

Lexical Approach to Syllabus Design

Meral ÖZTÜRK*

ÖZET

Sözcüksel müfredatlar, dil öğreniminde sözcüklerin tekrar gündeme gelmesiyle, mevcut müfredat türlerine bir alternatif olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Bilinen müfredat türlerinin hemen hepsinde (yapısal, durumsal, fonksiyonel gibi) sözcüksel hedeflere yer verilmekle birlikte, ilk defa sözcüksel müfredatlarda sözcükler bu kadar önem kazanmıştır. Bu makalede sözcüksel müfredata göre hazırlanmış bir İngilizce ders kitabı incelenmektedir. Collins COBUILD English Course (Willis & Willis, 1988) isimli bu ders kitabı, müfredatta yer alan hedef sözcüklerin seçiminde ve bunların seviyelere göre sıralanmasında kullanılan kriterler ve hedef sözcüklerin öğretilmesinde kullanılan 'taşıyıcılar' açısından tartışılmaktadır.

İngilizce sözcüklerin seçiminde yazarlar kullanım sıklığı kriterini kullanmakta ve bunu belirlemede Birmingham metin bankası kullanılarak yapılan sözcük sayımı sonuçlarını esas aldıklarını ifade etmektedirler. Kitapta toplam 2500 adet sözcük kullanıma yönelik olarak öğretilmekte, buna ilave olarak da her üniteye çok sayıda anlamaya yönelik sözcük öğretimi hedeflenmektedir. Kitapta ayrıca hedef sözcükler listesinde yer almayan pek çok sözcüğün bulunması müfredatın yoğunluğunu arttırmakta ve gerçekçi olmayan boyutlara çıkarmaktadır. Bundan başka, kullanım sıklığı kriterine de sıkı sıkıya bağlı kalınmadığına dair kuşkular ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Sözcüklerin sıralanmasında da sistematik bir yöntem kullanılmadığı görülmektedir. Hedef sözcükler, üç kitaptan oluşan setin seviyeleri arasında bölüştürülürken ayırım noktalarının neye göre belirlendiği belirtilmemiştir. Ayrıca ünite başına düşen hedef sözcük sayısının da üniteden üniteye büyük ölçüde değişiyor olması, bu konuda da mevcut bilimsel araştırma verilerine dayalı olmayan rasgele bir uygulama yapıldığı izlenimi doğurmaktadır.

Sözcüksel hedeflerin öğretilmesinde taşıyıcı olarak konular ve aktiviteler kullanılmaktadır. Konular herkesi ilgilendirebilecek kadar genel

* Dr., Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı Öğretim Görevlisi

olmakla birlikte zaman zaman dağılmaktadır. Konuşmaya yönelik aktiviteler ise yeterince etkileşimsel olamamıştır.

Sonuç olarak Collins COBUILD kitabının müfredatı bilinen müfredatlardan çok önemli bir farklılık göstermemektedir. Bu durum tamamen sözcüksel kriterlere dayalı müfredatlar hazırlanabileceği konusunda ciddi şüpheler uyandırmaktadır.

INTRODUCTION

Lexical approach is one of the latest proposals to language teaching and to syllabus design in ELT (Sinclair, 1991; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992; Lewis, 1993). Earlier approaches advocated a variety of principles for the organisation of ELT programmes: structural, situational, topical, functional, or cognitive principles. Although vocabulary is accommodated in all of these approaches, it is in the lexical approach that lexical criteria were given prominence as the main organising principle in course design. This paper reviews one such implementation of a lexical syllabus. Collins COBUILD English Course (COBUILD Course from now on) written by Jane and Dave Willis (1988) is claimed by the authors to be based on lexical principles. After a brief introduction of the material, we go on to discuss these principles while making a critical evaluation of the practices of the authors in terms of effectiveness of learning.

