

# **Teaching Context**

**'Synthetic and Analytic Syllabuses'**

**In a South Korean University Setting**

by:

**Paul Z. Jambor**

**Currently (October, 2009) at:**

**Korea University**

**IFLS: Department of Education, Art & Design**

**Date of Completion: March 31, 2006**

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	p. 2
2	'Type A' Syllabus .....	p. 3
2.1	Lexically Based Syllabus .....	p. 4
2.2	The Notional-Functional Syllabus .....	p. 7
3	'Type B' Syllabus .....	p. 10
3.1	The Process Syllabus .....	p. 11
3.2	The Procedural Syllabus .....	p. 13
	Chart 1 ('Type A' & 'Type B' Syllabuses) .....	p. 15
4	Cultural Context .....	p. 15
5	The Author's Classroom Experience .....	p. 16
6	Cultural Values in the Teaching Context - 'Type A' or a 'Type B' syllabus? .....	p. 18
7	Summary .....	p. 20
	References .....	P. 22
	Appendix .....	P. 23

## 1 Introduction

When one is considering whether a 'Type A' or a 'Type B' syllabus is most suitable for one's classroom environment, there are many considerations such as cultural contexts, learner types, desired aims and objectives, as well as institutional structuring, that one should keep in mind before making a final decision regarding one's classroom teaching approach. This essay's primary aims are to identify the many characteristics of either approach, and to lay down a compelling body of reasoning, in an effort by the author, to best determine which of the two syllabus types would most preeminently serve the interests of his learners and the institution, and which would best fit into the cultural context of his classroom environment.

As this paper intends to show, the 'Type B Syllabus' is finer tuned at providing students with better communicative potential, however, the 'Type A Syllabus' allows the teacher to be more accountable so that s/he may provide the head teacher and/or the principal with a more detailed breakdown of the language items being taught. - All of which aims to determine whether the syllabus the author is currently working with conforms to the 'Type A' or 'Type B' tradition.

While a 'Type A' syllabus provides students with an external knowledge of language, the 'Type B' syllabus offers an internal awareness of language. Also, while a 'Type A' syllabus follows a synthetic approach, the 'Type B' syllabus follows a more analytic one, with the earlier representing a 'What is to be learnt?' (content) and the latter a 'How is to be learnt?' (process) culture. While the 'Type B' approach is better suited at improving

learners' communicative competence, in terms of putting the language to fluent bona fide use, the 'Type B' approach would certainly prove to be more useful in training teachers whose primary task is to teach grammar as a subject in its own right.

Given the fact that the author teaches communication classes, designed to improve speaking skills, a "Type B' approach would be of most use to the learners, however, the cultural contexts/values, surrounding any EFL classroom in Korea, do well to accommodate a 'Type A' syllabus, thus a combination of the two would most likely serve all parties of interest.

## **2 'Type A' Syllabus** (See Chart 1: p.14)

The author has never been an advocate of this Reconstructionist synthetic syllabus type as it is counterproductive for improving his students' communicational fluency as it fails to teach language holistically. It is far too concerned with the content of the lessons, and not enough attention is placed on the process of learning itself.

Most syllabi that fall under the umbrella of a 'Type A' syllabus are best represented by a notion of controlled practice, sequentially presenting language items (content) one at a time, whereby learners are expected to build a gradual understanding of language (See Willis, 1990:42). Students who learn English through extensive grammatical focus, do well on linguistically based grammar tests, however, they possess a limited ability to speak and understand the language when confronted with real life situations.

From the author's experiences, in Hungary and Korea, wherein he tried teaching English by utilizing itemized syllabi, he concluded that such

syllabi proved futile in developing fluency as it merely provided learners with external rather than internal grammatical competence. The kind of structural focus found in a synthetic syllabus does provide learners with a reasonably good knowledge of simplified grammar rules, however, for the most part, it fails in developing fluent speaking skills as this conscious form of knowledge is not readily available.

