

Syllabus Design for Young EFL Learners

Izumi Tanaka

Introduction

This paper discusses the syllabus design for young EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners. In the first section, after defining the key terms and introducing certain perspectives on how children learn, the procedures followed in syllabus design will be considered.

In the second section, some types of syllabuses will be introduced in terms of product- and process-oriented approaches, in order to examine their appropriateness for young EFL learners. The product-oriented approaches will include a grammatical syllabus and a functional/notional syllabus, whereas, the process-oriented approaches will comprise a content-based syllabus, a procedural syllabus and a task-based syllabus.

Finally, a sample syllabus for young Japanese learners will be presented in the appendix, including a description of children in the age group of 12 years old and the processes followed in syllabus design.

1. Principles of syllabus design for young learners

Definition of key terms

Syllabus design

As Nunan (1988:3) points out, there seems to be some confusion over the terms 'syllabus' and 'curriculum.' According to White, 'syllabus' refers to the content or subject matter of an individual subject, whilst 'curriculum' refers to the totality of content to be taught and aims to be realized with one school or educational system. In the USA, 'curriculum' tends to be synonymous with 'syllabus' in the British sense (White 1988:4). In this paper, 'syllabus design' will be developed in the British sense.

Young learners in EFL (English as a foreign language)

Young learners aged 6-12 years old will be focused on. The term of EFL learners is defined as the learners who 'usually learn English in a classroom setting, in a context where the target language is not widely used in the community (Lightbown and Spada 2006:199).'

How young learners learn

It might be necessary to consider how young learners develop their learning and thinking abilities before discussing syllabus design for young learners. Fisher (1995:13) and Wood (1998:37) posit three main perspectives on the development of learning and thinking, which are introduced by Piaget, Vygotsky and Bruner.

It is said that Piaget tried to find out how children develop their cognitive mechanism. His suggestion is that 'all children pass through a series of stages before they construct the ability to perceive reason and understand in mature, rational terms (Wood 1988:37).' For Piaget, children's learning seems to occur through taking actions and solving problems, and thinking is considered to be an activity. As a result of activity, 'assimilation' and 'accommodation' could take place. Assimilation seems to occur when a child uses his/her existing knowledge and skills to take in new experiences. Wood (1998:37) states that assimilation is constrained by the child's stage of development, therefore it seems to lead to a specific concept of learning 'readiness'. As for accommodation, Cameron (2001:3) explains that it seems to occur when 'the child's actions and knowledge adapt to the new possibility and something new is created'. Accordingly, it seems necessary to design and provide an appropriate activity for young English learners.

Like Piaget, Vygotsky also placed 'an emphasis on activity as the basis for learning and for the development of thinking (Wood: 1998:37).' Cameron (2001:6) explains the difference that 'for Vygotsky the child is an active learner in a world full of other people, whereas for Piaget the child is an active learner alone in a world of objects.' That is, Vygotsky's view seems to put emphasis on the role of communication, social interaction and instruction. His theory, a zone of proximal development (ZPD) (the metaphorical "place" in which a learner is capable of a higher level of performance because there is support from interaction with interlocutor) (Lightbown and Spada 2006:206) could imply the importance of the roles of parents, teachers and peers.

Bruner, who is said to be influenced by Vygotsky (Wood: 1998:38), 'emphasized the role of the teacher in his research (Fisher 1995:13).' After some investigations on how adults help children to solve problems, he found that children need someone to 'scaffold' their learning to lead them on to higher levels and 'scaffolding has been transferred to the classroom and teacher-pupil talk (Cameron 2001:8).' One way of scaffolding seems to be 'to help children to focus on the key concepts of what they are learning, and then revisit these concepts again and again, which is called "spiral curriculum" (Fisher 1995:13).'

Having discussed how young learners develop their thinking and learning, the paper will be now focused on the main theme. In the next section, first the

procedures of syllabus design for young learners will be explained.

Procedures of syllabus design

Goals, aims and objectives

In a mean-ends approach, there seems to be a distinction between goals and aims. White (1988:27) explains these terms as follow; whilst goals are very general and broad, aims are more specific and refer to as 'key objectives' which are the short-to medium-term goals. Nunan (1988:24) also states that 'learning goals will provide a rationale for the course or program and may be derived from a number of sources, including task analysis, learner data, ministry of education specifications and so on.'