Collins COBUILD English Course

COBUILD Course is a complete set for teaching general English comprising three levels with accompanying cassettes and a practice book. The target audience and aims of the course are indicated in fairly broad terms in the Introduction. We are informed that the course is designed for classroom use with adults, and is assumed to be appropriate both for learners with a variety of first language backgrounds and for those speaking the same native language. The audience is also specified in terms of English proficiency level as beginners' level, early intermediate level and intermediate level. More often than not, these terms refer not only to the learners' lexical competence but also to his structural competence. However, the fact that the type of syllabus the course is based on is lexical leaves us in doubt as to the authors' definitions of these terms. Are proficiency levels defined lexically, structurally, or both?

The aims of the course are specified very broadly as "to consolidate learners' English and extend their vocabulary and communication skills" (p.ii). An additional aim is to prepare learners for Cambridge First Certificate in English examination" (p.ii).

The number of the vocabulary introduced in each level is specified in all three components of the set. The first book which is for false beginners introduces 700 words, the second book aims to teach 850 new words to early intermediate students, and Level 3 which is for intermediate students teaches 950 words. At the end of the course, learners are assumed to have learnt "productively" a total of 2500 words with the addition of a "sizeable receptive vocabulary". A certain connection is implied between the proficiency levels and the number of words to be learnt. There is no indication, however, that the cut-points made in the number of the words according to the proficiency level have not been decided arbitrarily. How do we know, for example, that a knowledge of 700 words represent an early intermediate level of proficiency?

Unit of Analysis

The organising unit in a lexical syllabus is the "word". However, the legitimacy of the "word" as the basic unit of analysis is quiet disputable. Sinclair and Renouf (1988:141) justify a lexical syllabus arguing that in graded readers "measurement of progress often includes an assessment of the number of words that learners know". This statement dangerously equates progress with increase in vocabulary size and thus reduces all language learning down to vocabulary learning. While vocabulary size is often related to language proficiency, language proficiency is a complex skill consisting of other types of knowledge such as phonological, morphological, structural, discorsal, social, pragmatic, etc. as well as lexical. Vocabulary size could be a relatively reliable indicator of proficiency, but not proficiency itself, we cannot take it that every individual with a big vocabulary is inevitably proficient in the L2, nor that we can teach language by teaching words alone. Interestingly, graded readers are not graded solely on the basis of the number of words, they are also graded according to syntactic complexity. Furthermore, their main purpose is to provide opportunities for learners to improve their comprehension of written English texts and they are most suitable as materials for extensive reading outside the classroom. Therefore, the fact that readers are lexically graded would not justify a lexical syllabus for an English for General Purposes course which is supposed to include all four skills.

Another theoretical assumption underlying a lexical syllabus is that words and phrases are discrete linguistic items and can be learned 'separately and completely one at a time' (Long & Crookes, 1992:32). However, vocabulary acquisition research indicates otherwise. Learners do not seem to learn words and phrases "completely" the first time. Indeed, vocabulary errors "persist" even after "most grammatical problems have been cleared up" (Long and Crookes, 1992:33).

Selection

There are a number of criteria that could be used as the basis for selection of vocabulary such as frequency, coverage, availability (disponibilité), or learnability (Mackey, 1965). In the COBUILD Course, lexical objectives are claimed to have been selected on frequency criteria. Frequency is "the total number of occurrences of an item in a given corpus of language" (White, 1988: 49). The language corpus that yielded the word frequencies used in the COBUILD Course (see Appendix) is the Birmingham Corpus which was produced by a team of researchers at Birmingham University who, using computer facilities, searched through a vast number of authentic English texts ranking millions of words in order of frequency of occurrence and analysing their patterns of use (Willis & Willis, 1988). As it is, the frequency list is merely a linguistic description of the English lexicon in terms of frequency of use by native speakers. The underlying assumption in using this corpus as a basis for organising an English language text-book is that a frequency description of the TL is also relevant pedagogically. Designing their syllabus on the basis of frequency of words in native speaker data, rather than an analysis of learners' needs, the authors seem to assume, rightly or wrongly, that what is most common in native speaker texts are both meaningful and useful to learners with varying second language needs (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988: 150). Although what is infrequent use in the TL tends to be what is useful to learners, it would not be wise to assume that this is unexceptionally true. It is often the case that learners might need to learn relatively infrequent vocabulary as well especially at the university level. Learners' needs might be so diverse that establishing "special corpora" could be considered "to serve the needs of the major English language learning communities" (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988: 150).