In the act of writing, learners have the time to apply the rules of grammar, but because verbal communication takes place in real time, there is simply not enough time for them to efficiently apply their repertoire of grammar rules to spoken discourse.

Michael West asserts that the synthetic approaches (of the 1950s) have 'low surrender value' as learners achieve little progress in relation to the amount of time they invest in learning (see White, 1988:12). Consequently, from this particular point of view, a synthetic approach can be seen as unsatisfactory in developing fluent speakers of L2.

Given that the author teaches communication/conversation classes, this syllabus type would most likely prove to be fruitless in helping learners become fluent speakers. Willis, and Carol, among others, believe that a lexically based syllabus is the solution to effectively teach language (see Willis, 1990:46).

## **2.1 The Lexically Based Syllabus**

Although the lexical syllabus is described by some (i.e. M. H. Long and G. Crookes of the University of Hawaii (see references)) as a

synthetic syllabus, it fails to meet all the characteristics of such a syllabus, as synthetic approaches generally utilize simplified non-authentic language while the lexical syllabus uses authentic language which is composed of text that has been generated by natural discourse intended to serve a communicative purpose, rather than to exemplify grammatical patterns of the target language.

Willis suggests that 'the most difficult thing about language is that there is simply so much to learn' (Willis, 1990:139). Therefore, the most effective way to teach language is by exposing learners to the commonest words in the language and in doing so evading a 'low surrender value'.

Willis pointed out that H. E. Palmer and Michael West were the first to propose a word based syllabus in the 1930s and 1950s respectively. He further stated that in 1971 Carol devised an estimate that the most frequent 1,000 words make up 74% of the English language, while the next 1,000 words account for an additional 7% of the language, and a further 1,000 for only 4% (Willis, 1990:46). The utility proves to fall drastically after the first 1,000 most common words. Willis advocates the COBUILD research corpus which is based on computerized concordances of lexis. The COBUILD project devised a similar but slightly different estimate to that of Carol's, stating that the 700 most frequent words make up 70% of native speaker text, the next 800 accounting for a further 6%, whilst the next 1,000 words accounting for only 4% of the English language text (Willis, 1990:46). Here too the

utility fell sharply.

By presenting the language as lexical chunks which embody both meaning and context, a rich body of input could be generated for the learners for processing and to make a part of their own corpus so they can build toward an internal awareness of the target language as a whole, as well as being concerned with the learning process.

Even though the lexical syllabus has characteristics of a holistic approach, it can be described as synthetic on the basis of its graded tasks, sequenced lexis and the grammatical items which are exemplified by the language encompassing these lexical items.

This syllabus would supply the author with a sufficient level of accountability with regard to the institution's requirements and specifications due to the clear prescribed lexical items in the syllabus content, thus providing a level of transparency into the structure of the course. Nevertheless, the author makes little attempt to employ this syllabus type since most research corpora are based on native-speaker language, thus making little attempt to meet the Korean language learner's needs. Furthermore, there is little attempt by researchers to develop pedagogic corpora that could prove to be more learner friendly.

It is important to note that approximately 80% of all English discourse takes place between non-native speakers (see Carter, 1998:50). Additionally, most Korean learners will predominantly use English to communicate with non-native English speakers within their region, therefore, they need not acquire native-like skills to communicate

efficiently.

Non-native speaker pedagogic corpora would better serve the interests of Korean learners, however they're unavailable. Moreover they could help to empower Korean English teachers.

The textbook 'KnowHow' by Oxford University Press, pre-selected by the English department head at the author's university, only uses roughly 40% of the first 2,000 most common words according to the calculations of one of my colleagues, Sharon Simpson, at Hoseo university, therefore the textbook, itself seems to provide little focus on a word-frequency based syllabus.

This could raise the question: Could a notional and functional syllabus better serve Korean students' needs?