Tyler (in Nunan 1988:62) suggests that there are four ways of stating objectives: specify the things that the teacher or instructor is to do; specify course content; specify generalized patterns of behaviour, and specify the kinds of behaviour which young learners will be able to exhibit after instruction. He also suggests 'performance objectives', in which 'the preferred method of stating objectives is in terms of what the learner should be able to do as a result of instruction (Nunan 1988:63)'.

Nunan (1988:158) illustrates three components of 'performance objectives': an activity (what learners will do); conditions (under what circumstances) and standards (how well they will perform). Although there seem to be arguments both for and against the use of 'performance objectives', they might lead to learner-centred approaches, in which the learner could be involved in the interaction more actively.

There seems to be a distinction between real-world objectives and pedagogic objectives. A real-world objective 'describes a task performed outside the classroom, while a pedagogic objective is one which describes a task performed inside the classroom (Nunan 1988:70).'

There also seems to be another distinction of objectives, product objectives and process objectives. Product objectives describe what learners will be able to do as a result of instruction and process objectives describe the experience that the learner will undergo in the classroom (Nunan 1988:70).

As Nunan (1988:71) concludes that 'any comprehensive syllabus needs to specify both process and product objectives', in a syllabus for EFL young learners' context, both 'product objectives' and 'process objectives' seem appropriate to be specified. In a lesson with these objectives, young learners would be given instructions about what and how they should do, and an opportunity to use the language in interactive ways, where they might receive 'scaffolding' from a teacher and peers to promote their learning.

Needs analysis

Syllabus design seems to begin with questions such as who the learners are, why

and what they need to learn, and when, where and how they want to learn. Nunan (1998:75) defines 'needs analysis' as 'a family of procedures for gathering information about learners and about communication tasks for use in syllabus design.' The data of needs analysis seems to be able to distinguish between 'objective' and 'subjective' information.

'Objective' information provides 'biographical information on age, nationality, home language' and 'subjective' information 'reflects the perceptions, goals and priorities of the learners (Nunan 1988:18).' The learners' learning styles and preferences, which, it could be argued, belong to the category of 'subjective' information, can be classified into two types: 'what they want to learn' and 'how they want to learn (Nunan 1988:79).'

In the context of young learners, as sometimes they do not seem to have a specific purpose and motivation of learning English, the choice of the instructional ways might need to be selected in light of their interests, the affairs relating to their real life which would be provided by subjective information, and also the stages of their cognitive development and their social and cultural circumstances which would be provided by objective information.

Selection and grading

To promote language learning among young learners, it would seem important to achieve coherence in terms of the learning objectives of a syllabus and the content of teaching and learning in classroom.

According to Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (in White 1988:48), grading, which defined as the arrangement of syllabus content from easy to difficult (Nunan 1988:158), seems to have two different aspects: staging and sequencing (White 1988:48). Staging 'is related to the number and frequency of lessons and the intensity of teaching (White 1988:48).' Sequencing is related to content to be taught, which 'can be sequenced according to difficulty, frequency, or the communicative needs of the learners (Nunan 1988:159).'

Although 'traditionally, items in a grammatical syllabus are graded largely according to whether they are easy to difficult', it could be argued that 'grammatical difficulty is not necessarily the same as learning difficulty (Nunan 1988:92).' In Piaget's theory, as assimilation and accommodation seem to occur when children have 'readiness', the content might need to be interesting and understandable for young learners so that they would be able to use their existing knowledge.

In approaches to syllabus design which focus on the learning process, tasks seem often to be selected and graded. There seem to be two types of task: real-world task (e.g. understanding the radio, reading newspaper) and pedagogic task which 'is assumed to result in learning which can be transferred to real-world communicative language use (Nunan 1988:24).' The factors which might determine the task would

be ‘cognitive difficulty, the complexity of the language, the psychological stress and background knowledge (Nunan 1988:48).’

Evaluation and assessment

According to White, evaluation occurs at all stages of the syllabus design process, and includes identification of needs, setting objectives, choice of content, choice of methods and media, and implementation of the programme (1988:148).’ Especially, students’ outcomes in the process of learning would seem to provide valuable sources of information, which might be produced in ‘assessment.’

