Introduction: English learning systems and the need for change.

Language courses have a kind of built-in inertia; they are resistant to change, and more so in the case of successful courses. Teachers’ (and students’) perceptions of the need for change are not as great if a course is working well, whereas a badly designed course quickly throws up reasons to revamp the aims, content and style of a class.

With regard to developing an integrated English course at Kagoshima Immaculate Heart College (KIHC) there are many challenges. The aim of this integration is to replace speaking and writing with a single course. These two courses have been viewed as effective, but could nevertheless be improved through a more holistic approach.

Before looking at which factors might be effective in the implementation of the new Integrative English course (hereafter referred to as IE), it is necessary to briefly look at the remit of both the old and the new courses, all which must take account of basic points covered in L2 acquisition such as errors, developmental patterns, variability and pragmatic features related to language learning (Ellis).
IE replaces Oral Communication 1&2 and Writing 1&2, and aims to integrate skills from both courses. Oral communication is a speech course concentrating on functional skills. The remit of the course is to take students from the high school stage, where vocabulary and grammar based testing play a large role in determining students perceived English ability, and instead of trying to repeat the high school experience, prepare students for real-world situations. Students at this college go abroad for one month at the end of their first year (though some study abroad for a longer period), so effective functional skill in the target language is a necessity.

The second course in IE is writing. The aim of the course is for students to master paragraph writing and be able to express themselves clearly over passages of a page in length. The remit of these two subjects was markedly different, and remains so even within the current integrated format. This necessitates what may initially seem to be a forced amalgam of the various areas of each syllabus. However, the same situation also provides a timely reminder that the content and details of any basic skills course is to some extent an artificial construct.

If we define the preparation of students for an extended study abroad trip as the primary goal of the speech section of the course, then as long as that overarching aim is met (i.e. Students arrive at the end of the course in possession of sufficient English conversation skills as to feel reasonably confident about undertaking a study abroad period) then the speech component of the course can be considered a success.

With the proviso that the primary aim of the course is met there is room for a large variation in the content of the day-to-day specifics of individual lessons. With this in mind the initial apparent artificial nature of a speaking / writing combination is lessened when we realize that the content within the speech section of any course is open to variation as long as it serves the purpose of leading the students to the main goals of the course.

Here we can note that in any speech course designed to prep students for study abroad there will be a number of common areas that a teacher planning such a course would include. However, when we consider these common areas: topics such as asking and answering basic questions, listening skills, asking directions, relating a story, expressing wishes and opinions, etc., we find there is no single, set way we must stick to in order to effectively cover the topics. Contrast this with a content course where certain facts and types of knowledge are both essential to the subject and also themselves subject to a predetermined order for teaching / learning and it becomes apparent that there is a level of flexibility available to the teacher as regards approach to a course of this nature.

If we accept the premise that an effective basic skills course may be constructed in a large number of ways (again with the proviso that there is a clear overall goal that both teacher and students are aware of) then we are in the position to use the apparent difficult juxtaposition of speech and writing as a way to highlight the fact that boundaries between
the traditional four skills in English learning are actually not representative of the real world, but are in fact simply a convenient way to divide up a timetable. While this artificial separation into distinct skills is easier on the timetable, it certainly doesn't reflect the way English outside the classroom operates.

Current Finnish education is illustrative here. The Finnish model, often cited as a model of excellence in Japan, has recently received a major overhaul with the aim of doing away with just such artificial boundaries. To take one example, the Second World War has traditionally been a history class subject. Finland is proposing to do away with such distinctions and to recognize that to be conversant with the topic in a more comprehensive way a holistic teaching approach is required. In effect, the second world war will be history, geography, politics, logistics and supply (maths), manufacturing and more. This approach makes clear that events do not exist in isolation and that this has only ever been a construct of convenience for the classroom.

Returning to Integrative English at KIHC we can make the same argument for including different English skills in the same class. The aim is not to blur the distinction between skills but to show how they can augment each other. In this way, a student who reads an interesting piece of written work could then try out that idea in spoken form with classmates or staff. They are certainly more likely to do so in a class that affords opportunities to practice both skills than in a class where there is only one form of output recognized.