## **2.2 The Notional-Functional Syllabus**

Language learning, in a sense, is conceptualized by a repertoire of notions and functions in a notional-functional syllabus. The Notional syllabus is designed to compel learners to produce pre-designed chunks of language, which are perceived as vital for carrying out certain tasks (see Smith & Mcarthy, 1997:259).

Because students are expected to produce pre-constructed language structures in the hope of empowering them with the ability to effectively deal with any particular real life situation, the author feels this is just another means of rote learning which leads to the buildup of unnatural language in the learners' L2 repertoire. Rote learning has



mainly provided the author's students with the ability to mimic the desired sentence formats, while providing them with limited ability to communicate effectively when confronted by real life situations.

Even though 'notion' is a part of its name, this syllabus type nonetheless fails to deal with the concept of notions directly, as on the one hand it claims to base the language learning experience on certain conceptualizations of real life situations, while on the other it still advocates the acquisition of those language forms which are prescribed by the language teacher (see Willis, 1990:58).

SLA research has offered EFL teachers the insight that language is ineffectively taught one item at a time; be it lexis, grammatical items or language chunks (see Willis, 2000:37). Language is holistic therefore elements must be taught within a holistic framework, in context, so learners can devise abstract systems of rules to help them better understand the complexity of the English language (See Willis, 2000:30). Willis asserts that linguists try very hard to simplify functional grammar into easily comprehensible rules, however, the painful truth is that the authentic rules governing language are so intricate and difficult to comprehend that linguists are unable to explain them entirely. Willis would put it as such:

...the internal grammatical system operated subconsciously by fluent speakers was vastly more complex than was reflected by or could be incorporated into any grammatical syllabus – so complex and inaccessible to consciousness in fact, that no grammar yet constructed by linguists was able to account for it fully (Willis, 1990:8).

With such an insight at the disposal of the author, it should be evident that an abstract set of rules, accumulated through constant revision of holistic language forms, would better serve his learners by providing them with a subconscious understanding of grammar which can readily be retrieved. In such a way, learners could form a larger picture of the language which they could in turn understand through abstract principles, rather than looking at language in concrete terms. The Notional Functional syllabus fails to empower learners with such an abstract understanding of language. Rather, it sequences language chunks learners are required to produce. Correspondingly, Willis makes the following claim:

...When [the Notional Functional Syllabus]... is used to teach English for general purposes [it]... is subject to one criticism laid against synthetic approaches. They are concerned with specifying and ordering what it is that the learners will be expected to produce, rather than with helping the learner to build up a picture of the language (Willis, 1990:45)

Consequently, this syllabus type fails to teach language holistically. Thus, the author distances himself from utilizing this syllabus type due to its Present - Practice – Produce teaching approach.

Nevertheless, because of the transparency into the specification and ordering of its content, it would provide a level of accountability for the author with regard to his institution, by providing information necessary to fill out the mandatory online syllabus form (See Appendix;

Figures 1 & 2). However, in light of the claim that this approach allows little deviation from the prescribed form, it might not be appropriate in helping the author's students develop a holistic knowledge of the language that is readily available.

### 3 'Type B' Syllabus (See Chart 1: p.14)

The author himself prefers the 'Type B' syllabus as it more effectively improves his students' abilities to communicate fluently by means of sustaining his students' interlanguage development, however, as we shall see, it provides him with limited accountability regarding his institutional context.

This Progressivist syllabus type is best described as an analytic syllabus born out of the Communicative approach. It is more concerned with the learning process than the content, since it is the actual process that facilitates interlanguage development. In other words, it is the way students learn that best determines the amount of input they convert into intake. According to interlanguage theorists like Selinker (1972) and Coder (1967), among others, input does not necessarily mean intake, (See Carter and Nunan, 2001:1). Consequently, the synthetic sequencing of language items can be viewed as being pointless since what students are exposed to may not always transform to what they retain. At the same time, recycling language items in context, as is often done in a 'Type B syllabus', would help the learners readily remember useful knowledge (See Willis, EKT: p1). That is to say, learners could develop an internal system of language reinforced

through constant recycling of holistic authentic language.