In case of assessment to evaluate the syllabus design for young learners, informal assessment (system for observation and collection of data about students’ performance under normal classroom conditions)(Harris and McCann 1994:90) would seem to be suitable to them. Fisher (1995:13-14) explains that ‘children are trying to make sense of the world, and constructing their own theories about how it works’ and ‘all have different thinking and learning styles.’ That is, as young learners seem to be on their own developmental stage and have different ways of thinking and learning, it might be appropriate to assess their learning according to the performances such as the outcomes of tasks, the participation of role play and group presentation.

Setting ‘attainment targets’ in which descriptors (definition of a level of performance in a band scale) (in Harris & McCann 1994:89) for assessment are developed from the long-term objectives of a course or program might be useful to collect the data to evaluate the syllabus.

Having outlined some of the key principles of syllabus design for young learners, this paper will now turn to examine two broad and distinct syllabus types; product-oriented syllabuses, and process-oriented syllabuses.

2. Syllabus types

There seems to be a distinction in syllabus types in terms of analyzing syllabus proposals: synthetic syllabuses and analytic syllabuses. In a synthetic syllabus, ‘the different parts of language are taught separately and step by step so that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of parts until the whole structure of language has been built up (Wilkins in Nunan 1988:27).’ In an analytic syllabus, ‘learners are exposed to holistic “chunks” of language and are required to extract patterns and regularities from these (Nunan 1988:158).’ Based on this classification, Nunan (1988:159) separates syllabuses into two types and defines them; product-oriented and process-oriented syllabuses. ‘Product syllabuses’ are defined as syllabuses which focus on the outcomes or end products of a language program. ‘Process syllabuses’, on the

contrary, are defined as syllabuses which focuses on the means by which communicative skills will be brought about.

Product-oriented syllabuses

The common syllabus types that fall under the category of product-oriented syllabuses seem to be grammatical syllabuses and functional-notional syllabuses. A grammatical syllabus can be defined as a syllabus where 'syllabus input is selected and graded according to grammatical notions of simplicity and complexity (Nunan 1988:28).' A functional-notional syllabus is explained as a syllabus where 'functions may be described as the communicative purposes for which we use language, while notions are conceptual meanings expressed through language (Nunan 1988:35).'

Grammatical syllabus

A grammatical syllabus seems to indicate a synthetic approach to language learning. Nunan (1988:29) postulates that the grading and selection of language content are key elements of a grammatical syllabus, which is based on the assumption that 'language consists of a finite set of rules which can be combined in various ways to make meaning.'

White (1988:48) points out that the natural order of acquisition is one of the criteria for decisions regarding the selection and grading of syllabus content. The natural order of acquisition is empirical evidence in the findings of Second Language Acquisition (the study of how learners learn an additional language after they have acquired their mother tongue) (Ellis 1985:5). SLA findings showed that 'certain grammatical items seemed to be acquired in a particular order, and that this order was similar for children and adults, for learners from different language backgrounds (Nunan 1988:32).'

Against this assumption, Rutherford (in Nunan 1988:35) insists on the importance of 'identifying language constructions of the grammatical system from which learners can generate the most powerful generalizations.' His argument seems to imply that 'grammar learning should not be seen as the memorization of sets of grammatical items, but as the raising of consciousness in the learner of the ways grammatical and discourse processes operate and interact in the target language (Nunan 1988:35).'

In young learners' context, therefore, it might be safe to say that grammatically graded languages might be able to be introduced in the natural order of acquisition with communicative and interactive ways. Under this circumstance, learners might be able to interact with peers and a teacher, receiving scaffolding within their ZPD and using the language which would be appropriate to their knowledge and cognitive level. Gradually, as Rutherford emphasizes, learners might be aware of grammatical systems of the language. Perhaps, the more children would develop their

cognitive level, the more they would try to understand the language linguistically.

Functional-notional syllabus

In the 1970s, a notional-functional approach proposed that ‘syllabuses could take notional-functional categories as an organizing principle (White 1988:75).’ Accordingly, in addition to a grammatical approach, syllabus organization ‘would have to take communicative categories into account as well (White 1988:75).’ These syllabuses are considered to be synthetic syllabuses as ‘they looked very similar to structural syllabuses (White 1988:37).’

