Teachers as Curriculum Developers
—Negotiating Standardised Goals—

Mark BRIERLEY & Jonathon ADAMS

1. Introduction

The Comprehensive English course has been developed by teachers at Shinshu University who have come from a variety of academic and educational backgrounds. It is assumed that the goals of the course should be communicative, in line with the University's policies and those of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

This paper begins by introducing the curriculum and explaining how it can be visualised. It proposes that the main goal of the Comprehensive English course should be to improve the communicative ability of students. Next, the Common European Framework is introduced as an international standard in communicative ability. With the Common European Framework in mind, goals and objectives are proposed for each half of each semester of the Comprehensive English course. Finally, there is a discussion of the curriculum development process.

2. What is the Curriculum?

The most obvious embodiments of the curriculum are the series of course books produced by the University, teaching materials such as DVDs, and the teacher's manuals including assessment criteria. Different teachers may use additional or alternative material and may even use different assessment tools to apply different evaluation criteria. Therefore, communication between teachers also plays a key part in the implementation and evolution of the curriculum.

2.2 Goals

All stages of curriculum development, from design and drafting to implementation and assessment, depend on the goals of the course. In the case of a TOEIC course, a particular score can reasonably be set as a target, and students' scores on that test can be used to measure whether or not they have reached the goal. In the case of a presentation course, the students' performance in the confined and definable construct of a presentation may be assessed according to established criteria, with reference to documented standards or recorded models. Establishing the goals of a comprehensive, communicative, learner-centred course presents a much greater challenge.

How comprehensive must the course be? What should students be able to communicate, with whom and under what circumstances? If it is to be a four-skills course, presumably students' listening, speaking, reading and writing skills must interact, so they can, for example, speak in response to what they have just heard, or write about what they have just read. If the course is to be learner centred, should the students themselves be able to negotiate goals and assessment criteria?

2.3 Objectives of the Comprehensive English Course

Comprehensive English is a learner-centred, four-skills integrated course aimed at improving communicative competence in line with the University's mission of creating excellent communicators. Analysis began in 2004, involving questionnaires and interviews with students, teachers and administrators and observations of classes. Over thirty teachers have been involved in the design and development process, and implementation began in April, 2006. The course

currently involves around 60 teachers instructing over 1000 students, mostly for the two years (135 classroom hours) of compulsory English language education, although some students only study this course for the first year, and one faculty chose the course only for the first semester of the second year. We will take the main goals to be:

> To improve communicative ability
> To inspire learner autonomy
> To increase language acquisition

2.4 Communicating a Curriculum

Traditionally, curricula were designed from a structural view, in which language is seen as grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. Specific goals were set and courses and materials were designed around specific points to meet these goals (Graves, 2001:184).

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is described as, "The knowledge of language and the knowledge of when to use it appropriately" (Hymes, 1972 cited in Hyland, 2007: 8). As the communicative approach and functional-notional syllabi became more popular, curriculum design began to take on the following elements:

Functions	Notions and topics	Communicative situations

This does not, of course, mean that grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary were no longer taught; for example, functions require grammatical knowledge, accurate pronunciation and production of vocabulary. The traditional components, however, are seen as a means to an end. This presents a different framework upon which a curriculum can be developed.

Four-skills teaching provides another way of categorising proficiency:

Listening skills	Speaking skills	Reading skills	Writing skills

Task-Based Learning (TBL) provides still another theoretical basis upon which to construct a curriculum (Nunan, 1989:14-17). *Competencies* are distinguished from *skills*. *Skills* are like tools, describing what a language user can do. *Competencies*, on the other hand refer to their ability to do something at a specified level.

Tasks and activities	Competencies

Graves (2001, citing Dubin and Olshtain, 1986, Hutchinson and Waters, 1987, Johnson, 1989, Nunan, 1985, Richards, 1990, and White, 1988) combines all these processes into a complete syllabus grid (shown below). In addition, she points out the importance of Culture, Learning Strategies, Content, and includes at the top of the grid, by implication above and before all other considerations, participatory processes by which the students involve themselves with the curriculum, learning strategies by which they will learn from it, and the content, the medium through which they will become proficient in the language.

Participatory Processes	Learning Strategies	Content	
Culture	Tasks and activities	Competencies	
Listening skills	Speaking skills	Reading skills	Writing skills
Functions	Notions and topics	Communicative situations	
Grammar	Pronunciation	Vocabulary	

Table 1. Syllabus grid.

It is important that students, who belong to a variety of academic departments, understand where the course is going, and the challenge is to clearly and succinctly show these many dimensions in a one-dimensional text, or two-dimensional tables. While all these factors need to be taken into consideration, for the sake of simplicity in this paper, we have chosen the four skills. While there

are many language functions that combine skills, and cognitive processes that underlie them, all language acts involve, or are manifested in, one or more of the four skills.