One of the basic problems with 'word' as the unit of analysis in syllabus design is the concept of the word itself. There are basically two types of words in English: function words and content words. Function words such as articles, pronouns, conjunctions etc. have a grammatical function within the sentence and they hold the content words together. In that sense, they are the building blocks of structural syllabi. Should they be included in a lexical syllabus? The answer is not easy: the inclusion of function words will spoil the purity of a lexical syllabus. Furthermore, this will require a selection and sequencing of structures to be taught resulting in a structural syllabus existing alongside the lexical for the same course. Of course, total exclusion of function words from syllabus would not necessarily imply their exclusion from the teaching materials, because no such materials exist except in the form of word lists (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988:143). A lexical syllabus in the form of a list of content words, therefore, would leave grammar to be learned inductively and casually from the materials. The main drawback of

this attitude is that grammar may not be learned at all and may interfere with the learning of vocabulary because words are meaningful within a linguistic context. If the linguistic context is not understood the words that appear in that context would not be understood, either.

The authors of Collins COBUILD English Course do not exclude function words from their syllabus. The Birmingham frequency list, which is the source for the selection, does not exclude the function words from the analysis, either. Nor does it differentiate between function words and content words, either, but treat them all as instances of the same inclusive category of 'word'. Therefore, function words and content words do not appear separately in the corpus, but appear in a mixed fashion only ordered by their frequency in actual language. Nevertheless, function words tend to group together at the top of the list. In fact, until item number 42 no content words appear at all, because function words are the most frequent in native speaker data. For that reason it would be practically impossible to teach a lesson based on a syllabus sticking closely to the order in the corpus. In practice, this would mean that the first lesson for beginners in a General English course would be all function words and none or very few content words. There are no materials that exist to cover those function words only. Therefore, there is a need for function words to be spread evenly throughout the course. This, in turn, requires decisions to be made as to at which point in the syllabus they should be introduced and how many of them will be introduced at a time, thus producing a structural syllabus.

Although, the authors of the COBUILD course do not explain how they treated the frequency data, it is clear that they do include teaching of function words regularly. "Each unit has at least one, sometimes two, grammar sections which revise major grammatical features from levels one and two, and extend to give thorough coverage of noun phrases and verb groups, clause and sentence structure" (Willis & Willis, 1988: iv). These sections include grammar points such as indefinite articles, the pattern 'it is / was... who / that' or the uses of verb 'do' etc., and exercises that practice them. Although categorised and sequenced somewhat differently from the traditional structural syllabuses there seems to be some kind of a list of structural patterns separate from the lexical list. Interestingly enough, these patterns are taught, more often than not, deductively. First, the rule pattern in a skeletal form is introduced, then a few examples are provided and lastly, exercises are provided for practice. This presents a contradiction with what they said about 'grammar teaching / learning' in the Introduction: "Grammar is learned rather than taught".

There is no less difficulty with the content words in a lexical syllabus. The content words take prefixes and suffixes when used in sentences and not simply used in base form. There is a small number of affixes in

English and rules can be applied to them, as they have certain established meanings and they change the meaning of words they are attached to in certain predictable ways. However, there are no few exceptions. E.g. 'real' and 'certain' do not have obvious direct meaning relations to their derivated forms 'really' and 'certainly' (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988:147). On the other hand, there is a great number of words in English ending in -ly which are closely associated in meaning to their base forms. Dictionaries do not even bother to define them, but simply indicate that a certain word can take an -ly suffix. They are only defined when they have a special use unpredictable from the suffix. Therefore, it would be very practical and time-saving for the syllabus designer to include as separate objectives only those forms of words whose meanings are not predictable from other forms (base or other regularly affixed) already known to the learners. It would be unwise, for example, to expect the learner to predict the derivated noun form 'gift' on the basis of their knowledge of 'to give'. Neither the forms nor the meanings of the two are directly relatable. (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988:147)

Another difficulty with the content words concerns the different senses of words. Words in English may have several senses to their meaning. Knowing one of the senses does not always mean that the learners will be able to predict others. Which of the senses, then, should be included in the syllabus? An obvious answer to this would be 'the most central one' (West in White, 1988). It can be assumed that the most frequent senses are the most central ones, but even then it is doubtful that the Birmingham Corpus respects the frequency of senses in ordering.

