

A WARM WELCOME TO  
ALL THE FACULTIES OF THE RESPECTIVE  
DEPARTMENTS OF CIHAN UNIVERSITY.

Dr. Nisar C. Shaikh  
Lecturer,  
Dept. of English,  
College of Arts & Letters,  
Cihan University-Erbil.



A Seminar on...

**‘A RATIONALE FOR SKILLS-ORIENTED  
PROCEDURAL SYLLABUS’**

# Abstract:

There has been a continuous debate among the second language acquisition (SLA) researchers, pedagogues and teachers about the effectiveness of approaches to teaching English to the students of other languages. Now-a-days, this situation of English Language Teaching (ELT) is widely known as, English as a Second Language and English as a Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) context. The illustrious approaches to teaching English in these contexts are: The Structural Approach and Communicative Approach. The first focuses on teaching of grammar (system of language), and the other, teaching of meaning (language in use). After the setback to structural approach in the last 4 decades, communicative approach has got enormous popularity in the world of ELT. When this approach has been getting adopted for last 40 years till today, and worldwide syllabus designers, material writers and teachers have been using at a large, Prabhu, an applied linguist from India, investigated a new approach to English language teaching called, 'Communicational Approach.' He posited the difference between these two approaches as; the Communicative Approach emphasizes 'teaching English for communication,' whereas Communicational Approach on 'teaching English through communication.' Based on his approach, Prabhu developed 'Procedural Syllabus,' which consists of language tasks he used for teaching in many schools in South India. It was the pioneering work of Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) in the world, and the second successful project after James Billow's Madras English Language Teaching (MELT) project in South India. The present study is an attempt to gear the same approach with an extension of the skills element (hence, Skills-oriented Procedural Syllabus) and concentrates on activities which involve the four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing, focusing, that is, not on knowledge of the language, but on the use of that language in the classroom, the use that each student has to make of English, individually, every day.

# Main focus of the work

- Develop a Skills-oriented Procedural Syllabus based on Prabhu's (1987) model, for slightly older children functioning in the normal school situation in Maharashtra.
- To discover whether the approach would lead to the learners' proficiency in English language.
- To design such a syllabus that in addition to Prabhu's Procedural Syllabus and task-based syllabuses across the world fits into the Indian academic context.

# Introduction:

This seminar consists of a presentation on the research project, which was undertaken for my PhD degree. It is about to find out how effective is the teaching of skills-oriented procedural syllabus compared to the activity-based syllabus adopting constructivists approach to enhance language abilities of EFL/ESL learners. In addition to that, the attempt in this research project is made to find ways of making language learning a natural activity, much like that of a first language learner acquiring its mother-tongue. This study took place in Indian context, but the approach to the teaching of English or some part/s of the syllabus may be applicable in many countries, where English is being taught as a second/foreign language.

# Research hypothesis

- 1) Students undergoing a course based on teaching English through a Skills-oriented Procedural Syllabus, that is, through the process of developing rhetorical and cognitive skills with no focus on grammar, will perform significantly better than similar students, following the syllabus currently in practice in schools.
- 2) The Experimental Group will perform significantly better than the Comparison Group on linguistic skills, which include not only correctness in the use of single-clause and multi-clause sentences, but also intelligibility in the use of language, in spite of the lack of focus on grammar in the course.
- 3) The Experimental Group will perform significantly better in understanding and using the rhetorical skills of cohesion and coherence in continuous speech and writing.
- 4) The Experimental Group will perform significantly better on tasks involving the higher abilities of language than the Comparison Group. This dimension comprises the understanding and expression of cognitive operations in language, such as interpretation, inference, evaluation, summarization, and the generation of ideas.

# Research Methodology:

## A) Subjects; Selection by Random Sampling Method.

<b>Groups</b>	<b>Experimental Group</b>	<b>Control Group</b>
Grade	9	9
Subjects	20	20
Treatment	Teaching of Skills-oriented Procedural Syllabus	Regular Activity-based Language Syllabus
Duration	3 Months	3 Months
Medium of instruction	Marathi (Local language)	(Marathi Local language)

# B) Parameters of the Skills in the Experimental Treatment

Language skills	Component skills	
Listening	Cognitive skills	Rhetorical skills
	Lower order Higher order	Cohesion
Reading		Coherence
Speaking	Linguistic skills	Rhetorical skills
	Correctness	Cohesion
Writing	Intelligibility	Coherence