	Reception	Production
Audio	**Listening**	**Speaking**
	perceive the utterance, *identify*, *understand* and *interpret* the message	*organise* a message, *formulate* and *articulate* the utterance
Visual	**Reading**	**Writing**
	perceive the text, *recognise* the script, *identify*, *understand* and *interpret* the message	*plan* and *formulate* the message, *handwrite* or *type* the text

Table 2. Four skills grid: Communicative Language Processes (CEF pp 86, 87)

3. The Common European Framework (CEF)
The common European Framework was developed by the council of Europe between 1989 and 1996 to describe achievements of foreign language learners in Europe. The Association of Language Testers in Europe, ALTE (founded by the Universities of Cambridge and Salamanca) refers to the CEF in making tests for 24 languages. The reasons for choosing this framework are that it is the most readily available, and is the most widely researched and referenced. Having been developed for several languages, it does not focus on particular features of English, but on what can be done in a language. While associated with commercially available tests, the agenda behind the CEF is neutral: simply to define communicative ability without commercial or political implications.

3.1 Common Reference Levels
The ALTE level is a simple way to refer to proficiency according to the CEF. Cambridge ESOL tests are designed to test whether students meet the criteria defined by the CEF.

Common Reference Levels: global scale	ALTE Level	CEF Level	Main levels	Cambridge ESOL	TOEIC*
Proficient User	5	C2	Mastery	CPE	910+
	4	C1	Effective Operational Proficiency	CAE	701-910
Independent User	3	B2	Strong Vantage	FCE	541-700
	2	B1	Threshold Level	PET	381-540
Basic User	1	A2	Strong Waystage	KET	246-380
	Breakthrough	A1	Breakthrough		

Table 3. Common reference levels

* It is difficult to compare exams that are not based on the same framework, and the TOEIC exam levels on these scales can only be considered a rough guide (although cited on Wikipedia, and elsewhere on line, their source is uncertain).

ALTE exams have a low profile in Japan. Many students at this university have taken the TOEIC test. The average TOEIC score at entry to Shinshu University is around 400. In April, 2007, 90 first-year students took Cambridge ESOL/Step Bulats pre-tests in listening, reading and writing. Their scores suggest that their listening and writing are at ALTE level 1 (75% and 82% of candidates, respectively), and their reading is at ALTE level 2 (79% of students).

3.2 Approach Adopted by the CEF

The Common European Framework follows an 'action-oriented' approach, where the learner is a 'social agent' belonging to a society that is not exclusively defined by language (Halliday, 1994:68-70, Mitchell and Myles, 2001:25). Language use and learning are defined in areas such as competences, context, strategies, language activities and processes. The following criteria are specified in the development of a curriculum (CEF p.7)

- identify needs
- determine objectives
- determine content
- select or create material
- establish teaching and learning programmes
- recommend teaching and learning methods
- evaluation, testing and assessment

The action-oriented approach identifies the following forms of language use and learning (CEF p.10-16).

  i. Competences—sum of knowledge, skills and characteristics that allow a person to perform actions.
  ii. General competences—not language specific, but used for actions of all kinds, including language activities.
  iii. Communicative language competences—those which empower a person to act using specifically linguistic means.
  iv. Context—situational factors.
  v. Language activities—the exercise of one's communicative language competence in a specific domain in processing texts in order to carry out a task.
  vi. Language processes—the chain of events, neurological and physiological, involved in the production and reception of speech and writing.
  vii. Texts—sequence or discourse related to a specific domain, that becomes the occasion of a language activity, whether as support or goal.
  viii. Domains—the situation, for example: personal, public, occupational, educational.
  ix. Strategies—organised and regulated lines of action chosen by an individual to carry out a task in order to achieve a given result.
  x. Tasks—any purposeful action considered as necessary to achieve a set goal; an activity.

3.3 Topics and Communicative Language Abilities

The table below presents topics for communicative activities and an example of subcategories for one topic. These categories are recommended in the CEF, although categories may be changed as appropriate to the needs of the students. For example, employment or the student's field of study may be added as categories.

Thematic Categories for communicative acts (Threshold level, 1990, ch.7)			An example of subcategories:
1. personal identification	5. travel	10. food and drink	4.1.leisure
2. house, environment	6. human relations	11. services	4.2.hobbies
3. daily life	7. health and body care	12. places	4.3.radio and TV
4. free time, entertainment	8. education	13. language	4.4.cinema
	9. shopping	14. weather	4.5.exhibitions
			4.6.art and others
			4.7.sports
			4.8.press

Table 4. CEF topics

Other categories for the Comprehensive English course may include employment or field of study.