The Collins COBUILD English Course provides the objectives for content words for each unit as a list at the end of each unit. The list contains (almost always) single words, nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs, often derived from the same base form, e.g. 'motor, motorist, motorway'. This suggests that the authors treat the derived forms as lexical objectives when they have meanings unpredictable from the base form. The learners may not work out, for example, from the suffixes that motorist does not mean someone who makes or repairs motors or that motorway means 'road'. Therefore, each of them is nominated as a lexical objective. On the other hand, inflected forms never appear as lexical objectives. They are, like function words, are treated in the grammar section. However, it is sometimes difficult to judge, just by looking at the list, which sense of the word is being meant. For example, the lexical objective 'article' in the list for a unit in Level 3 turns out to be 'newspaper article' in the materials, and 'meter' to be 'parking meter'. In this sense, the list is somewhat misleading. On the other hand, it may be unjust to expect semantic precision from a mere list after all, because meanings of words only get clear in use.

Grading

Grading involves ordering of items from easy to difficult as well as planning of objectives for each unit. In COBUILD Course there is no evidence of ordering in terms of difficulty. Neither lexical objectives seem to be planned very carefully and realistically. The number of lexical objectives in the book is not stable and varies dramatically across units. There are units with just 17 lexical targets on the one hand and units with over 50 objectives on the other and many units with random number of objectives in between. As far as vocabulary is concerned, this range is very large. Obviously, the authors do not consistently act on any theory concerning the number of vocabulary that can be taught and learned within one unit which they estimate will take up to 4 hours to complete (p. iv). However, they do act on the assumption that the teachers can teach and the learners can learn up to 25 words in an hour. This seems to be a difficult objective to achieve. That number of vocabulary may be introduced within such a limited time, but it can be guaranteed that they could be taught properly, let be learned.

The authors claim that learners will learn new words and learn them 'productively', too, because each unit introduces a number of receptive vocabulary in addition. Learners do not need to retain the receptive vocabulary to be able to use them later. What they need to do is just to understand them the first time and recognise when they meet them again. It will be very well-known to anyone who has tried to learn a second language, even the receptive vocabulary is very slow to develop. You may understand a new word but you may not be able to remember its meaning on a later occasion (especially if the context is not supportive) even if you may recognise the form. Words seem to slip our memory so easily. There is no reason to believe, either, that you will be able to understand or even guess the meaning of new words the first time.

In addition to productive and receptive target words, there are also a number of words in the materials that authors do not include as objectives in either category (e.g. wheel nuts, jack, pursuers, snappy, swerve, joyriding, intact, etc. in the same unit as the previous examples). It is not clear on what criteria it was decided that some words will go into receptive objectives while others will be ignored. The frequency criteria may be at work, again, because these do seem to be less common than the receptive objectives. However, they are not few in number in the materials. Will they not get in the way of understanding the materials and of fulfilling the requirements of the tasks, and thus interfere with the learning of target vocabulary and with the understanding of the receptive vocabulary? There does not seem to be, either, much difference between the ways the productive and receptive target vocabulary is taught (the teaching methodology will be discussed in some

detail further on). It is all too possible that learners will end up learning productively a non-objective word while missing a productive lexical objective entirely.

The authors claim that they used the findings of the Birmingham Project which analysed the 'patterns of use' in millions of words. However, most lexical objectives, both in the in-unit and end-unit lists, appear as single, isolated items; e.g. 'to comment on' is listed, in one of the in-unit lists, merely as 'comment', and we do not even know if it is a noun or a verb. The same is true for 'campaign', 'panic', 'reverse' etc. Some fixed phrases and idioms are, indeed, listed in full form within in-unit objectives, such as 'show off', 'find faults with / about', 'take risks', 'have a puncture', 'had been had up, etc'. Nevertheless, no phrase or idiom is placed in the comprehensive 'end-of-unit list'. With the addition of these, the number of lexical objectives become even greater and teaching and learning them becomes more of a problem.

There are also vocabulary in Levels 2 and 3 which have been introduced in earlier levels and are being revised there. There are 50 such words in Level 3, for instance, and we are not informed what criteria are used to decide that 'just' these words among the possible 1150 words will be revised.

Another important issue is related to the grouping together of lexical objectives in a unit. The authors do not explain their criteria. Some of them are brought together by the topic (main theme) of the unit. Indeed, each unit contains jargon specific to a topic; for example, among lexical objectives for the unit mentioned earlier are 'kilometre, lane, lorry, meter, motor, motorist, motorway, path, pavement, signal, reverse and seat belt.' They are all directly related to the unit theme: driving. There are other words which are used in the materials in passing. But it is hard to understand how 'communist', 'capitalist', 'marxist' and 'socialist' fit in. They are introduced in the Review section for the first time. Were they at the Birmingham frequency list together with other lexical objectives in the unit and had to be introduced exactly at that point?

It is difficult to judge how closely the authors kept to the frequency list and on what basis they deviated from it and included less frequent words in the syllabus. It would not be realistic, of course, to expect to find authentic materials with the very words in a frequency list. It may be, therefore, understandable that the materials should include new words which are not objectives. However, the syllabus need not include the less frequent vocabulary even if they are in the materials. When they do there must be some criteria for choice. The authors do not inform us about their criteria if there are any.

Carriers

Generally speaking, syllabi are lists of items and (except topical and *task-based syllabi*) they need 'carriers' that will make them usable in a teaching situation (Long & Crookes, 1992:30). Willis & Willis (1988) have chosen 'topics' and 'tasks' as the carriers of lexical objectives. Seemingly, lexical objectives are *presented* through topics and *taught* through tasks.

The units are organised around topics. Each unit has one basic theme, but this is not too strictly adhered to. The theme expands and diverges to related topics. A variety of topics are covered such as music, personalities, driving, travelling, environment, family relationships, etc, which are both general enough to be relevant to the majority and specific enough to be interesting. The materials, all authentic, are rich both in number and variety: there are newspaper articles, stories, poems, songs, concert programmes, advertisements, etc. The new vocabulary is presented through these written texts. There are also oral native speaker data in the cassettes, but these are not authentic in the strictest sense. They include native speakers discussing a topic or doing a task, which were recorded by the authors specifically for the purpose of this course book. Although the speakers were not told what to say about a topic so that it should be as natural as possible, the conversations do not have the same kind of openings and closings as would be in a real conversation: most of them start by the nomination of the topic and they hardly have a closing section. In most of the recordings, the native speakers are engaged in doing the same tasks as the learners, and learners often listen to these cassettes after they did the tasks themselves first. The native speaker data, in that sense, is more like 'feedback' than basic teaching materials.

The other two skills are also practised in the course book. Learners practise their speaking skills while performing the tasks and the writing practice is simply a written version of the spoken tasks.

Tasks are claimed to play a very important role in the teaching methodology applied in COBUILD Course. However, a distinction needs to be made between what has come to be called 'task-based syllabi' and 'task-based language teaching' (Long, 1985, 1990; Long & Crookes, 1992). There are three types of task-based syllabi: process syllabi proposed by Candlin and Breen; procedural syllabi by Prabhu and task-based syllabi by Long (in Long & Crookes, 1992). Whatever the difference may be between their theoretical assumptions, all three of them advocate 'tasks' as the basic organisational unit of 'language syllabi'. In other words, these syllabi are lists of target tasks. A task is differently defined by each: for Prabhu (in White, 1988) tasks are cognitive and learners are engaged in them mostly individually. For Long (1985:89) a task is: "the hundred and one things people do in everyday life" and for a task-based syllabus to be meaningful to learners it

should be based upon a needs analysis of tasks learners do everyday. Finally, Breen sees tasks as any activity carried out in the classroom, and this may even be a 'language test' (1987:23). Whatever its nature is, the content of a language teaching programme advocating a task-based syllabus is made up of a list of tasks. The classroom procedures or activities to teach this content, again, are tasks. What this implies is that the distinction between the syllabus and methodology has become very small in task-based syllabi (Nunan, 1991: 283).