According to the principles of the 'Type B' approach, it is believed that fluency leads to accuracy and not the other way around (Willis, 2000:37). This type of a syllabus would prove useful for the author in developing learners' communicative skills, however, it might be particularly challenging to justify with the institution and the Korean educational bodies since it provides limited transparency into the structural framework of the lessons. This is because language items are not sequenced in advance in the form of a 'concrete pre-designed course', thus offering only limited amounts of key information for the internet based syllabus (See Appendix; Figure 1 & 2). The two main syllabi that fall under the umbrella of a 'Type-B' syllabus are process and the procedural syllabi, both being 'differing products of progressivism' (White, 1988:25).

### **3.1 The Process Syllabus**

As this syllabus type makes no attempt at pre-designing the language course, due to its student led nature, it would certainly provide little accountability for the author as a teacher, given the lack of transparency into the course structure. Furthermore, as we shall see, most Korean learners are reluctant to adapt a learning style necessary to accommodate such a syllabus.

Candin and Breen's procedural syllabus is yet another task-based approach, with a focus on the learning process, built on a non authoritarian classroom power structure, wherein the teacher and the

students choose the tasks through constant negotiation. Moreover, it is internal rather than external to the learner (See Long and Crookes, p.3). The direction of the course is determined by the students as the course progresses, rather than being established by the presentation of an inventory of sequentially selected items learners would eventually have to practice and produce as in the Present-Practice-Produce approach well embedded in any synthetic syllabus.

Widdowson asserts that in fluent discourse language is submissively regulated by grammar rules rather than being generated by them (See Willis, EKT: p.11). Therefore, there should be no direct focus on language form unless the learners decide that they need grammatical clarification on a particular form they have already experienced.

Johns sees the learner as a researcher while the teacher as a coordinator of the classroom processes (see Willis, EKT: p.3). Emphasis here is laid on the process rather than on the subject. John's approach threatens most Korean learners of EFL since it challenges their expectations of the teachers' roles as an authority figure (See Section 5).

No doubt, the power structure of the institution in which the language learning is to take place should be structured to permit teachers to assume different roles, and should exist in a cultural context (See Section 4) wherein it is acceptable for students to take on a more directive role in their learning experience. This type of student role is exceptionally rare in a Korean classroom context, thus the 'learner led' process syllabus should prove to be particularly challenging to implement,

however, if such a syllabus could be employed successfully, it would be highly beneficial for learners in the author's communication classes. It would certainly need the support of a series of lessons on the L2 culture, although, the author has no time for them as there are only around 17 teaching hours available in each semester.

The following quote is one criticism of the process syllabus:

'published criticism of the process syllabus ( see, e.g., Kouraogo, 1987: R. V. White, 1988) claim that [it]... assumes an unrealistically high level of competence in both teachers and learners, and implies a redefinition of role relationships and a redistribution of power on authority in the classroom that would be too radical and/or culturally unacceptable in some societies (Long & Crookes, p.11).

Learners and teachers are both expected to follow certain cultural norms within the classroom environment, and it is impractical to expect these roles and the allocation of powers to radically change between them. Moreover, learners can't be expected to know what's best for them, and teachers may be incapable of recognizing when it is most appropriate to allocate control to the learners.

### **3.2 The Procedural Syllabus**

The Procedural Syllabus, however, could work well in a Korean teaching context as it makes no requirement on the part of the students to assume any leading role as it is the teacher's duty to sequence all tasks according to difficulty.