As this syllabus seems to contain both linguistic and communicative purposes, it might be natural that there would be a conflict between the elements of a structural approach and those of a functional approach. Some solutions seem to have been found: to introduce such exponents as ‘would you like’ and social formulae such as polite requests as grammatically unanalyzed units, in which the range of utterances arises from the differing combinations of structural and functional elements (White 1988:78-79).

In a functional-notional syllabus, topic and theme would need to be set to make the context meaningful. Young learners especially seem to be fond of acting a dialogue in these situations such as shopping, asking directions and ordering. They seem easy to absorb the situation, where they would interact with each other and practice the language in an enjoyable way.

Process-oriented syllabuses

Unlike product-oriented syllabuses, process-oriented syllabuses emphasize ‘the processes through which knowledge and skills might be gained in language learning (Nunan 1988:40) and the means towards the learning of a new language might be focused on (Breen in Nunan 1988:54).

White (1988: 94) seems to categorize process-oriented syllabuses into three types: content-based syllabuses, procedural syllabuses and task-based syllabuses. Although all three types make much of the learning process, rather than on the end product, a content-based approach to syllabus design underlines the ‘organizing the syllabus around learners’ learning preferences, whilst procedural syllabuses ‘reflect a more direct influence from SLA theory and research (White 1988:96)’. Task-based syllabus, on the other hand, places an emphasis on tasks through which language is used and learned (White 1988:95).

Content-based syllabus

A typical example of a content-based language syllabus might be seen in an immersion program, in which the school subjects are learnt in a second or a foreign language. In this context, ‘language is not a subject in its own right, but merely a

vehicle for communicating about something else (Nunan 1988:38).'

Mohan (in Nunan 1988:49) argues that content-based syllabuses 'facilitate learning not merely through language but with language' and develop 'a knowledge framework which can be used for organizing knowledge and learning activities'. According to Mohan, there seems to be two sides in the knowledge framework: specific, practical side and a general, theoretical side. In each side, 'any topic can be exploited in terms of six categories: description, sequence and choice (specific practical sides) and classification, principles and evaluation (general theoretical sides) (Nunan 1988:49-50).'

Hutchinson and Waters (in Nunan 1988:38) note that 'in the content-based model, student may become frustrated because they are denied the language knowledge that enables them to carry out tasks that have been set. To making up for its weak points, it is indicated that 'a model combining the four elements of content, input, language and task (Nunan 1988:38)' should be presented.

The LANGUAGE and CONTENT focused on are drawn from the INPUT, and are selected primarily according to what the learner will need in order to do the TASK. In other words, in the TASK the linguistic knowledge and topic knowledge that are built up through the unit are applied to the solving of a communication problem.

(Hutchinson and Waters 1983:102 in Nunan 1988:38)

Content-based syllabus might be an effective way of learning language when young learners would receive enough exposure to the language. In the context of English as a subject, this syllabus seems complex to young learners as they would need to have achieved cognitive level to understand the content and at the same time they would be required to express their ideas in the target language. They would need to be required to apply cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) (dimension of proficiency in which the learner manipulates or reflects upon the surface features of language outside of the immediate interpersonal context) (Brown 2000:246). Hutchinson and Waters' model might be applicable to young learners if the content would not be far beyond their cognitive level as they might apply basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) (the communicative capacity that all children acquire in order to be able to function in daily interpersonal exchanges) (Brown 2000:246).

Procedural syllabus

In the Bangalore Communicative Teaching Project (CTP), which is known for its procedural syllabus, Prabhu (1987: 87-88) suggests 'some criteria for grading tasks, as a rough measures of cognitive complexity': information provided (the amount and type of information provided), reasoning and precision needed (the amount and type of reasoning and precision needed to complete a task), familiarity with constraints

(learner's knowledge of the world), and degree of abstractness (working with concepts is more difficult than working with the names of objects or actions). He also provides the following three types of activities which might be used as means to stimulate the learning process of young learners: information-gap activity, reasoning-gap activity and opinion-gap activity (Nunan 1988:43-44).