A task-based approach to language teaching, on the other hand, uses 'tasks' as classroom activities to teach content determined on some other basis, e.g. structural, functional, or lexical grounds. Task-based language teaching, in other words, is task-based in methodology, but not in syllabus design (Long, 1990:37). COBUILD Course applies a lexical syllabus design but a task-based approach to methodology. Tasks are means of teaching words which form the content of the syllabus.

The kind of spoken tasks in COBUILD Course include "narrative, explanation, sharing feelings and opinions and talking about texts they [the learners] have read as well as discussing features of language" (Willis & Willis, 1988:iv). These tasks are often 'discussions' (not a great variety of tasks, there) where learners talk about an aspect of the general theme of the unit. In most of them learners are asked to relate the topic to their personal experience. This is a good-intentioned attempt at making the tasks more relevant to the learners. However, the learners may be reluctant to talk when things get too personal: like fears or dreams.

Some of the tasks used to introduce units include pictures: the learners are asked to talk in pairs or groups on the basis of a picture / pictures related to the general theme. The utility of these tasks in achieving the lexical objectives, however, is doubtful. Either in the discussions or in the picture-based talk, the learners may simply avoid the lexical objectives. Given the fact that the authors do not attempt to make the learners aware of the lexical objectives, the learners may end up practising very few of the lexical objectives. They may refer to the 'supporters' of a campaign in one of the pictures simply as 'the people', or the 'van' driver in another as 'the man'. It is quite possible to talk about the pictures without using the target words listed for that activity by the authors. Simply providing learners with a discussion topic and expecting them to use the target vocabulary not all of which closely associated with the topic seems to be very unrealistic. The learners will use whatever words they know to get through and will not just demand the target objectives as a natural outcome of being happened to be talking about that topic. These initial spoken tasks seems to me as more like means of introducing the general topic of the unit, rather than ways to teach vocabulary. However, the authors expect these tasks to teach vocabulary, as

they provide lists of words, on the teachers' page, that will be learnt from these tasks.

Besides these introductory tasks, there are a number of other tasks often following the reading of written texts. These tasks involve mostly comprehension exercises on these texts. They can very well be done individually, but the authors ask the learners to do them in pairs or groups to turn them into spoken tasks. These tasks would be more appropriate for teaching reading comprehension skills, because what is learnt through the tasks will be higher-level reading skills such as guessing at meaning, inferencing from the text, thinking about the topic before reading (pre-reading activities), finding synonymous words / phrases in the passage, becoming aware of discourse organisation patterns such as 'situation-problem-solution-evaluation' etc. These are typical activities used to improve reading comprehension skills.

The learning of the target vocabulary in doing these tasks seems casual except when the words in the passage are reviewed explicitly in 'word study' section. This way of teaching vocabulary inductively through tasks, however, is in accordance with the principles of task-based language teaching. Only what is learnt through the task cannot be guaranteed to be the same with what it is expected to be.

Writing tasks, on the other hand, are often written versions of the spoken tasks. Therefore, the same problems as in the spoken tasks are present in the written tasks, too.

The authors provide exercises for dictionary use in the 'Dictionary Skills' section of each unit, such as how to find meanings in a dictionary about stylistic features of words, the phonetic symbols used to represent pronunciation of words in the dictionaries, the collocations of words, figures of speech, prefixes, skimming through the entries to find the one that is relevant, etc. These exercises are very useful in that the learners may draw upon these skills in the future after the course is completed and expand their individual vocabularies by themselves. This is a good attempt to help them become more independent learners.

Conclusion

On the whole, the Collins COBUILD English Course seems to treat language as a composition of a number of skills. While establishing 'word' as the basic and most meaningful organising element in a syllabus, the authors do not ignore other aspects of language, and focus also on structural, functional, pragmatic and discursal aspects of language. They prefer to teach vocabulary inductively using spoken and written classroom tasks while

teaching other aspects of language explicitly such as structures or discourse patterns. As a result, the lexical objectives remain in disguise and the book gives the impression of being topic or even reading-skills-based, rather than lexically based.