If learners in all their other classes, at the author's university, are to play the part of the receiver of pre-selected information, then why should they be expected to assume alternate roles in their English classes? Willis asserts:

One cannot expect that learners will very readily adopt a pattern of behaviour in the English class which is at variance with the roles they are required to play in their other lessons. (Willis, 2000:9)

Because this syllabus type would allow for the usual Korean teacher-student roles, it may well be a good solution, however, since there is limited attempt made at getting the students to take part in oral conversation, as the tasks are predominantly completed in relative silence, the author feels this syllabus would prove to be counterproductive in his communication classes where the aim is effective oral communication.

It was Prabhu and the Bangalore research project team that developed the task-based procedural syllabus, with a cognitive focus, for a group of grade school students in Southern India. The students were given problem-solving tasks that presented them both with an opportunity and the necessity to use the language. Prabhu employed 3 task-types in the Bangalore project; information gap, reasoning gap and problem-solving tasks (See Carter and Nunan, 2001:5). Prabhu's tasks were composed in English, focusing the learner's attention on the texts.

Most Korean learners are self motivated, so there is little reason to believe this method would fail overall. Furthermore, since

the procedural syllabus predetermines the tasks sequenced by difficulty, it would provide a level of accountability for the author as a teacher.

Criticism of this syllabus has been lodged by Long and Crook on the basis that it has no procedures designed for the selection of tasks based on learner needs (see Carter and Nunan, 2001:4). Additionally, Greenwood (1985) suggests that the procedural syllabus enjoys no backing of evaluative evidence (see White, 1988:109).

### Chart 1

<i>Type A</i> What is to be learnt?	<i>Type B</i> How is it to be learnt?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Interventionist</li> <li>-External to the learner</li> <li>-Other Directed</li> <li>-Determined by authority</li>   <li>-Teacher as lesson-maker</li>   <li>-Content = What the subject is to the expert</li> <li>-Content = A gift from the teacher/knower to the learner</li> <li>-Objectives defined in advance</li> <li>-Subject Emphasis</li> <li>-Assessment by achievement or by mastery</li> <li>-Doing things to the learner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Internal to the learner</li> <li>-Inner Directed or self fulfilling</li> <li>-Negotiated between learners and teachers</li> <li>-Learner &amp; teacher as joint decision makers</li> <li>-Content = What the subject is to the learner</li> <li>-Content = What the learner brings and wants</li> <li>-Objectives described afterwards</li> <li>-Process Emphasis</li> <li>-Assessment in relation to learners' criteria</li> <li>-Doing things for or with the learner</li> </ul>

(White, 1988:44)



#### **4 Cultural Contexts**

It is without much contest that cultural values are deeply imbedded in most educational systems. What is more, Hofstede writes about the “software of the mind” whereby people are preprogrammed in how to behave (See Irving, 1986). Given that teachers, students and other individuals in all levels of authority, within any educational framework, are pre-programmed in the way they ought to behave by their culture(s), then it should be without any doubt that ‘culture’ does play a key role in education. Although private institutions can choose to embody the culture(s) of the target language, public institutions are rarely given that level of flexibility. Cultures not only influence the roles of institutions in educational processes, they also manipulate teacher-student relationships.

While in Western cultures learners are expected to assume a more self-directed role in the learning process, with the teacher as the mere coordinator of that process, in a more Eastern educational context, the teacher assumes a central authoritarian position. This ‘knower figure’ thus needs to be respected as s/he stands well above the students in the educational hierarchy. To my experience, the Korean EFL educational system fits this orientation.

#### **5 The Author’s Classroom Experience**

Being a part of the Korean educational system, the author is expected to make all the decisions for his students as he is seen to be in the most knowledgeable position to do so. This type of educational context is designed to accommodate a synthetic approach.