As a way of testing the validity of this approach we examined the IE course through Nation and Macalister’s (2010) curriculum design model (see appendix A). This model uses a series of circles to define the components of the curriculum design process, with the course goals at the center, surrounded by three other criteria: Content and sequencing, Format and Presentation, and Monitoring and Assessing. The goals, which form the center of the model are themselves linked to three parameters: Needs, Environment, and Principles. It is these last three parameters that we will look at in this paper, in order to assess how well the new integrated course at KIHC performs when viewed from these standpoints.

We will use Dubin and Olshtain’s (1986) definitions of curriculum and syllabus, which states the following:

“A curriculum contains a broad description of general goals by indicating an overall educational - cultural philosophy ... a syllabus is a more detailed ...statement of teaching and learning elements which translates the philosophy of the curriculum into a series of planned steps leading towards more narrowly defined objectives ... “. In the context of this paper we will be dealing with syllabus rather than curriculum.
Needs

Needs analysis is used to examine what needs the course should satisfy for the learners. A good language course should fulfil some need or lack in the learners’ language ability.

Needs analysis can be performed in several different ways. Nation and Macalister (2010) classify needs into three categories: wants, lacks, and necessities. Wants addresses what learners desire to know in relation to the L2. Lacks highlight what learners lack in their language skills, such as aspects of the L2 that they may not have experience with. Lastly, necessities asks the question of what learners need in relation to their language usage. Nation and Macalister (2010) point out that these three things can also be categorized more broadly into present knowledge, required knowledge, and subjective needs.

James D. Brown (1994) establishes several different approaches to examining the three previously listed elements of needs analysis. One way is described as the discrepancy approach. In that approach, effort is made to examine the gap between the learners’ performance in the L2 and the desired performance in the L2. Another approach described in Brown’s (1994) work is the analytical approach. The analytical approach looks at what learners need to know in order to move on in a developmental sequence.

When we began the process of integrating the Oral Communication 1 &2 classes and the Writing 1&2 classes it provided us with a natural opportunity to re-examine the needs of our students in relation to those specific courses, and what, if anything, could be updated or included in the new IE course. As was stated previously, language learning courses tend to suffer from stagnation, when a course is viewed as successful, it can become difficult to change it. The integration process was seen as a good opportunity to update understanding of the students’ needs.

In the case of our IE course, it was necessary that the course must answer both student’s needs of the students, and the needs of the KIHC English program. That is to say that the two courses being replaced by the IE course were in many ways the foundation courses of the new KIHC program. This new course will set students’ expectations for future courses, as well as give students transferable skills that can be applied to another course of our program.

Pairing Nation and Macalister’s (2010) base level needs analysis questions with Brown’s (1994) format of examining the answers in an analytical and discrepancy based view gives us the following results:
### Necessities:

As stated previously, the IE course will take the place of Oral Communications and Writing I, II as the base level classes for first-year students at KIHC, meaning that many important skills must be established during the IE course. For many students, this is their first experience with English as the primary classroom language. As such, students have to practice active listening to participate in a class that is taught almost wholly in their L2. This experience will continue across almost all of their English courses at KIHC. As KIHC’s first year program is aimed at sending students abroad between the first and second school years, the new course must maintain the same emphasis on daily communicative English.

One problematic area is the process of integrating the writing into the oral communication tasks. With a program stressing daily English, it is perhaps more consistent to focus on more everyday writing tasks; such as email or letter writing. However, as the only first-year writing course, the IE must also serve as a base for the second-year writing courses; academic writing and business writing. This means that IE must focus on the introduction of paragraph writing and the writing process.

### Lacks:

Students enter KIHC with several years of English study behind them. However, the style of English teaching common in Japanese elementary, middle, and high schools concentrates more on pronunciation and repetition of pre-formed conversations. KIHC’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necessities</th>
<th>What is necessary for the learners’ use of language?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students must be able to listen and understand class instructions in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learners must be able to maintain conversations regarding their likes, dislikes, daily schedule, family and school life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students must be able to write compositions of at least two paragraphs that express their opinions of basic topics. (similar to spoken tasks to above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lacks</th>
<th>What do the learners lack?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• While students enter KIHC with previous language study, they have never experienced a language class where focus is directed at creating and maintaining conversation, rather than rote performance of pre-set tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students enter the school with no direct knowledge of the ‘writing process.’ They are unfamiliar with the pre-writing and revision stages of the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wants</th>
<th>What do the learners wish to learn?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students have also been interested in learning more English for common daily life situations, such as shopping and for use in social situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students have expressed discomfort at performing spoken tasks alone, and are more comfortable with paired or grouped tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students have expressed a desire to learn more slang words and casual forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
program focuses on student production of original material. At first, many students are uncomfortable with the level of production required. In the same vein, students arrive with very little experience in producing English writing of longer than a few sentences at a time. They have very little knowledge of writing process and are unfamiliar with the ideas of pre-writing or revising their written work. Time must be included in the syllabus to allow for scaffolding to help them generate ideas, as well as time to instruct them on revising their own work. Time must also be dedicated to instruction on how to produce typed and formatted English compositions. Student have very little experience in typing on the computer in English, but as all classes require typed work, IE is the course that must introduce these skills.