The difficulties involved in designing a lexical syllabus suggests that language programmes cannot be based on purely lexical content. There is nothing wrong with the common practice where vocabulary is incorporated into the course content with the main organising unit in structural, functional, etc. syllabi. What is necessary, though, is the enhancement of the role of vocabulary in syllabus design and of the criteria for selection and grading.

REFERENCES

1. Breen, M.P. (1987) "Learner Contributions to Task Design". In Candlin, C.N. and Murphy, D. (eds.) **Language Learning Tasks**. London: Prentice-Hall International. pp. 23-46.
2. Lewis, M. (1993) **The Lexical Approach: The State of ELT and a Way Forward**. Hove: Language Teaching.
3. Long, M.H. (1985) "A Role for Instruction in Second Language Acquisition: Task-based Language Teaching". In Hyltenstam, K. & Pienemann, M. (eds.) **Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition**. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp. 77-79.
4. Long, M.H. (1990) "Task, Group, and Task-Group Interaction" In Anivon, S. (ed.) **Language Teaching Methodology for the Nineties**. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre. pp. 31-50.
5. Long, M.H. & Crookes, G. (1992) "Three Approaches to Task-based Syllabus Design". **TESOL Quarterly**. 26/1:27-56.
6. Mackey, W.F. (1965) **Language Teaching Analysis**. London: Longman.
7. Nattinger, J.R. & DeCarrico, S. (1992) **Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Nunan, D. (1991) "Communicative Tasks and the Language Curriculum". **TESOL Quarterly**. 25/2:279-95.
9. Sinclair, J. (1991) **Corpus, Concordance, Collocation**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Sinclair, J.McH. and Renouf, A. (1988) "A Lexical Syllabus for Language Learning". In Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. (eds.) **Vocabulary and Language Teaching**. London: Longman.
11. Willis, J. & Willis, D. (1988) **Collins COBUILD English Course**. Collins Sons and Co. Ltd.
12. White, R.V. (1988) **The ELT Curriculum**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Appendix

First 200 word forms in the Birmingham Corpus, ranked in order of frequency of occurrence:

1. the	51. out	101. most	151. another
2. of	52. them	102. where	152. came
3. and	53. do	103. after	153. course
4. to	54. my	104. your	154. between
5. a	55. more	105. say	155. might
6. in	56. who	106. man	156. thought
7. that	57. me	107. er	157. want
8. I	58. like	108. little	158. says
9. it	59. very	109. too	159. went
10. was	60. can	110. many	160. put
11. is	61. has	111. good	161. last
12. he	62. him	112. going	162. great
13. for	63. some	113. through	163. always
14. you	64. into	114. years	164. away
15. on	65. then	115. before	165. look
16. with	66. now	116. own	166. mean
17. as	67. think	117. us	167. men
18. be	68. well	118. may	168. each
19. had	69. know	119. those	169. three
20. but	70. time	120. right	170. why
21. they	71. could	121. come	171. didn't
22. at	72. people	122. work	172. though
23. his	73. its	123. made	173. fact
24. have	74. other	124. never	174. Mr
25. not	75. only	125. things	175. once
26. this	76. it's	126. such	176. find
27. are	77. will	127. make	177. house
28. or	78. than	128. still	178. rather
29. by	79. yes	129. something	179. few
30. we	80. just	130. being	180. both
31. she	81. because	131. also	181. kind
32. from	82. two	132. that's	182. while
33. one	83. over	133. should	183. year
34. all	84. don't	134. really	184. every
35. there	85. get	135. here	185. under
36. her	86. see	136. long	186. place
37. were	87. any	137. I'm	187. home
38. which	88. much	138. old	188. does
39. an	89. these	139. world	189. sort
40. so	90. way	140. thing	190. perhaps
41. what	91. how	141. must	191. against
42. their	92. down	142. day	192. far
43. if	93. even	143. children	193. left
44. would	94. first	144. oh	194. around
45. about	95. did	145. off	195. nothing
46. no	96. back	146. quite	196. without
47. said	97. got	147. same	197. end
48. up	98. our	148. take	198. part
49. when	99. new	149. again	199. looked
50. been	100. go	150. life	200. used