As mentioned earlier, it would be difficult for the author to employ a process syllabus wherein students are expected to make course altering decisions since Korean learners are unaccustomed to do so. The author himself has negative personal experiences implementing a learner directed teaching approach into the Korean classroom context. Generally the author teaches freshmen English Conversation classes that are typically expected to follow the table of contents of a pre-selected course book. However, on a couple of occasions the author was given the opportunity to teach students who elected to learn English outside the curriculum. Seeing that the students were all adults, the author felt it was a good idea to give the learners some choices once the courses had reached a certain point. Both individual courses had high attendance early on, however, the very day after the author asked students to start making choices about the direction they wanted their courses to progress, the attendance dropped by around 80% in both classes. It is very unlikely that this was a coincidence. It's highly probable that the student's respect for the author as an 'authority figure' crumbled, therefore, they may have felt a lack of faith in his teaching approach.

The author has since learned that even though Korean students are able to make choices on their own, the available choices offered to them should be limited in number and importance so as to make the learning path less unpredictable. Korean students generally expect the teacher to lay down the corridor of learning in concrete terms.

Hence, the question worth asking is; Would a 'Type A' or a 'Type B'

syllabus work most effectively in a Korean language classroom?’

## **6 Cultural Values in the Teaching Context - ‘Type A’ or a ‘Type B’ syllabus?**

For the purpose of accountability, a concrete syllabus needs to act as a public document allowing for any governing body to transparently audit the educational process within any institution. Consequently, as an employee of a university, the author is required to fill in an internet based syllabus; inserting the specified contents of sequenced items, class materials, aims and objectives of the course into their appropriate slots (See Appendix, Figure 1 & 2). It is deemed unprofessional to drastically deviate from such a syllabus.

The pre-selected course book can acceptably operate as a syllabus within the institution, and this echoes a synthetic approach, however, the author himself refuses to regard the book’s graded table of contents as the sole format of his syllabus. Although, the course book needs to be systematically utilized in his class, he employs the book only for random reading, information gap, reasoning gap and listening activities via the audio content.

The author believes in meaningful group communication amongst the learners, and little focus is placed on grammar rules and a great deal of focus on motivating students to take an active role in verbal communication activities which utilize topics they find interesting. This, however, mirrors a more analytic (process oriented) approach.

Even though the institution necessitates the online syllabus (See Appendix, Figure 1 & 2) to be followed meticulously, the author, nevertheless, deviates from doing so as he believes there is little need to pre-specify lesson plans ahead of time. This is because each batch of students are different, thus, requiring diverse approaches all together.

The author's institution itself is set up to support the 'Type A' syllabus, requiring teachers to predetermine and itemize the course even before the first lesson starts. The cultural contexts surrounding the institution are designed to support a synthetic approach whereby the teacher is in a position of knowledge and authority. Overall, a 'Type A' syllabus does allow for the Korean teacher-student roles to flourish, however the author prefers the 'Type B' syllabus, as it is simply the best option if the aim is fluency rather than explicit knowledge of language rules.

As one may expect, the institution and the author are at odds with one another, given that the institution supports the implementation of a 'Type A' syllabus while the author does his best to implement the 'Type B' syllabus whenever possible.

Students in the author's classes are organized into groups of 4-5 wherein they are to engage in conversation and problem solving activities with little interruption by the teacher. The focus here is on the conversational process. No clarification of grammar rules is implemented unless required by the students. His students are given the opportunity to select the topics they find interesting, however they are expected to make no major course altering decisions.

Overall, in answering which syllabus type the author utilizes, it would be proper to point out that he employs aspects of both due to institutional demands. Firstly, there is a synthetic quality to his syllabus as the public internet based version is defined in concrete terms and because the pre-selected textbook itself offers a slot filling grammar focus which becomes indirectly ingrained into the lessons. Predominantly, the systematic focus on the course-book is unavoidable within the university's teaching context.

Although, required to rigorously follow the pre-designed 'synthetic' format of the online syllabus, the author does his best to implement the analytic approach, of the 'Type B' fraction, given that he carries out no intended sequential focus on language items.