Wants:

It is difficult to determine what the students want in their language classes. However, based on the observations of the English teaching staff over a period of 10 plus years we can establish certain generalizations that apply to students studying English at KHIC. Despite giving students opportunities to express their opinions on what they want out of their classes, we have received very few answers. Students are reluctant to be perceived as unhappy with, or unappreciative of, their English classes. That being said, there are certain complaints or requests during classes that are consistent amongst the students.

Students are more interested in communicative tasks that seem immediately useful to them. They enjoy tasks that allow them to perform life tasks in English, or allows them to communicate about subjects they enjoy. Lessons about daily life, like shopping for birthday presents or deciding upon restaurants for dinner, are always welcomed by the students and are easily incorporated into the syllabus.

Some students have expressed discomfort with solo speaking tasks in the classroom. While their desire is to only perform paired speaking tasks, this is not practical. There is room for balance however. Within the course paired and group tasks can be more varied than solo speaking tasks.

Finally, the students are fascinated by English slang, and have requested to learn more colloquial terms. They are especially fascinated by the differences between the English spoken by the multi-national teaching staff at KIHC. These things are easy to incorporate into the classroom and make the class more enjoyable for the students.

Environmental Analysis

Nation and Macalister (2010) establishes that when designing and implementing a new language learning syllabus, a well thought out environmental analysis is important. Environmental analysis is the process of looking at which factors will have the greatest
effect on the effectiveness and goals of the course and then deciding how to account for them. These factors may originate from teachers or learners, economic, social or institutional issues and can all have a direct or indirect impact on curriculum development. According to Richards, J (2001) it is the process of determining whether or not the course will actually be useable in a language learning setting.

The first step in an environmental analysis is producing a broad list of constraints that will affect the course both negatively and positively, then singling out which of these require the most attention to ensure successful implementation of the new syllabus. Due to the fact that the new IE course at KIHC will replace the two-existing speaking and writing courses, it was expected that the environmental constraints would consist of both those carried over from the previous courses as well as new ones resulting from the course change. This proved to be correct, as during the initial brainstorming session previous constraints regrading class size, equipment, student motivation and skill level were all identified as having an effect on the new course along with additional factors such as overall class time, availability/suitability of resources and goals within an integrated course. Using a table derived from Nation and Macalister (2010), the syllabus design model proposed in the following table is a list of main constraints and their possible affects, identified during the initial environmental analysis for the new IE course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Constraints</th>
<th>Particular Constraints</th>
<th>Effect on Curriculum Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>* While all students have studied English in secondary school, their levels vary widely.</td>
<td>* Increases the need for streamed classes based on ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Some students will require much more teacher guidance than others.</td>
<td>* Will affect progression rate through the course work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Student’s willingness to answer questions, join in or lead group discussions or self-evaluate can be low in Japanese classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>* The need for effective functional language skill as preparation for study abroad.</td>
<td>* Provides a general goal for students to strive towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Allows for class variation and more real world activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of</td>
<td>* The ability to find a textbook or textbooks that cover both speaking and writing components in an integrated manner. These resources must also match the student’s English ability level.</td>
<td>* Will directly affect how the course is designed and run. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>good textbook with resources such as CDs and video will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>beneficial for both students and teachers. Not having this will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>force teachers to bring in or produce other resources to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following constraints were deemed to be the most important factors affecting the design of the new course.