Prabhu also shows two models of the CTP: the conscious model (where meanings understood are conveyed) and the unconscious model (where the grammatical system is developed). He seems to emphasize the development of the internal system as 'the internal system developed by successful learners is far more complex than any grammar yet constructed by a linguist (White 1988:104).'

As one flaw of the Bangalore Project, Nunan (1988:44) mentions that the focus is exclusively on learning processes and there is little or not attempt to relate these processes to outcomes. The concept of activities in this syllabus might be suitable to young learners as they seem to be designed considering their cognitive levels. However, especially in EFL context, a syllabus in which learning objectives would be clarified might be more appropriate to young learners as the teacher would scaffold the learners and lead them to the ends of the learning.

Task-based syllabus

Skehan explains 'task' as follows:

Tasks...are activities which have meaning as their primary focus. Success in tasks is evaluated in terms of achievement of an outcome, and tasks generally bear some resemblance to real-life language use. So task-based instruction takes a fairly strong view of communicative language teaching

(Skehan in Richards and Rodgers 2001:224).

Thus the principles underlying task-based syllabuses seem to have been derived from the communicative language teaching movement: activities that involve real communication are essential for language learning, and language that is meaningful to the learner and supports the learning process (Richards and Rodgers 2001:223).

Long (in Nunan 1988:47) suggests the following procedure for developing a task-based syllabus: first, conduct a need analysis, then classify the target tasks into task types, derive pedagogical tasks from the task types. Having done this procedure, Nunan (1988:48) suggests that pedagogical tasks are selected and sequenced, and subsequently, real-world tasks, pedagogic tasks and a combination of these might need to be selected when engaging in task-based syllabus design.

Pica, Kanagy and Falodun (in Richards and Rodgers 2001:234) classify tasks according to their type of interaction, for example jigsaw tasks, information-gap tasks, problem-solving tasks, decision-making tasks, and opinion exchange tasks.

These ideas for tasks might be useful when designing syllabuses for young learner, as they would provide the opportunities to use the language purposefully and appreciate the outcomes of tasks.

From young learners' perspective, Cameron (2001:21) emphasizes the importance of analyzing the learning environment created by an activity in terms of demands on learners and support for learning. When the gap between demands and support was adjusted, children's learning seems to occur as 'the zone of proximal development' would be created. In addition, it seems important that 'the teacher must set clear and appropriate language learning goals (Cameron 2001:28) as the teacher could give an appropriate support to his/her learners engaging in tasks. Thus, it seems that task-based syllabuses would be suitable to young learners and create an appropriate learning environment.

Hybrid syllabus

In the account of Second Language Acquisition research, Peters' suggestion (in White 1988:83) that 'there is an aspect of language learning involving unanalyzed chunks and sequences which are used functionally and appear to be stored in the memory pending later grammatical analysis' might imply two-level models (functional and structural syllabuses) of language learning. Widdowson (in Nunan 1988:37) also claims that 'dividing language into discrete units of whatever type misrepresents the nature of language as communication.'

Young EFL learners need to learn language in a communicative way, developing their knowledge of language and skills for communication. Therefore, it might be needed to consider the syllabus which would comprise the features of both product- and process-oriented syllabuses, as White (1988:82-83) explains that 'a hybrid or a proportional syllabus would provide a valuable and viable compromise.'

A hybrid of product and process syllabuses would state both objectives and process of learning, where children can learn language, receiving an instruction from the teacher and interacting with the teacher and their peers through the meaningful and communicative activities (interaction and scaffolding). In this learning environment, children might learn within the current Zone of Proximal Development, 'consolidating new skills and then moving on to the next challenge (Cameron 2001: 28)', so that they would expand their experiences for the language and cognitive stages to the higher level.

Conclusion

In the first section of this paper, after discussing how children develop their thinking and learning, the principles of syllabus design were discussed. Needs analysis, formulation of objectives, selection and grading of content and tasks, evaluation

and assessment were considered as the key principles of syllabus design.

In section two, five types of syllabuses, belonging to either of the two types of approaches, product- and process-oriented, were discussed with respect to young learners. As young learners do not learn structures in discrete units, the selection and grading of forms might be based on the needs analysis of learners. It also appears that children learn language in an interactive manner through tasks and activities; such learning helps specify the learning objectives.

