positions than they were being trained for. One way to meet both sets of goals would be to increase the amount of general functional, situational, and skill content provided along with the specialized skill and structural content that was being taught.

D. Combining and Integrating Syllabus Types

Throughout this monograph, syllabus types have been discussed more or less ideally and independently, treating each as if it were the sole type being used in instruction. In practice, however, few instructional programs rely on only one type but combine types in various ways.

A distinction exists between combination and integration, although it is not absolute. *Combination* is the inclusion of more than one type of syllabus with little at-tempt to relate the content types to each other. For example, a lesson on the function of disagreeing (functional) could be followed by one on listening for topic shifts (skill) in which the function of disagreeing has no significant occurrence. Such combination frequently occurs in language teaching when various communicative or "fluency" activities (i.e., skills, tasks) are added on to a structural, functional, or situational syllabus. Little or no attempt is made to relate the content of the two types of instruction.

Integration is when some attempt is made to interrelate content items. For example, if, after a structural lesson on the subjunctive, students were asked to pre-pare stories on the theme, "What I would do if I were rich," the two types of instruction would be integrated.

Integration is obviously more difficult and complex to undertake than combination. Integration may seem to be the preferred way to use different syllabus or content types, and in some ways this perception is accurate. Instruction that reinforces and relates various syllabus and content types is probably more effective than instruction that is divided into discrete compartments. On the other hand, again, when specific knowledge and behavioral outcomes are desired, discrete combinations may be preferable to fully integrated syllabi. For example, if it is true that instruction in form is directly usable by learners mostly for Monitoring (Krashen,1982), then it may be that structural or formal syllabi should make up, as Krashen suggests, a limited but separate part of the overall curriculum, with the objective of enabling students to use the structural knowledge in test-taking and editing settings, and not of enabling them to gain active control over the use of the structures in discourse.

Another argument in favor of combination stems from the finding that much of early second language behavior is a combination of formulaic language use (use of memorized chunks of language for particular functions) and more creative and synthesized applications of rules (Ellis, 1986).

It may be that some situational or Functional content can be included with the objective of providing the learners with the formulas and routines they need for immediate and specific communication, and other types of instruction can be used to foster their overall language acquisition.

E. A Practical Guide to Syllabus Choice and Design

The resources available for actual language teaching syllabi have been described in this monograph, along with some of the constraints on choosing and combining them. By now it is clear that no single type of content is appropriate for all teaching settings, and the needs and conditions of each setting are so idiosyncratic that specific recommendations for combination are not possible. In addition, the *process* of designing and implementing an actual syllabus warrants a separate volume.

Ten steps in preparing a practical language teaching syllabus:

1) Determine, to the extent possible, what out-comes are desired for the students in the instructional program. That is, as exactly and realistically as possible, define what the students should be able to do as a result of the instruction.
2) Rank the syllabus types presented here as to their likelihood of leading to the outcomes desired. Several rankings may be necessary if outcomes are complex.
3) Evaluate available resources in expertise (for teaching, needs analysis, materials choice and production, etc.), in materials, and in training for teachers.
4) Rank the syllabi relative to available resources. That is, determine what syllabus types would be the easiest to implement given available resources.
5) Compare the lists made under Nos. 2 and 4. Making as few adjustments to the earlier list as possible, produce a new ranking based on the resources constraints.
6) Repeat the process, taking into account the constraints contributed

by teacher and student factors described earlier.

7) Determine a final ranking, taking into account all the information produced by the earlier steps.
8) Designated one or two syllabus types as dominant and one or two as secondary
9) Review the question of combination or integration of syllabus type and determine how combination will be achieved and in what proportion.
10) Translate decisions into actual teaching units.

This guide is intended as a general procedure to follow in making syllabus decisions for specific instructional programs. It is expected that quite different designs will emerge for each application, and this is as it should be. What is important in making *practical* decisions about syllabus design is that all possible factors that might affect the teachability of the syllabus be taken into account. This can be done only at the program level.

References

Alexander, L.G. (1976). Where do we go from here? A reconsideration of some basic assumptions affecting course design. *English Language Teach*ing, *30(2),* 89-103.

Brown, H.D. (1980). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brumfit, C.J., & Johnson, K. (Eds.). (1979). *The communicative approach to language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Candlin, C., & Murphy, D. (Eds.) (1986). *Language learning tasks* (Vol. 7, Lancaster Practical Papers). London: Pergamon.

Chastain. K. (1976). *Developing second language* skills: *Tigory t,- practice.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Dubin, *F., &* E. Olshtain. *(1986). Course design: Developing programs and materials for language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1986). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2000). The Practice of English Language Teaching. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Krahnke, K.J. (1987) Approaches to Syllabus for Foreign Language Teaching. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Krahnke, K.J., & Knowles, M. (1984). *The basis for belief: What ESL teachers believe about language teaching and why.* Paper presented at the 18th annual meeting of Teacher of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Houston, March, 1984.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice* in *second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Lambert, W., & Tucker, G.R. (1972). *The bilingual education of children.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Long, M., & Sato, C. (1983). *Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), Class oriented research in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.*

Lozano, F., & Sturtevant, J. (1981). *Life styles.* New York: Longman.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (1982). Method: Approach, Design, and Procedure. *TESOL Quarterly, 16(2),* 153-168.

Widdowson, H.G. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Wilkins, D.A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolfson, N., & Judd, E. (1983). *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.*

Yalden, J. (1943). *The communicative syllabus: Evolution, design. and implementation.* Oxford: Pergamon.