### Time Constraints

The time available for a course is always a very important issue; without sufficient time to meet goals the class will not work. During the syllabus planning phase, achievable realistic goals that adequately balance both the writing and speaking components of the course. Another possible solution to alleviate the problem of time constraint is to set more work and goals outside the classroom, in order to promote increased student autonomy. This would give the teachers more time to cover class work and would also help students in better understanding the integrated nature of these English skills as described in Nation and Macalister (2010).

It is hoped that with balanced goals, student autonomy, and time to show how both skills can complement each other, that the new course will allow the students to achieve an increased level of success in English.

### Classroom and Resource Constraints

The availability of suitable textbooks for the new course will have a direct effect on the overall design. Most textbooks for teaching English in an integrated manner tend to focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Setting &amp; Resources</th>
<th>Time Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Set class sizes of between 20 - 25 students.</td>
<td>* IE will be three times a week over each fifteen-week semester. The previous Oral Communication and Writing I,II classes had 2 classes and 1 class per week, respectively. The new class must be able to adequately cover the content of both speaking and writing skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Three computer rooms on campus.</td>
<td>* Setting well balanced goals for both speaking and writing will be required. Time must also be devoted to showing how these two skills can complement each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Lack of adequate/functional audio visual equipment across all classrooms. No interactive display equipment (interactive whiteboard, tablet computers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Computer rooms can be used for the writing component of the course. Computer room availability is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Textbooks using video, sound or interactive material cannot be fully utilized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on four main skills, so finding a dedicated one for speaking and writing can be problematic. If a suitable textbook cannot be found, one solution is to use separate textbooks for speaking and writing but use them in an integrated manner. This, combined with added resources produced by teachers, can provide a good base for the new course.

The actual environment inside the classroom is also an important issue. Classroom size, number of students, the ability to rearrange the room to accommodate differing teaching styles and the availability of audio visual equipment all have an effect on the learning process. (Dublin, F & Olshtain, E. 1986). Large classrooms, smaller class sizes and non-fixed furniture at KIHC allows for effective group work during class time. It is hoped that this will encourage student autonomy and also address some of the constraints with lower level students and some students' unwillingness/inability to produce in front of the entire class.

A major constraint at KIHC however is that due to aging infrastructure, only the bare minimum of audio visual equipment is available in most classrooms. Some classrooms and PC rooms that are fully equipped with DVD players, projectors etc., however the reliability of this technology and the ability to reserve them for class can be an issue. This constraint will have a large impact on the design of the course. Producing a course that fully utilizes the interactive content of most modern textbooks will be difficult.

**Principles**

Developing principles is a key component when designing a new curriculum. Researchers (Ellis (2005), Nation & Macalister (2010), Cotterall (2000), et al.) believe that there is a disassociation between the practice curriculum design and the theory of language processing. Principles can support and strengthen the curriculum’s goals as well as address other challenges such as needs and environment. Thus, if there is a connection between these areas then the course will become more sound and meaningful for the learners.

By integrating principles to the curriculum design process, the instructors can avoid unrealistic challenges to meet numerous different individual learners’ needs (Cotterall, 2000). Thus, it provides a more holistic and realistic parameter. Nation & Macalister (2010, p.38), suggest that the “principles should allow variety and flexibility in order to suit a wide range of conditions in which language is taught”. Determining and defining which principles are adequate and significant for our new course is vital to the development of a successful course.

As previously mentioned, our primary goal is for our students to feel confident and be prepared to effectively communicate with others during their study abroad program. Thus, the IE course will focus on implementing the Communicative Language Teaching approach (CLT) and Task Based Language Learning (TBLL).

These two approaches will enable our course to be more learner-centered and
the teacher’s role will be dedicated as a facilitator. Language is developed through communication. Both of these approaches provide an opportunity for students to concentrate their target languages on more authentic, real-life situations. Furthermore, CLT can provide intrinsic motivation and empowerment for the students. According to Graham and Perry (2007), CLT allows students to share responsibility, set goals and take charge of their own learning. TBLL is an extension of CLT. Nunan (1999, p.24) defines TBLL as “an approach to the design of language courses in which the point of departure is not an ordered list of linguistic items, but a collection of tasks”. TBLL emphases on providing experiences where learners listen to various examples of authentic communication in a real social context and then discuss in order to solve problems and communicate ideas, and needs. Both of these approaches are key tools that will help learners apply and transfer their skills to real life situations such as studying abroad.