## **7 Summary**

Based on the evidence laid out within the body of this essay, it should become rather obvious that any one method is singularly inadequate to teach English in Korea. On the one hand, a 'Type A' syllabus is an appropriate match for the Korean cultural context, complementing the teacher-student relationships, but on the other hand, a 'Type B' syllabus enjoys the backing of SLA research and empowers learners with more readily available language knowledge that leads to fluency.

Furthermore, if the focus is to be on explicit rather than implicit knowledge of language, than a 'Type A' (content oriented) syllabus would be the ultimate choice. However, given the fact that the author teaches mainly

conversation classes, a 'Type B' (process oriented) syllabus, with a focus on recycling language items to most effectively incorporate them into the learner's syllabus, would best serve to improve the learners' communicative abilities. Ultimately, the author must learn to balance his professional obligations with the awareness that an analytic syllabus is a far better option if the aim of the learners is the ability to take part in fluent discourse.

Overall, a 'Type A' syllabus benefits the author the most, within a Korean cultural context, as it provides him with a desired level of accountability by allowing for transparency into the course, while as a bonus also providing his learners' with an external knowledge of the language. However, the implementation of a 'Type B' syllabus better accomplishes the communicative aims of his students, although, it can be rather challenging to employ due to the Korean learners' teacher expectations. It is perhaps paramount for the author to utilize a mixture of both syllabi, in the form of a multi syllabus, since a proper blend would better satisfy all parties of interest within the Korean educational system.

Consequently, the author is compelled to employ a combination of both syllabus types, however, it must be stated that he does prefer to employ the 'Type B' syllabus, since it best improves his students' communicational competence by way of raising their internal awareness of language. Even so, he is obligated to implement elements of the 'Type A' syllabus to ensure the renewal of his contract for at least one more term.

## References

Carter, R (1998) 'Orders of reality: CANDODE, Communication, and culture, *ELT Journal*, Volume 52/1, January 1998, Oxford University Press 1998 [Online] Available at: <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/52/1/43?ck=nck> (Accessed in 2006)

Carter, R. & Nunan, D. (ed.) (2001) *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Irving K. J. (1986) 'Geert Hofstede's Model' in Robert Paterson's Radio Weblog [Online] Available at <http://radio.weblogs.com/0107127/stories/2003/01/16/cultureGeertHofstedesModel.html> (Accessed February 25, 2006)

Long, H. M. & Crookes, G. (nd.) 'Three Approaches to Task-Based Syllabus Design', University of Hawaii [Online] Available at <http://www.iei.uiuc.edu/TESOLOnline/texts/longcrookes/> (Accessed on December 7, 2005)

Schmitt, N. & McCarthy, M. (ed.) (1997) *Vocabulary - Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

White, R. V. (1988) *The ELT Curriculum*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

Willis, D. (1990) *The Lexical Syllabus – A new approach to language teaching*, London: Collins  
ELT

Willis, D. (2000) *Syllabus and Materials*, The Centre for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham

Willis, D. (nd) 'Syllabus and Pedagogic Corpus', Forthcoming, (EKT)

## Appendix

Figure 1:

2006학년도 제 1학기 학기 수업 계획 및 진도표 2006 First Semester Class Plan					
교과목명 Course	국문 Korean Dept.	PRACTICAL ENGLISH COMMUNICATION 1		담당교수 Professor Name	Name
	영문 English	PRACTICAL ENGLISH COMMUNICATION 1		학수번호/ 분반 Class Number	PR0560/32
시간 및 학점 Duration & Credits	2 시간 2 학점 2 hrs. - 2 credits	이수구분 Type of Course	실무과정 Business Communication	개설전공 Major	학부/자연과학부 Natural Sciences
연락처 Phone Number			E-mail 주소 E-mail Address		
기본사항 Basic Information					
1. 교과목 개설목적 및 수업 운영방침 Aims & Methodology	A brief outline of the student aims and the methodology to be employed by the teacher.				
2. 수업진행방식 Teaching Method	강의/실습	Teaching Method Types			
3. 교 과 서 도서구입 Textbook	The main textbook the students will need to use/buy for the duration of the course.				
4. 과제도서 Homework Books	A list of books students need to use for their homework.				
5. 시청각교재 Audio/Visual Materials	A list of audio/visual material to be used by the teacher for teaching purposes.				
6. 참고문헌 Reference Books	A list of supplementary reading materials the students may wish to read out of class, so they can develop a better understanding of the course contents.				
7. 성적 평가방법 Final Mark Breakdown	출석 : 20 Attendance	과제를 수행 및 수업 참여도 : 20 Participation	중간고사 : 30 Mid-Term Exam	기말고사 : 30 Final Exam	기타 : 0 Others
<input type="button" value="저장"/> <input type="button" value="저장/특별수업계획서"/> <input type="button" value="초기화면"/> <input type="button" value="초기화"/>					

Figure 2:



2006학년도 제 1학기학기 수업 계획및 진도표 2006 First Semester Class Plan					
교과목명 Course	국문 Korean Dept. 영문 English	PRACTICAL ENGLISH COMMUNICATION 1		담당교수 Professor Name 학수번호/분반 Class Number	Name PR0560/32
시간 및 학점 Duration and Credits	2 시간 2 학점 2 hrs. - 2 credits	이수구분 Type of Course	실무과정 Business Communication	개설전공 Major	학부/자연과학부 Natural Sciences
주별 내용 Contents					
주 Week	기간 Time Period	주제 Subject		강의형태 Class Type	
1 주 Week 1	02/20 ~ 02/25	Detailed description of the lesson contents. Listing of items to be taught During this particular lesson.		강의/ 토론 Communication	
	활용기자재 Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Projector <input type="checkbox"/> OHP <input type="checkbox"/> VTR <input type="checkbox"/> Cassette <input type="checkbox"/> AMP <input type="checkbox"/> CDP <input type="checkbox"/> LAN			
	과제물/제출기한 Homework	Description of the homework given to students on this day.		월 일	
2 주 Week 2	02/27 ~ 03/04	Detailed description of the lesson contents. Listing of items to be taught During this particular lesson.		강의/ 토론	
	활용기자재	<input type="checkbox"/> Projector <input type="checkbox"/> OHP <input type="checkbox"/> VTR <input type="checkbox"/> Cassette <input type="checkbox"/> AMP <input type="checkbox"/> CDP <input type="checkbox"/> LAN			
	과제물/제출기한	Description of the homework given to students on this day.		월 일	
3 주 Week 3	03/06 ~ 03/11			강의/ 토론	
	활용기자재	<input type="checkbox"/> Projector <input type="checkbox"/> OHP <input type="checkbox"/> VTR <input type="checkbox"/> Cassette <input type="checkbox"/> AMP <input type="checkbox"/> CDP <input type="checkbox"/> LAN			
	과제물/제출기한			월 일	
4 주 Week 4	03/13 ~ 03/18			강의/ 토론	
	활용기자재	<input type="checkbox"/> Projector <input type="checkbox"/> OHP <input type="checkbox"/> VTR <input type="checkbox"/> Cassette <input type="checkbox"/> AMP <input type="checkbox"/> CDP <input type="checkbox"/> LAN			
	과제물/제출기한			월 일	
.					
.					
.					
17 주 Week 17	06/12 ~ 06/17			강의/ 토론	
	활용기자재	<input type="checkbox"/> Projector <input type="checkbox"/> OHP <input type="checkbox"/> VTR <input type="checkbox"/> Cassette <input type="checkbox"/> AMP <input type="checkbox"/> CDP <input type="checkbox"/> LAN			
	과제물/제출기한			월 일	
자유 양식 Additional Information					
Any additional information the teacher may like to add to the already contained items.					

Save Basic Info. Front. Page Refresh