Common reference level: self-assessment grid (B1 PET level), 'Threshold'.			
	Reception	Spoken Interaction	Production
Audio	**Listening**	1. Can enter an unprepared conversation on familiar topics, such as everyday life or personal interest, (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events).	**Speaking**
	1. Can understand the main points of clear, standard speech on familiar matters. 2. Can understand the main points on TV or other media on current affairs and familiar topics when the delivery is quite slow and clear.		1. Can connect phrases in a simple way to describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes, ambitions. 2. Can give short reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. 3. Can narrate a story or describe reactions to a book or film.
Visual	**Reading**		**Writing**
	1. Can understand texts that consist mainly of high-frequency everyday language. 2. Can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal texts.		1. Can write simple, connected text on topics which are familiar. 2. Can write a variety of different written genres, such as narratives, descriptions or anecdotes.

Table 5. CEF communicative language abilities

3.4 Strategies

While *skills* are what language users can do, and *competences* are what they can do at a specified level, *strategies* require knowledge of how to do things and the ability to choose which skills to apply.

Receptive strategies involve identifying the context and knowledge of the world relevant to it. **Interaction strategies** (pp. 86-87) involve a combined use of receptive and production strategies.

	Receptive Strategies	Spoken Interaction
Audio	1. Listening for specific information 2. Listening for gist 3. Listening for detailed understanding 4. Listening to various media	1. Initiating conversation 2. Maintaining conversation 3. Closing conversation 4. Stalling
Visual	1. Reading for pleasure (Extensive Reading) 2. Reading for specific information (Scanning) 3. Reading for gist (Skimming) 4. Reading for detailed information (Intensive Reading)	5. Intervening 6. Asking for clarification or elaboration 7. Identifying and correcting misunderstandings 8. Paraphrasing vocabulary (Using different words)

Table 6. CEF strategies

3.6 Spoken Interaction

The learner has the roles of speaker and listener, and interaction involves negotiation of meaning, based on the co-operative principle from Grice's five conversational maxims (1975, cited in CEF).

Overall spoken interaction	Can communicate with confidence, deal with many familiar situations. Can follow clearly articulated speech. Can give appropriate opinions and reactions to what is said.
Conversation	Can enter conversation on unprepared but familiar topics, and sometimes ask for repetition.
Interviewing	Can use a prepared questionnaire to carry out a prepared interview.
Informative exchange	Can exchange, check and confirm, and can obtain and give more detail.
Informal discussion	Can follow much of what is said, identify the main points and give opinions.
Formal discussion or meetings	Can put over a point clearly and take part in discussion of familiar topics

Table 7. CEF spoken interaction (p.73)

3.7 Effective Study Skills
In addition, students need skills to study effectively.

Study skills
a. To maintain focus of attention on the information.   b. To grasp the purpose of set tasks.   c. To identify one's own goals.   d. To organise and use materials to achieve these goals.   e. To make use of the language learnt.   f. To use the materials for independent learning.   g. To be aware of one's own strong and weak points.   h. To co-operate actively in pair and group work.

Heuristic skills	General Phonetic awareness and skills
a. To understand new experience (language, people, learning methods) through using other competences such as analysing, memorising, observing). b. To find, understand new information in the target language. c. To use new technologies.	a. To distinguish and produce unfamiliar sounds. b. To perceive and link unfamiliar sound sequences from a continuous stream of sound. c. To divide sound into distinct parts. d. To understand sound perception and production.

Table 8. CEF study skills, heuristic skills and phonetic skills

4. Course Design
The Comprehensive English course is made up of blocks lasting three to four weeks. Many of the blocks involve prolonged activities, such as quizzes, surveys and presentations, which involve students in choosing topics, preparation, performance, and then reflection upon their own performances and the communicative acts they have performed. This is compatible with the Common European Framework, which rather than specifying discrete linguistic features, describes tasks and functions which speakers are able to do. In order that students can develop such abilities, and can be shown to have developed such abilities, a degree of repetition is necessary, and activities within blocks can be repeated throughout the course. The topics change, creating opportunities for different language to be acquired.

4.1 Classical Textbook or Interactive Textbook
Many English language textbooks published in Japan consist primarily of written texts with questions before and after. Instructions are often in Japanese, and exercises usually require a written response. Recent, internationally published EFL textbooks (e.g. Headway, Interchange, English Firsthand) often contain very few long texts, favouring instead short texts and dialogues.

There are many interactive activities: for example, information gap activities where each of a pair of students turns to a different page in the book, each page providing different information and instructing the student to find the missing information (Nunan, 1989:64-66).