Accordingly, it is concluded that a hybrid with the features of both product- and process-oriented approaches would be preferable to young EFL learners. A sample hybrid syllabus for the target learners is presented in the appendix.

References

Books:

- Brown, H. D. (2000) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, USA: Addison
Cameron, L. (2001) *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1985) *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University
Press.
- Fisher, R. (2005) *Teaching Children to Learn*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.
- Harris, M. and McCann, P. (1994) *Assessment* Oxford: Heinemann.
- Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. (2006) *How Languages are Learned*. (Third Edition).
Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988) *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. (2001) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*
Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, R. V. (1988) *The ELT Curriculum*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chapters and Articles:

- Mohan, B. A. (1986) *Language and Content*. (pp. 35-42) Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987) *Second Language Pedagogy*. (pp. 86-102) Oxford: Oxford University
Press.
- Wood, D. (1988) *How Children Think and Learn: The Social Contexts of Cognitive
Development* (pp14-36). Oxford: Blackwell.

Appendix

A sample syllabus for 12-year-old Japanese young learners of English

(1) Learner profile

Age: 12 years old

Place to learn: Private Primary School

Number of the students: 20 students

Time table: two times a week, 40 minutes lesson

Learning experience: The children have been learning English for 5 years under the team-teaching scheme.

Language skills: As English is a foreign language for these students, their opportunities to practice English and their exposure to English is limited. With regard to receptive skills, they can follow the teacher's instructions and read easy picture and caption books. With regards their productive skills, their speaking ability is very limited and writing their own ideas is very difficult without teacher's support.

(2) Aims and needs

A school trip is planned to British Hills, where the students will have lessons from a native speaker in a small group. They will need to be able to communicate in English with the teachers and staff working there. To cope with real-world English, the students will need to learn some useful expressions.

(3) Syllabus types

Considering from their aims and needs of learning, a hybrid syllabus which will contain functional and task-based syllabuses seems appropriate to this context. In this hybrid syllabus, the learners will practice the language focusing on both forms and meanings.

(4) Selecting and grading objectives, content, tasks and activities

Objectives: The performance objectives (conditions, standards and tasks) shown by Clark and Hamilton (in Nunan 1988:91) seem to illustrate the link between product objectives and process objectives. In addition to these classroom objectives, the real world objectives seem to make them more motivated learners.

Content: There seem to be two items which relate to the grading of content: grammatical items and functional-notional items. Pienemann and Johnston (in Nunan 1988:93) claim that 'it is learning difficulty which determines those items students will be capable of learning at a given stage.' This might be true of young learners as they seem to understand and pick up language in 'chunks'.

Tasks and activities: In the following syllabus, the tasks will be graded according to Nunan's typology (1988:55). First, students will look at the authentic pictures and understand the content (material source), second they will know and understand the related words and teachers demonstrate the dialogue and they understand the meanings (processing), third, they will have meaningful practices (productive), and finally they will have a role play and tasks in a small or a big group (interactive).

(5) Assessment

Factors to be assessed: Both linguistic factors and non-linguistic factors would need to be assessed using analytic scales and holistic scales. Analytic scales are 'rating performance or progress in which different activities are divided into constituent parts and a different band is produced for each activity (Harris and McCann 1994: 89).' Holistic scales seem descriptive and 'are included over several bands to produce a multi-activity scale' (Harris and McCann 1944:90).

Informal assessment: In the context of EFL young learners, it would appear necessary to assess their learning by informal assessment which is 'a way of collecting information about our students' performance in normal classroom conditions (Harris and McCann 1944:5).' This might be done through 'observation, diaries, interviews, peer appraisals, questionnaires, ranking and rating scales' (White 1998:155), all of which might provide the syllabus designer with useful information. As an outcome of tasks, 'written down, ticked off, listed, sketched or tape recorded (Nunan 1988:45)' would be appropriate to the data.

Formative assessment: To inform their process of development to the learners, formative assessment seems appropriate to this group as well. Getting feedback from the teacher 'throughout a course will help him/her to be a more efficient learner (Harris and McCann 1994:90).' Peer assessment might be effective to formative assessment as the interactive activities are performed in a pair and a group work.