After reviewing key principles that were constructed by researchers such as Ellis (2005) and Nation & Macalister (2010), one would conclude that it would be challenging to integrate and monitor all principles within a course. We will only apply several principles that we believe are relevant and that will aid us in achieving our overall goals. Our principles will be a mix of suggested principles from Ellis (2005), Nation & Macalister (2010), Cotterall (2000), et al. Nevertheless, all of our principles will follow Nation & Macalister (2010) curriculum design diagram. Our principles will be divided into three main categories: content and sequencing; format and presentation; monitoring and assessment.

Content and Sequencing

Content and sequencing focuses on the key components that go into a language course. The goal is to make sure that the learners are gaining something useful from this course. The content should be meaningful to the learners’ needs. Also, the students should be aware that the skills they learn are transferable and applicable to situations outside of the classroom. If there is no practical or valuable use of language then the course is pointless.

A) The course should provide the most exposure to language that is commonly used in English speaking environments.

It is essential to determine what are the common expressions, lexical and grammar functions that are used in English and decide the materials that will enable students to be exposed to them. According to Nation & Macalister (2010), a language course should give most attention to the high-frequency items of the language. It is suggested to teach learners strategies for learning and managing with low-frequency items. This concept aids our goal for the study abroad trip by highlighting commonly used expressions in different social settings. At present we are considering Cambridge University Press Empower textbook for our course because it features and reviews high frequency expressions and grammar.
functions that will allow students to practice and recall these key target language points.

B) Creating appropriate classroom conditions for language learning.

It is recommended that the classroom environment should be a place to promote community building. The environment should make the learners feel positive, less anxious and safe. The classroom resources should reflect the connections between L1-L2 cultures and languages. According to Nation & Macalister (2010) and Ellis (2005), social scaffolding is considered a classroom norm. Learners should be encouraged to be engaging, examine and hold opinions, and try to understand other people's views. By implementing this principle within our course, students should feel motivated and open to communicating in English.

C) Language learning is enhanced through learner's autonomy.

The overall goal for this course is to allow students to eventually become effective and independent language learners. The instructor's role is to facilitate and present learner's tools that will enable them to learn their target language. In addition, instructors should ideally help students recognize positive values of the target language (Nation & Macalister, 2010). Students are encouraged to understand how to use these tools in different social settings. The instructors prompt students to make connections from their learning to their own lives. By giving learners some control over the topic, learners will feel more confident and engaged while completing the classroom activities (Ellis, 1999). Thus, they will become more active learners.

Format and Presentation

This area focuses on what happens within the classroom and during the learning process. One must decide what activities and methods will be used that will address and fulfill the students' needs. We have determined to use a more active approach with a mix of traditional and non-traditional resources within this course. For example, this course will use textbooks, role-plays, newspapers, discussions, and worksheets. Also, we will implement online programs for outside of the classroom use, such as English Central that concentrates on the speaking and listening components of the language, and Moodle, which focuses on the writing component.

A) Learners should have a positive attitude and be excited about learning the language.

This is a crucial principle because instructors need to provide extrinsic motivation in order to increase intrinsic motivation (Nation & Macalister, 2010; Dörnyei, 2001). It is common for students not to be interested in learning the language for several reasons, such as, resistance to the language or low self-esteem. Instructors must find ways to attract and involve these uninterested learners. The topics should be adequate and fit the
students' needs and teachers should try to demonstrate the relevance of these activities. Class activities should be centered around built-in challenges such as memory games, problem-solving activities, and competition time procedures. Finally, instructors can also create progress reports so learners can develop realistic achievements and view their improvements.

B) **Instructors involve learners in the use and practice of authentic language.**

The key is for learners to get enough exposure to realistic situations. The learners should have a chance to hear different accents, learn various idiomatic expressions, and discuss about topics that are significant within English-speaking countries. Presently, textbooks and lack of technological resources can hinder this experience, thus it is crucial for the instructors to find creative alternatives.

By enabling students to practice authentic language, they should feel more prepared in handling different situations during their study abroad trip. According to Andrade and Evans (2013), instructors should create a context-rich learning environment for practicing language skills. Context-rich learning environments will increase learner's autonomy and active learning. Examples of targeted language that could be implemented are scripted dialogues, interviews, and writing tasks. There should be transparency and awareness of what the learner is studying. Cotterall (2000) states that tasks should be given to learners that will provide rehearsals of real-world communicative tasks. Learners should attempt to construct meaning, make inferences, participate in discussions, and understand the content.