Textbooks frequently dictate what students should read, or what they will listen to, and include a series of questions. They may include instructions, and therefore suggest what students should do. However, they do not always explain how things should be done. For example, should the texts be read aloud, in silence, as quickly as possible, or with intensive scrutiny of each word? Comments from teachers and students on the Comprehensive English textbooks suggest that the reasons why students should do tasks is often not stated or is unclear. One agenda in textbook design is to keep books as generic as possible, so teachers can choose what to do with the material. This is critical for commercially-available textbooks, which are usually chosen by teachers. The agenda of an educational institution, on the other hand, is to specify what students learn. Therefore, below are some proposed goals for the teachers and students of the Comprehensive English Course.

4.2 Semester I: A Teacher and B Teacher

Students study twice a week, the two lessons termed the A lesson and B lesson. Generally, the first lesson (for example, Wednesday period 3) will be an A lesson and the second lesson (for example, Monday period 3) will be a B lesson. In theory, the classes will therefore run in the sequence: 1A 1B 2A 2B 3A 3B... However, occasionally, a holiday falls on one or more days in a week, so lesson 3B may be before 3A, or 3A may be before 2B and lessons are likely to get a week, or even two weeks, out of sync. In each block, the A part and the B part should be complementary, but somewhat independent, so that material in each lesson reinforces what happens in the other lesson, but is not dependent upon it.

While most language courses require several lessons a week, and many several every day, Japanese university English courses often only comprise one meeting per week, creating some logistical and institutional challenges. The A and B lessons are taught by a different teacher, due to staffing and timetabling considerations. There are also benefits to students having more than one instructor; where possible, one of the teachers will be a native speaker, while the other will be Japanese. An additional advantage of this form of team teaching may be in the area of assessment whereby, for example, the B teacher can more rigorously assess skills taught in the A lesson with less risk of partiality or bias towards students.

In order to clarify each teacher's role, the basic responsibilities are categorized either as input, including Extensive Reading, for the A teacher, or as output, including writing and speaking activities, for the B teacher. "Input" and "Output" are largely nominal; it would be impractical and unhelpful to suggest that A lessons should not include speaking and writing, or that B lessons should include no reading or listening. As a communicative course, Comprehensive English should focus on the combination of skills, and not treat the four skills as separate components that must function independently. The nature of communication requires spoken or written responses to input that is heard or read, and where possible, each lesson should activate all four of the skills. This amounts to a "production approach" to instruction—students engage with topics and produce output to drive L2 development, such as speaking to reinforce reading content (Skehan, 2001:45).

Rather than dividing goals between the two teachers, it may be more important that they are shared and understood by both teachers so that the repetition that is necessary for language acquisition can take place. In terms of content it may be beneficial for teachers to repeat the same topics, and even the same texts, to increase student familiarity with the material. The role of action research is important here, as teachers can and should reflect on their own practice and develop approaches that are relevant to their own classrooms (Ellis, 2001:67).

Block	Content
A - Introductions	Self-introduction, introducing others, autobiographies
B - Hometowns	Presentations and descriptions of hometowns
C - Surveys	Find out about hobbies, lifestyle, etc. of the class
D - Travel	Discuss travel plans

Table 9. Semester I plan

Semester I Weeks 1-7: Introductions; hometowns			
	Reception	**Spoken Interaction**	**Production**
Audio	**Listening**	1. Asking and answering questions about self/ hometown	**Speaking**
	1. Understand classroom English.		1. Yes/ No questions
	2. Listening for specific information – introductions of people, introduction of Matsumoto city.	2. Initiating and closing	2. Speaking about regular activities (simple present) and recent activities (simple past)
	3. *Listening for gist* – finding suitable topics to talk about.	3. Short exchanges	3. Using keywords for short monologues
	4. At least 90 minutes listening per week (50% of lesson time exposed to teacher, other students or audio/video material)		4. Introducing self/ other person/ hometown
			5. Using classroom language to communicate with teacher and other students
			6. Awareness of paraphrasing/ Definitions of unknown words
			7. Role-play
Visual	**Reading**	**Extensive Reading**	**Writing**
	1. Following textbook instructions	1. Find level at which it is possible to read smoothly without a dictionary	1. Simple sentences about self/ hometown
	2. *Awareness of different reading styles:* Reading for pleasure Reading for specific information Reading for gist Reading for complete understanding	2. Stop reading if book is too dull or difficult	2. *Planning a self-introduction*
		3. Record books, giving simple cline responses (Excellent/ good/ ... terrible. Very easy/ easy ... impossible)	3. Basic paragraph format including topic fronting
	3. Reading for specific information		4. Filling in self-assessment forms
			5. Filling in peer-assessment forms
		4. Record reading speeds	6. Writing short answers to comprehension questions

Table 10. Semester I goals: first half

4.3 Examples of Vocabulary for Semester I weeks 1-7

Classroom language
"open the book at page..."
"Could you repeat that, please?"
"I beg your pardon."
"What does this mean?"
"It's .... in Japanese/ English."
"Sorry, I don't know."
"Sorry, I don't understand."
"I will be absent next lesson."
"What do you want to study in this class?"
"What activities do you want to do?"

Personal questions
"How old are you?"
"Where do you live?"
"What's you phone number?"
"What do you study?"
"Why did you choose to major in ..... ?"
"Where are you from?"
"Where in ... are you from?"
"How many people live there?"
"It has a population of ..."
"What do you like to do in your free time?"
"What is your favourite season?"
"What food do you like?"

Paraphrasing
"It's ..."
"It's like ..."
"It's a bit like ..."
"It's a little like ..."
"It's a kind/ type of ..."

General Questions
"What do you do when you are happy?"
"What book has impressed you the most?"
"What are your plans for the summer vacation?"
"What place would you like to visit the most?" "Why?"
"What kind of work do you want to do in the future?"
"Who is a person that you respect and why?"
"Have you ever had a part-time job?"
"Tell me about it."
"What job would you like to do?"
"Have you ever lived or travelled abroad?"
"Where would you like to go or live?"

4.4 Examples of Vocabulary for Semester I – weeks 7-15

Choosing a topic
"I want to do..."
"Let's do..."
"Can we do..."
"Why don't we do..."
"Shall we do..."
"Do you want to do ...?"

Asking questions
"Can I go first?"
"I'd like to ask some questions about..."
"OK, here's my first question."
"Are you ready?"

Question words
Who, What, Where, When, Why, How
What + [noun], How + [adjective]

Space fillers, time-buyers
"Errr... umm"
"Let me see"
"I'll have to think about that"
"That's a good question"
"That's a tricky question"
"That's an interesting question"
"What do you think?"

Clarifying
"What do you mean?"
"I'm sorry, I don't understand the question."
"What does ... mean?
"What do you mean by ...?"
"Do you mean...?"

Reporting:
"Conduct a survey"
"Carry out a survey"
"Analyse the results"

Talking about numbers
"More people X than Y."
"Fewer people Y than X."
"X is more popular than Y."
"About the same number of people X as Y."
"On average…"
"Nine out of ten people ..."
"Over three quarters ..."
"About sixty percent …"
"More than half …"

"Less than a third …"
"One person in ten ...."
"Everybody likes ...."
"Almost everybody likes ..."
"Most people like ..."
"Many people like …"
"Some people like …"
"A few people like …"
"Hardly anyone likes ..."
"Nobody likes ..."

Semester I Weeks 8-15: Surveys about student life; travel			
	Reception	**Spoken Interaction**	**Production**
Audio	**Listening** 1. Listen for specific information 2. Listen for interactive language 3. Listen for function of questions	1. Ask and answer questions about various topics 2. Clarifying and asking for clarification 3. Paraphrasing 4. Asking for further information Functioning within a group	**Speaking** 1. Asking prepared questions 2. Answering questions relating to life and surroundings 3. Delivering a spoken report 4. Expressing numerical information 5. Choosing language appropriate to the audience
Visual	**Reading** 1. Reading for specific information: facts and statistics 2. Judging effectiveness of questions	**Extensive Reading** 1. Decide reading targets (number of books/ pages/ words to read each month) 2. Identify most suitable genres 3. Write a response to a book or movie	**Writing** 1. Preparing effective questions 2. Recording responses in an interview 3. Writing full answers to comprehension questions 4. Brainstorming – writing unstructured, unformatted ideas 5. Writing a report, including numerical information 6. Filling in questionnaire about own performance as a student, and about the course

Table 11. Semester I goals: second half

4.5 Semester III

The third semester should review the teaching goals of the first year. The theme of the semester is work and the future. One teacher teaches one lesson per week.

Block	Content
A – Surveys about the future	Students can choose from topics such as: environment, education, technology, work, lifestyle, health.
B – Finding Work	Finding organisation and jobs. Role-playing a job fair
C – Applying for a Job	Résumé and cover letter writing
D – Interviewing	Role-playing a job interview

Table 12. Semester III plan

Semester III Weeks 1-6: Surveys			
	Reception	**Spoken Interaction**	**Production**
Audio	**Listening**	1. Functioning within a group	**Speaking**
	1. Understand classroom English 2. Application of different listening styles: Listening for specific information Listening for gist	2. Ask and answer questions about various topics 3. Interactive language: Initiating and closing Clarifying and asking for clarification Paraphrasing Asking for further information	1. Using classroom language to communicate with teacher and other students 2. Presenting a report including numerical information 3. Role-play
Visual	**Reading**	**Extensive Reading**	**Writing**
	1. Following textbook instructions 2. Application of different reading styles: Reading for pleasure Reading for specific information Reading for gist Reading for complete understanding 3. Reading for specific information, facts and statistics 4. Judging effectiveness of questions	1. Find level at which it is possible to read smoothly without dictionaries 2. Stop reading if book is too dull or difficult. 3. Recording books, giving simple cline response (Excellent/ good/ ... Very easy/ easy ... impossible) 4. Decide reading targets (number of books/ pages/ words to read each month) 5. Identify most suitable genres 6. Record reading speeds	1. Basic paragraph format including topic fronting 2. Preparing effective questions 3. Recording responses in an interview 4. Brainstorming – writing unstructured, unformatted ideas 5. Filling in self-assessment forms 6. Filling in peer-assessment forms 7. Writing a report, including numerical information

Table 13. Semester III goals: first half

Semester III Weeks 7-15: Jobs, organisations, applications and interviews		
	Reception	**Spoken Interaction**	**Production**
Audio	**Listening**	1. Communication strategies 2. Follow-up questions	**Speaking** 1. Describing jobs, organisations 2. Describing experience, skills 3. Role-play
	Application of different listening styles: Listening for specific information Listening for gist		
Visual	**Reading**	**Extensive Reading**	**Writing**
	1. Reading for gist, finding suitable jobs from a list of ads 2. Reading for information, details of organisations from internet	1. Decide reading targets 2. Write a response to a book or movie	1. Note taking 2. Writing a description of a job 3. Writing a UK-style CV or US-style résumé 4. Writing interview questions 5. Filling in questionnaire about own performance as a student, and about the course

Figure 15. Semester III goals: second half

5. The Curriculum Development Process

The development of a curriculum is a lengthy process. The steps have been described by the acronym ADDIE standing for analysis, design, development, implementation and evaluation (Molenda, 2003, cf CEF criteria in 3.2 above). Curricula cannot work without teachers. The role of teachers is essential in the implementation and evaluation of a curriculum, and cannot wisely be ignored in the analysis and development phases. Frequently, the first and last steps of ADDIE are neglected, as developers concentrate on the more exciting design, development and implementation without giving due concern to the initial analysis or final evaluation, both of which can be tedious (Santiago, 2007). Analysis is often absent as teachers hold assumptions about their teaching situation making it difficult to be objective. Evaluation of the course takes place on an ad hoc basis or is eclipsed by the requirement to evaluate students. Institutional constraints often dictate that development budgets are only allocated during a "development stage" which ends as teaching begins. In the ADDIE model, the evaluation will feed back into the design, development and implementation, so that the course is improved each year.

5.1 Analysis

Identification of student needs and interests can be formal or informal; it can take place at the macro, institutional, level, or at the micro, teacher-in-classroom, level. At the macro level, students and teachers can be extensively surveyed, government and university policy studies and employer demands can be canvassed. At the micro level, teachers use their experience and instincts, which, at best, will be a synthesis of the same elements, engaging as they are in daily contact with students and functioning as citizens of the wider society. At worst, the informal approach may lead to a bias towards a teacher's own interests or agenda, or to excessive attention being given to a particular group of students, whether their interests, lack of interests, abilities or inabilities. It must be stressed that teachers following their own agendas, and therefore teaching their own interests, may be more motivating and more effective than those teaching what they

don't believe in, or are not interested in. Here the distinction between the role of teacher as curriculum developer and as classroom practitioner is clear. Teachers must function differently according to whether they are adapting materials to their teaching or adapting their teaching to the materials. The relationship between the two roles is, of course, symbiotic.

5.2 Design and Development
Most teaching materials originate from one teacher in one classroom facing a specific group of students with specific challenges. The future life and success of the material depends upon whether it can be applied to other teaching situations, whether similar teaching situations can be found, and how it is adapted. It may also depend on how easily teachers can manipulate the material to suit their own ends or can identify and agree with the agendas behind the material. For the institution to maximise the quality of its teaching materials, it is important to allow teachers to develop their own materials, and to encourage and nurture collaboration so that these materials may flourish by being more widely used.

Different teachers have different teaching styles. Indeed, it is unlikely that any two teachers will implement material in exactly the same way. A piece of text, for example, may be used for reading aloud, comprehension questions or translation. Teachers establish routines in their classrooms, and have a wide variety of teaching styles, including lecture-style, text-oriented, peer-oriented and task-based approaches, with students working alone, in pairs or in groups. When developed by individual teachers for their own lessons, printed materials are likely to take no account of much of what goes on in the lesson, as they are often designed to supplement established procedures. A large degree of compensation may take place, for example, through instruction to the class as a whole or coaching of groups or individual students, and materials that would flop in any other class may be carried successfully by a teacher who is dedicated to the material, interested in its content, or otherwise in possession of the key to unlocking it. Therefore, if teaching points are not explicitly stated, they may change in the hands of another teacher. What may work in one classroom may not work in somebody else's. At the same time, if a curriculum is to be prescribed through a text book, the teaching points must be clear to teachers, and possibly also to students. If the class is to cater to students' different learning styles, then teaching points should be repeated in as many ways as possible.

5.3 Implementation
The implementation of a curriculum has accepted, formal stages; however, the reality may be different. The level of prescription may vary a great deal. At one extreme, teachers may be given vague goals or guidelines about what or how they should teach. At the more prescriptive end of the spectrum, teachers may be allocated a textbook, given a teachers manual, be obliged to attend training or meetings, before and during the course, and their classes may be monitored to ensure the curriculum is being enforced. Carless (2001:264) stresses the importance of teacher training, calling for permanent, locally available in-service training, effective systems for supervision and support, adjusting training to teachers' knowledge and experience, and encouragement of teacher motivation and commitment, for example, through opportunities for professional development.

5.4 Evaluation
Evaluation of the course may also take several forms. Evaluation of the course is not the same as assessment of students, or grading of students. For example, a vital goal of the course may be to increase student motivation. It may be unreasonable to include questions such as "Do you like English?" or "Do you think English is important for your future?" in a test. Including the answers to such questions in students' grades may also influence the answers students give, and therefore invalidate the evaluation. A goal of Extensive Reading, which forms a core of the course, is for students to enjoy reading. The success of the course can be measured by asking students if they

are enjoying what they are reading, though this would be inappropriate as a measure of the students' performance.

According to Rea-Dickens and Germaine (2001: 256), materials should be "evaluated in terms of how they reflect the principles by which they have been written". The evaluation of "materials in process" investigates how teachers and students respond to the materials (ibid. p. 257). Both the course and the students can be evaluated by assessing results and processes. Results-based evaluation should answer questions such as: Can students apply strategies? Can students effectively perform communicative acts? Process assessment should answer the questions: Is the institution providing suitable conditions for learning to take place? Are students following course guidelines? The history of communicative assessment in Europe goes back to 1916. Japan's assessment traditions focus more on discrete points. A historical emphasis in Japan on the perception of foreign countries as a source of skills and knowledge has also lead to an emphasis on receptive skills. (Poole, 2003)

Reading and listening can only be assessed by observing spoken or written responses and performance in these receptive skills can therefore only be measured by inference. The institution can seek to evaluate the aural exposure of students to English, the availability of reading material at suitable levels of difficulty, and the opportunity to read within class time. The institution can seek to evaluate whether the conditions for language acquisition are being met. Students can later be evaluated to measure improvements in proficiency. Communicative skills can only reliably be measured by observing actual communication.

The relationship between student assessment, motivation and grading is a complex one, beyond the scope of this article.

If a goal of the course is to prepare students for studying their majors in subsequent years of study, accurate evaluation can only take place when they reach those years and undertake that study. Evaluation can therefore take several forms, including feedback from students, current teachers and teachers of the students in future semesters. If the success or popularity of specific units varies between classrooms, then teacher practice could be analysed to find what practice is best. In order to improve the quality of teaching, methods of evaluation must be carefully considered to minimise any damage to teacher morale or threat to teaching conditions.

5.4 Revision
The revision process is based on the evaluation of the course. Once again, the process of revision may take place in an informal, intuitive way, or in a formal, systematic way. When individual teachers prepare their own materials for a second or third time, they may use the same materials in a different way, modify existing materials or create entirely new materials. When materials are administered by several teachers, the criteria for changing methodology, modifying or discarding materials are more complex. Revisions should be based upon feedback that is as wide and as deep as possible, from teachers, students and, if possible, external or independent evaluation.

Any materials considered for an institutional course are likely to have already been revised several times. However, materials are also likely to have been revised since their last implementation, therefore in a sense they are new. The first edition of a course book is likely to be a first draft. Indeed, as situations constantly change, there is a strong case for each year's course book to be considered as a draft for the following year, and the curriculum to be in a constant state of development. The last few years of the twentieth century and first few years of the twenty-first century have seen major political, social and technological changes that language teaching curricula must address. For example, writing emails, searching the internet or making calls from mobile telephones are all activities which few curriculum designers would have considered ten years ago.