(6) Syllabus design

Syllabus type—A Hybrid syllabus

Types	Aims
Functional aspects	Students will learn everyday, real-world language for communicative purposes.
Task-based aspects	Students will engage in meaningful tasks that allow them to interact with their peers and teachers.

Sequencing of topics

Lesson 1&2	Arrival at British Hills	Lesson 7&8	Changing Money
Lesson 3&4	Passports Please	Lesson 9&10	Let's Go Shopping!
Lesson 5&6	Finding Your Way Around		

Grading of tasks and activities

Lesson 1&2	Are you my teacher? • information gap task • role play	Lesson 7&8	Can I change 2000 yen please? • decision making tasks • role play
Lesson 3&4	At passport control • jigsaw task • role play	Lesson 9&10	Excuse me, how much is this? • problem solving task • role play
Lesson 5&6	Excuse me, where is the toilet? • information gap task • role play		

Syllabus for ten lessons

Topic	Functions, Notions & Expressions	Activities and tasks
<u>Lesson 1&2</u> Arrival at British Hills	Show the picture of arrival Practice the words Dialogue: (Greeting and introducing myself) A: Hello, I'm Are you? B: Yes, I'm/ No, I'm not. A: Nice to meet you. B: Nice to meet you, too	Listening task.....Check the words you hear Listen to the dialogue Linguistic task.....Put the sentences in order Practice the dialogue Task—Information gap • Student A has a name of a teacher written on a card. Student B has a name of a student written on a card. • To find a partner and greet each other Role play • Student 1 and student 2 • Student and Teacher (close to real-world task)
<u>Lesson 3&4</u> At Passport Control	Show a real passport of British Hills. Practice the words Dialogue: (Identifying) A: Passport please. B: Here you are A: What's your name? B: My name is A: How long will you stay here? B: For three days.	Listening task.....Check the words you hear Listen to the dialogue Linguistic task.....Put the sentences in order Practice the dialogue Task—Jigsaw • Student work in groups of four. Divide the group into two. Group A has a word list. Group B has a worksheet of the dialogue, in which there some missing words. • In a group, students complete the sentences Role play • Student 1 and student 2 • Student and Teacher (close to real-world task)

<p><u>Lesson 5&6</u> Finding Your Way Around</p>	<p>Show the map of the main building Practice the words Dialogue: (asking directions) A: Excuse me, where are the toilets? B: <u>Go straight, they are on the left.</u> <i>Turn right/left. Go down /up the steps.</i> A: Thanks.</p>	<p>Listening task……Check the words you hear Listen to the dialogue Linguistic task……Put the sentences in order Practice the dialogue Task—Information gap • Work in pair. Student A has a worksheet of A. Student B has a worksheet of B. • Student gets information from the partner and write the names of the place on the worksheet. Role play • Student 1 and student 2 • Student and Teacher (close to real-world task)</p>
<p><u>Lesson 7&8</u> Money Exchange</p>	<p>Show real bills, yen and pound. Practice the words Dialogue: (changing money) A: How much is one British Hills pound, please? B: It is worth two hundred yen. A: Can I change 1500 yen, please? B: Yes, of course.</p>	<p>Listening task……Check the words you hear Listen to the dialogue Linguistic task……Put the sentences in order Practice the dialogue and big numbers Task—Decision making • Work in group. Student A has to find the real money exchanger of British Hills, who is one of student B, C, D. • Student A changes money at the proper rate. Role play • Student 1 and student 2 • Student and Teacher (close to real-world task)</p>
<p><u>Lesson 9&10</u> Shopping</p>	<p>Show a picture of the shop Practice the words Dialogue (buying things) A: Excuse me, I'm looking for English tea? B: Go down the steps, they are near the cakes. A: I'll take these please. B: Ok, that's five pounds please</p>	<p>Listening task……Check the words you hear Listen to the dialogue Linguistic task……Put the sentences in order Practice the dialogue and big numbers Problem solving • Work in pair. Student A is asked to buy a certain thing as a souvenir from Student B • Student A buys the thing for Student B. Role play • Student 1 and student 2 • Student and Teacher (close to real-world task)</p>