Instructors also must consider what materials will be used beyond the classroom. As previously mentioned, there are some environmental and time constraints within KICH. It is encouraged for learners to use non-traditional tools such as media and technology to help enhance their skills. These tools will be most used outside of the classroom. Thus, English Central is an interactive online tool that can be used to extensively improve the learners' listening and speaking skills. Moodle is another outlet for students to write their opinions and participate in various online discussions. Finally, our students live in an English-speaking dormitory. Students can transfer some of the skills they have learned within the classroom and apply them to their daily lives.

C) **There must be a balance between input and output as well as the difference language skills: speaking, listening and writing.**

Since this course was originally two separate core courses (Writing I, II, and Oral Communication), it is crucial for the instructors to find balance to practice on all of these skills. It is important to note that reading is a key component in language skills. Reading has its own separate program thus it will not be a key focus within this course. Naturally, there will be some small reading tasks to complete within the IE course. Instructors will have to
review and determine how much time to dedicate for the other language skills.

D) Learners should attempt to use L2 as much as possible and activities should help improve fluency and add to learners’ current language knowledge.

Nation & Macalister (2010) states that one of the biggest problems to fluency is the lack of opportunities outside the classroom to use the foreign language to communicate. We can overcome this obstacle by providing online platforms such as Moodle and English Central tasks. Another obstacle is encouraging the learners to use English on their own. Students live in a homogenous country and there are barely any opportunities to use L2 outside. Instructors can encourage the learners to practice as much as possible in the English-speaking dormitory as well as on campus.

Monitoring and Assessment

It is important to dedicate some time to reflect on and evaluate the course. Both the instructors and the learners should conduct this revision. Developing a course is a process that is ever changing. It is a cycle. It is vital to understand the strengths and weaknesses by analyzing students’ and teacher’s perceptions.

A) Instructors should be aware that needs analysis and environment analysis are essential and ongoing.

It is necessary for the instructors to look back on the course and review the learners’ needs and environment. It is recommended to not only do this towards the end of the course. Reflection should be ongoing. An analysis must be conducted at the beginning of the course, and it is suggested to review the needs in the middle and again at the end of the course. It is important to keep track of fulfilling the learners’ needs or checking to see if there are any changes to their needs.

B) Self-regulated learning should be stimulated.

There will be limited time within the semester and an instructor should not be the only evaluator of learners’ self-improvement. It is critical for learners to understand how they can evaluate themselves and manage their own progress. Instructors should help learners develop effective practice habits and recognize their own strengths and weaknesses. Cotterall (2000) mentions that a course should provide reflection on learning. When an individual’s learning awareness grows, the potential for learners’ autonomy grows. Zimmerman (2008) states that self-regulated learning has three phases: forethought, performance and self-regulation. Students can try to make their own decisions within classroom activities and projects. Learners can be encouraged to set goals and decide which strategies to use in order to complete a task, practice self-observation during their
C) Instructors are encouraged to provide constructive feedback to help students improve the quality of their language use.

In order to provide effective constructive feedback, instructors must find balance between positive and negative comments. Too much negative feedback can discourage learners from continuing to learn the language and motivation will dramatically decrease. On the other hand, too much positive feedback may give the students an illusion that they are perfect and it may hinder any future improvements.

Effective constructive feedback can be done in numerous ways. The instructor can create a checklist or review the can-do statements to determine if the learner has fully completed the tasks. These methods are measureable and visually clear for the student to understand. Also, anonymous peer feedback can be encouraged and provides a different perspective of the learner’s performance. An instructor’s feedback can be an extension of learner’s self-reflection. It is important to give some period of self-reflection for the learner and exchange ideas afterwards.

Final Thoughts

It is too early in this program’s history to draw any conclusions as to the effectiveness of combining these two subjects, but we believe that the rationale behind doing so is sound.

By implementing McAlister’s curriculum design within our syllabus, the principles can connect with other parts of the syllabus as well as being easily monitored and measurable. It is highly recommended to review these principles again in the middle and end of the program to determine if they are suitable for our learners. In this way, we hope to produce a more effective learning experience for students.
Appendix A

Nation and Macalister’s (2010) curriculum design model.
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