118

5.5 Teacher involvement

Eliciting feedback from teachers has several advantages throughout the entire development process. As experienced language professionals who have taught the students, teachers have a sense of what students can do and what will work in their classrooms. Often teachers have performed their own investigations on their students, and invariably they have collected samples of their students' work. At the revision stage, teachers are able to draw upon their direct experience of having used the material, and are likely to have suggestions for how it may be improved. Here lies a perceived disadvantage: that teachers each have their own different opinions and are likely to wish a wide range of changes which are impossible. Those who have been involved in the creation of the material may, on the other hand show a fierce reaction to any change. It seems likely, however, that while teachers may suggest a wide range of solutions, these will all address a small number of underlying problems that need to be addressed.[1] The task of curriculum developers is to accurately identify what the most serious problems are, and the most effective ways to solve them. Problems in a curriculum can be resolved by changing the materials, changing the written instructions, or providing teachers with more information. If an essential part of the course is perceived as problematic by a teacher, then the reason for its inclusion must be made clear. If one solution is chosen out of a number of possibilities, then the reason for that choice should be made clear.

One of the biggest potential advantages in involving teachers throughout the process is that this can make them stakeholders in the course, lowering the chance of resentment against teaching materials or methodologies being imposed from above. Raising motivation and boosting morale among staff is likely to directly affect student performance; student motivation is likely to decrease if students are faced with a de-motivated teacher. Involving staff from an early stage will also make the implementation simpler and more effective, reducing misunderstanding when the course is implemented.

Conclusion

In this paper we have assumed that communicative language teaching is the main goal of the comprehensive English course, and put forward the Common European Framework as an international standard, defining what it means to be able to communicate in a language. Goals for the first and third semester of the Comprehensive English course have been proposed, in the hope that the material developed for the curriculum can more effectively be used to advance towards these international standards. We look forward to the comments and collaboration of other teachers, as the curriculum continues to evolve, goals are clarified and re-evaluated, and materials are developed, adapted and implemented.

References

Carless, D. (2001) *Curriculum development in Hong Kong.* in Hall, D. and Hewings, A. Innovation in English Language Teaching. London: Routledge. (pp. 149-169)

Common European Framework of References for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (2003) Cambridge University Press/The Council of Europe.

Ellis, R. (2001) *Second language acquisition.* in Candlin, C. and Mercer, M. English teaching in its social context. London: Routledge. (pp. 44-74)

Graves, K. (2001) *A framework of course development processes* in Hall, D. and Hewings, A. Innovation in English Language Teaching. London: Routledge. (pp. 178-196)

Hall, D. (2001) *Materials Production.* in Hall, D. and Hewings, A. Innovation in English Language Teaching. London: Routledge. (pp. 246-252)

Halliday, M. (1994) *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Helgesen, M., Brown, S., & Mandeville, T. (2004) *English firsthand*. Longman ELT.

Hyland, K. (2007) *Genre and second language writing*. Michigan: the University of Michigan Press.

Mitchell, R. and Myles, F. (2001) *Second language learning concepts and issues.* in Candlin, C. and Mercer, M. English teaching in its social context. London: Routledge. (pp. 11-27)

Molenda, M (2003) 'In Search of the elusive ADDIE', Performance Improvement 42(5), 34-36.

Nunan, D. (1989) *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poole, G (2003) 'Assessing Japan's institutional entrance requirements', Asian EFL Journal: 5, 1. Retrieved January, 2008 from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/September_05_dn.php

Rea-Dickens, P. and Germaine, K. (2001) *Purposes for evaluation.* in Hall, D. and Hewings, A. Innovation in English Language Teaching. London: Routledge. (p. 253-262)

Richards, J. (2005) *Interchange.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Santiago, R. (2007, August 27). 'Understanding E-learners' characteristics and performance in online courses'. Presented at Shinshu University, Matsumoto, Japan.

Skehan, P. (2001) *Comprehension and production strategies in language learning.* in Candlin, C. and Mercer, M. English teaching in its social context. London: Routledge. (pp. 75-89)

Appendix: Communicative language competences

linguistic competences		sociolinguistic competences	
lexical competence	pp.110-112	linguistic markers of social relations	p.119
grammatical competence	pp.112-115	(choice of greetings, address,	
semantic competence	pp.115-116	turn-taking)	pp.119-120
phonological competence	pp.116-117	politeness conventions	p.120
Orthographic competence	p.117	expressions of wisdom (idioms, other	
(writing skill)		expressions)	p.120
Orthoepic competence	pp.117-118	register differences (levels of formality)	p.121
(pronunciation)		dialect and accent (to recognise)	
pragmatic competences			
discourse competence			pp.123-124
functional competence			

Notes

[1] The Pareto principle, named by Dr. Joseph Juran after Italian tax collector Vilfredo Pareto, states that 80% of problems can be attributed to 20% of causes.

(Associate Professor, School of General Education, Shinshu University)
(Associate Professor, School of General Education, Shinshu University)