## C) Course materials and tasks used for teaching to Experimental Group

<b>Core tasks</b>	<b>Other related tasks</b>	
Speed reading	Variation in chunk reading	Planned output task
Non-stop writing	Listening to comprehend	Reading to decipher meaning
Reading in chunks	Listening in order to identify pictures	Listening and note making
	Close test	Negotiation task

# D) Nature of Pre-Test and Post-Test

The Test Features	Part I Listening	Part-II Speaking	Part-III Reading	Part-IV Writing
<b>Time Allotted</b>	20 Minutes	8 Minutes	30 Minutes	10 Minutes
<b>Type of Tasks</b>	Listening to the conversational text and answer the questions based on it	One Extended Speech Task	Reading the given passage and answer the questions based on it	One Controlled Writing Task
<b>Skills required to perform on the tasks</b>	Finding literal/factual meaning (2-3 Qs.), interpreting (Qs 2- 3.Qs.) giving reasons and stating personal opinions (2-3 Qs.), handling textual and contextual links to infer meanings from the text (1-2 Qs.), summarizing the gist of the spoken text (1Q.) , identifying the clues and interpreting the turns of the speakers (1-2 Qs)	Using phonological and grammatical skills to produce utterances, which should be correct and intelligible in the context of communication, outlining speech, explaining points, narrating an event, describing a person or place, and giving reasons, organizing ideas logically and linking utterances	Deducing meaning from the context of the text (2-3 Qs.), predicting and anticipating meaning (2-3 Qs.), stating personal and author's point of view (2-3 Qs.), giving reasons (1-2 Qs.), understanding the gist of the passage (1-2 Qs.)	Using multiple clause sentences correctly and intelligibly, applying the mechanics of writing like capitalization, punctuation and dividing a text into paragraphs, Using cohesive devices to relate the sentences and parts in the text, writing descriptions and narrations, writing consistent and coherent paragraphs.
<b>Full Marks to the</b>				

# Overview of Data & Results

- The listening & reading skills comprise Cognitive and Rhetorical aspects
- The Speaking & Writing comprises Linguistic & Rhetorical aspects
- The linguistic aspect is attended only when the teacher gives a feedback on the learners' grammatical mistakes in speaking & writing

Skills	Groups	Gains of Experimental Group from Pre-Test to Post-Test in mean score		Standard deviation (Sd.)		<i>t</i> -Value	Level of Significance
		Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test		
Listening	Experimental	12.20	15.20	3.86	3.25	2.9689	0.05
	Comparison	7.70	7.80	4.21	2.97	0.1178	0.39
Speaking	Experimental	8.65	11.15	4.07	3.28	2.4902	0.01
	Comparison	3.15	4.65	3.70	2.25	1.4169	0.08
Reading	Experimental	9.60	12.35	3.76	4.93	3.3391	0.001
	Comparison	8.10	8.10	3.74	2.63	0,00	0.40
Writing	Experimental	7.60	12.75	4.68	2.90	4.7192	0.0001
	Comparison	3.90	5.40	3.43	3.30	1.6006	0.05 (n.s.)

# Conclusion

## Page 1

- Students of the experimental group made considerable progress in their proficiency in English.
- Experimental treatment, led them to be unself-conscious in their use of English, and not hampered with the fear of producing incorrect linguistic forms.
- Through this approach, without focus on grammar, they learnt to use English fairly grammatically, during the short period of the experiment.
- Of the four language skills, writing skills developed to a far larger extent, than any of the other skills, while listening skills developed the least, even though there was a significant difference between Pre-test and Post-/test results in Listening.

Continue to next page ...

...Continue from last page

- In reading skills also they made a remarkable progress as they learnt to correctly evaluate such matters as the author's opinion, infer meaning from the context, analyze and interpret the text, and most importantly, they could understand the discourse structure of the text.
- In speaking, also, their performance developed remarkably during the course of the experiment. However, they needed to have many more exercises of the type of Negotiation Tasks and Planned Output Tasks in order to make proper progress. The time available in the course was, unfortunately, not sufficient for this.

The background features a stylized landscape with rolling hills. The top portion consists of several layers of light blue and white wavy bands, suggesting a sky or distant mountains. The bottom portion consists of rolling green hills in various shades of green, from light to dark, creating a sense of depth and texture.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH