



Improving the teaching and learning with the help of curriculum

Hossein Bagheri Hossein Abadi and Mahdi Rezaei

Department of English Language, Faculty of Literature, University of Allameh Tabtabaei, Tehran, Iran

Email: mahdirezaei093940@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Goals, disposition, duration, needs analysis, learners and teachers, exercises and activities, resources, learning styles, skills to be acquired, lexis, language structure, and ability measurement are all components of any curriculum. These elements should be defined and documented in depth before establishing a program or course of study. In fact, these factors aid in the clarification of various aspects of the curriculum and, as a result, increase its productivity. In practice, proper consideration of each component of these components can have a huge impact on the program's richness. As a result, curriculum or course planners must examine each component individually and assess their position in the program. In general, these factors should be thoroughly examined before, during, and after the program. As a result, the purpose of this essay is to throw some light on the many components of a teaching-learning course.

Original Article

PII: S232247702100001-11

Rec. 28 January, 2021

Acc. 10 March, 2021

Pub. 25 March, 2021

Keywords

Curriculum,
Components

INTRODUCTION

The language teacher uses any method. The most important thing to remember is that the teacher must identify and describe all curriculum components ahead of time. As a result, before beginning a course, all of the aspects should be apparent and apparent to the teacher. The sections that follow describe and expand on the various components of a curriculum.

Goals

Objectives are, in general, one of the most important parts of any course or program. The teaching objectives of any curriculum are usually determined at the start of the course. The language elements or skills that the students may learn during the program should be explicitly stated in these objectives (Brown, 1995). In reality, aims or goals are the desired outcomes for which we strive. That is, goals are things we want to do at the end of the course (Van Blerkom, 2011). In this regard, Richards (2007) contends that the aims of a program are those that try to change the learners in some way. As a result, objectives define a program's goals and provide instructions for students and teachers. The EGP

courses' main objectives are to enable students to communicate effectively in English (Hedge, 2002) and to prepare them for their ESP courses (Stoller, 2001). Overall, defining objectives has the following advantages:

- They save a lot of time and energy for teachers.
- They aid in the selection of course materials.
- They enhance the appropriateness and efficacy of teaching-learning processes.
- They focus kids' attention, encourage perseverance, and motivate them.
- They encourage kids to participate and build their own learning strategies and skills.
- They assist in the development of criteria for evaluating materials and approaches, as well as the tracking of students' progress.

Objectives and goals, on the other hand, are not as simple as they appear. It is due to the fact that there are numerous parties involved in a course of study, including students, teachers, institutions, ministries of education, and so forth. As a result, each stakeholder has his or her own goals for the program. Students' expectations of the course, for example, may differ from the curriculum as a whole. As a result, the goals of students and teachers may be similar or

dissimilar. Breen (2001) explains it this way: The classroom is a melting pot of distinct subjective perspectives on language, multiple learning goals, and various preferences (p. 129). The idea is that some pupils have distinct objectives, while others have hazy objectives (Harmer, 2002). Longman and Atkinson (2002) Instructors, according to this argument, should assist students in developing realistic and achievable goals, making decisions based on those goals, and achieving those goals at the end of the course. Unfortunately, teachers are not often given enough information about their students' and courses' objectives (Tarone and Yule, 1989). The instructor's job is to define his or her own objectives and then negotiate them with the pupils (Snow & Brinton, 1997). As a result, teachers can plan classroom activities to meet the needs of various students and the overall course objectives (Candlin and Mercer, 2001). As a result, syllabus creators should gather extensive information about the course and develop appropriate objectives. The teaching of language skills (hearing, speaking, reading, and writing) or their subcomponents may be central to a course's objectives (pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar). Some courses may place a strong emphasis on communication and oral abilities, with communicative competence taking precedence. Others, on the other hand, may place a greater premium on writing and reading abilities (Richards and Rodgers, 2014). What should be emphasized and taught, however, is determined by the course's aims and goals.

Preparation

Students' views, without a doubt, influence whether or not they desire to learn a foreign or second language. Positive opinions regarding the language and its speakers boost pupils' motivation and speed of learning (Lightbown and Spada, 2003). Indeed, one of the manifestations of favorable attitudes toward the language is motivation for learning a second language. Students will work harder to acquire the second language if they have a favorable attitude toward the teacher, resources, and methods. They will, however, struggle to succeed if they are antagonistic to the language, resources, and professors (Harmer, 2002). As a result, negative

attitudes will heighten the affective filter of kids, obstructing language learning.

Negative attitudes toward the second language can also be influenced by external pressure. Candlin and Breen (1998) argues that students' attitudes toward language can be influenced by their perceptions of the classroom, prior learning experiences, and comprehension of the classroom culture. Lin (2001) makes an argument in this regard. Because pupils have an ambiguous, want-hate connection with English, teachers have little insight into their students' attitudes (pp. 271-2). Teachers, it goes without saying, may play a critical role in instilling and sustaining positive attitudes among their students.

As a result, educators must:

- urge kids to have a good mindset,
- provide pupils with effective skills and tactics
- Attempt to understand their students and their attitudes
- Attempt to reduce students' worry and increase their self-confidence
- Create a welcoming and supportive environment for a variety of student types,
- acquaint the students with the desired culture
- Involve pupils and hold them accountable for their own learning

Meanwhile, teachers should strive to create a peaceful and cooperative classroom climate because "asymmetrical interactions frequently involve disagreements in beliefs, attitudes, and values held" (Breen, 2001, p. 131). Students' "internal motivators" must also be strengthened and enhanced by teachers (Longman and Atkinson, 2002, p. 43) in order to encourage students to adopt a good attitude about the second language.

Duration

The quantity of time spent on teaching-learning activities in the classroom is one of the critical aspects that has a significant impact on the learners' learning rate. Language acquisition is certainly influenced by the number of hours of instruction per week and month (Rahimian, 2005). According to Peacock (2001), students' time in the EAP classroom is limited and limited. As a result of the time constraint, the quality and efficiency of classroom teaching-learning activities may be harmed. As a result, Brinton and Holten (2001) claim that a few weeks of instruction

will have little effect on the learners' linguistic ability. Language is also far too complicated and varied to be learnt in a short amount of time. As a result, EGP teachers are unable to cover the essential language skills, grammar, and vocabulary in a limited amount of time (Jordan, 2007). According to Hedge (2002), teachers have very little time to dedicate to revising and receiving feedback from students. Students must work extra hard to make up for the lack of instructional time. They try to make the most of their time. Van Blerkom (2003) advises "using solid time-management skills" in this regard. (Page 51) Longman and Atkinson (2002) also suggest that if students are to attain their objectives, they must successfully manage their time. In order to become self-sufficient, students must study and build effective methods and tools. Peacock (2001) highlights the necessity of independent study outside of the classroom at this point. Teachers, in general, require time to prepare and organize logical courses (Nunan, 1986). In order to have enough time for each activity and exercise, teachers must also carefully organize and allocate class time (Hedge, 2002). Overall, due to the limited time available, teachers should focus on teaching those components of the language that are most important to the students and are based on the course objectives.

Need analysis

We should do a needs analysis before designing a course and developing materials and procedures depending on the goals of the students and the institution. "A good educational program should be founded on an examination of learner needs," according to Richards (2007) (p. 51).

The first step is to do a needs analysis, which is often done before, during, and after the course to decide the course's outline, materials, and resources. Any course should be designed to meet the needs of the students, and we should be "sensitive to our learners' needs" (Schmitt, and Schmitt, 2020, p. 136). Needs analysis, according to Peacock and Flowerdew (2001), aims to "fine tune the curriculum to the individual needs of the learner." (See p. 178). In general, needs analysis aims to:

- figure out what the students should do in the target situation (target situation analysis)

- Examine the location and its resources, equipment, materials, and facilities (means analysis)
- Determine the students' linguistic proficiency at the start of the program (present situation analysis)
- determine the aims and goals of the pupils
- Determine what pupils must accomplish in order to learn (learning needs)

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) divided learners' needs into necessities, lacks, and wants in order to better understand them. The necessity of the intended environment is referred to as necessities. To put it another way, the language elements that learners will need in the target setting. The target situation analysis is brought to the fore in this way. One of the parts of what the learners must learn is determining the requirements of the target circumstance. The other, more crucial challenge is to understand what the students already know. We can determine which of the necessities the learners lack by determining what they have at their disposal. As a result, we may select and teach the relevant resources to the learners by understanding the gap between the necessities and the lacks. The objective points determined by the needs analysis are the necessities and deficiencies. The learners, on the other hand, have their own desires and wishes. As a result, any curriculum or syllabus designer should think about what students want. However, the desires of the students may collide with those of the teachers or other parties. The diagram below depicts the many parts of a university-level needs analysis. Varied stakeholders have different perspectives on the needs, as seen in the diagram above. Surprisingly, needs analysis is not a one-time effort, but rather a continuous activity that occurs throughout the teaching-learning process. The participation of students in the needs analysis processes is a critical concern at this point. Teachers and course designers must involve students in the needs analysis in order to motivate them to participate in the learning process. When learners' wants and wishes are ignored, as Peacock (2001) argues, "the result can be disgruntled and disillusioned students" (p. 283). Finally, teachers should acquire sufficient information about their students and the course in order to turn "needs analysis outcomes into course content and procedures" (Lynch, 2012, p. 394).

Learners and teachers

Students are, without a doubt, the most important stakeholders in a course of study. Skehan (1998), on the other hand, claims that they have been sidelined and that little attention has been paid to them in the design and development of materials and procedures. In general, each classroom contains a diverse group of pupils with "a wide range of personal features and cultural origins" (Candlin and Mercer, 2001, p. 243). Without a doubt, there are significant variances among language learners in a classroom, making the process of language learning and teaching quite difficult. "There are major disparities among L2 situations and populations," according to Ferris (2001) (p. 299). As a result of the differences between the learners, they each learn in their own unique way and respond to "the same stimulus" in various ways (Harmer, 2002, p. 45). It is also possible to assert that the students have diverse interests and needs, which influence their behavior. As a result, there are "differences in learning outcomes" (Mitchell and Myles, 2001, p. 23). As a result, some students excel in speaking while others excel at writing. Unavoidably, some kids' language learning styles are erratic and uneven (Gatehouse, 2001). Additionally, the teaching methods and cultural norms may have an impact on the students' learning strategies. Extrovert students, as seen in the diagram, are social and impulsive, resulting in fluency in conversational skills. Introverts, on the other hand, are organically motivated to learn a language without interacting with others (Johnson, 2001). Meanwhile, some kids are better at acquiring languages than others. As a result, kids are able to learn more readily and fast (Richards and Schmidt, 2002). Clapham (2001) states that "there is an imbalance between the science and social science students" at this point. (See p. 88). That is, she contends that scientific and engineering students are more capable than those in social science and humanities. However, it's impossible to back up this claim. Good language learners, regardless of discipline, are generally:

- Have a specific language learning target and goal in mind
- possess a high level of self-assurance and self-awareness
- Make an effort to learn and use language both in and out of the classroom

- Try to identify their flaws and minimize them as much as possible
- Attempt to forge their own paths and become self-sufficient
- be tolerant of ambiguity and uncertainty
- are willing to take a chance and utilize language in a variety of settings
- manage and arrange their time effectively and efficiently
- continually monitor and evaluate their progress
- make use of their language and global skills to aid comprehension
- simultaneously receive and generate language
- have a favorable attitude about the language they are studying
- Make an effort to understand their requirements and make use of all resources accessible to them
- Demonstrate tenacity

In general, the success of the students is tightly linked to the teacher's functions and talents (Richards and Rodgers, 2014). The instructor is the one who can orient and steer the students toward reaching their goals. However, in EGP classes, teachers face insurmountable challenges such as huge classrooms, low motivation, mixed skills, a lack of resources, time constraints, and the usage of L1 (Hedge, 2002). Nonetheless, these issues should not dissuade instructors from performing their duties. In general, language teachers must design, adopt, and adapt materials, conduct needs analyses, evaluate their course and students, and so on, in addition to their regular teaching duties.

Good language teachers, like good pupils, share the following characteristics:

- improve communicative practice and application
- provide each student feedback
- Tailor methods and materials to the level, objectives, requirements, and interests of the students
- Make an effort to understand their pupils' needs and desires
- Determine the students' linguistic proficiency and identify their areas of weakness
- offer input and develop it

Exercises and activities

Effective classroom games and exercises can help students learn and enjoy themselves. Students do

not learn a language by absorbing imparted knowledge; rather, they must practice and produce it in relevant circumstances to acquire it. Nunan (1998) claims that pupils are only educated about the forms of language, not their functions, and hence are unable to apply them in meaningful conversation. The crucial point is this: since each learner, instructor, and institution is unique, and that "instructional languages and curricula differ by country" (Candlin and Mercer, 2001, p. 243). As a result, the teacher's primary responsibility is to create exercises that interest various sorts of pupils while taking into account their goals, language skills, and needs as well as desires (Richards, 2007). Teachers must present a range of exercises and activities in order to keep their students engaged. Additionally, rather than simply responding the questions in a mechanical and abstract manner, teachers should create circumstances in which students can execute the exercises in relevant contexts. Teaching activities that focus on grammatical issues differ significantly from those that focus on communicative activities, as Richards and Rodgers (2014) point out. Generally, grammatical accuracy and verbal fluency should be balanced. Johnson (2001) correctly notes that new language forms should be provided in a clear and memorable manner in order to stay in the minds of pupils. Johnson also underlines the need of teachers creating settings in which pupils' attention is raised and they are aware of linguistic forms. To this purpose, Harmer (2002) suggests that "demonstration, explanation, discovery, correct reproduction, instantaneous inventiveness, and check questions" be utilized to introduce new language points and activities. (Pages 154-6). Skehan (1998), on the other hand, believes that the three Ps (presentation, practice, and production) are the ideal ways to carry out classroom activities. That is, the students are shown the new objects. Drills are then utilized to practice the new concepts in a safe manner. Finally, free learners develop language through communicative activities in the production stage. Candlin and Mercer (2001) maintains, however, that the traditional method of IRF (Initiation, Response, and Feedback) is a suitable method of student-teacher interaction. Assigning and conducting tasks remains the most popular and popular method of carrying out

classroom activities (Candlin and Breen, 1998). Teachers can adapt their strategies to fit different levels of skill and preferences by using task-based language learning-teaching activities. Tasks allow students to practice language abilities while also allowing them to employ language aspects (vocabulary and grammar) at the same time. Furthermore, teachers might assign project work to their pupils in order to help them become independent language learners (Hedge, 2002). Project works, in essence, are collaborative and group-centered, incorporate language skills, are learning-centered rather than teacher-centered, foster student accountability, and may be completed both inside and outside the classroom. The communicative language teaching trend is without a doubt one of the most successful techniques of learning language and immersing all learners in meaningful activities. Overall, communicative language instruction promotes message-focused activities, increases learners' independence, improves fluency, encourages meaningful activities (e.g. tasks and projects), and builds linguistic, pragmatic, discursal, and strategic competence. "Role play and simulation, communication games (e.g. board and card games), discussion and debates," Johnson (2001) recommends as examples of communicative language training. (pp. 262-3). At this point, grouping pupils is one of the most effective aspects of classroom teaching (Richards, 2001). To satisfy varying student levels and tastes, teachers must divide classroom activities into distinct groupings (individual, pair, group, and entire class activity). Clearly, there is no one-size-fits-all approach that can be employed in the classroom. In fact, according to Long (2001), the employment of methodologies may hinder rather than aid teachers in the implementation of classroom activities. Brown (2000) advocates for a "eclectic blend of tasks" (p. 179) that may fit various learners in different situations.

Resources

Good resources can not only be taught simply, but can also make the learning process easier. Clapham (2001) contends, however, that locating usable materials is difficult and that their suitability "cannot be predicted in advance." (p. 99). Cunningsworth (1995) advises selecting the best and

most relevant materials available in this regard. In essence, many teachers lack the time or are not given the time to create their own materials depending on their students' requirements and course objectives (Gatehouse, 2001). As Richards (2007) concedes, "A book may be wonderful in one situation" (p. 256), but it may be very useless in another. In general, good and useful materials have a few distinguishing characteristics. As a result, when selecting course materials, language teachers should consider the following characteristics. Overall, excellent materials:

- include a variety of texts, styles, and genres appropriate for pupils of various levels
- They are chosen depending on the course objectives and the needs of the students
- use a mix of plain, straightforward, and realistic materials
- provide a healthy mix of exercises, activities, study skills, and language skills
- plan communicative activities that replicate language use in real-life settings
- incorporate relevant and intriguing subjects and texts
- serve as the primary source of language input and contact
- enable pupils to communicate effectively both orally and in writing
- make use of images to create meaningful contexts
- They are created and produced depending on the social and cultural values and conventions of the students

We need to engage pupils with relevant and fascinating materials as language teachers. As a result, coursebooks are one of the most effective and convenient tools for bridging the gap between students and lecturers. Teachers, on the other hand, should not be overly reliant on them. Cunningsworth (1995) warns that a "heavy reliance on coursebooks" (p. 10) is "far from ideal" since it limits teachers' creativity and flexibility. Harmer (2002) recommends using both coursebooks and "a mix of homemade materials" to achieve this goal. (p. 305). Regardless, good textbooks include:

- provide a consistent curriculum and average language control
- Allow teachers and students to plan ahead of time

- encourage students' perceptions of development and give revision materials
- give possibilities for self-assessment and independent research
- act as a resource for the presentation and practice of new language things
- act as a grammar and vocabulary resource
- offer a well-organized list of items to teach
- give feedback, language models, learning opportunities, and language practice

Teachers can generally improve resources by customizing them to meet the demands of certain scenarios and pupils (Cunningsworth, 1995). Modifying, reordering, and enlarging exercises, activities, and content are examples of material adaptation (Richards, 2007). Meanwhile, teachers must assess the materials' suitability in light of their specific needs. To this aim, they can create a checklist to evaluate the materials based on the course objectives, needs, and social and cultural values. Also, when evaluating resources, teachers should aim to include their students' perspectives and thoughts (Harmer, 2002). The teachers must sequence the content of the resources after analyzing their applicability and appropriateness. Generally, sequencing is accomplished by arranging materials from simple to complicated and according to demands and objectives (Hedge, 2002). Finally, materials should be changed in light of how they are being used in the classroom.

Ways of learning

Certainly, study skills can provide students with some important and useful approaches for university. Because learners required more than linguistic competency and language descriptions to attain their objectives, the study skills method came to the fore (Hyland, 2006). At university, some students "feel worry and dissatisfaction," but learning efficient study habits can help them build confidence in their academics (Van Blerkom, 2003, p. 25). As Jordan (2007) points out, many students are not given any study skills instruction or training. Flowerdew and Peacock (2001) argue that strengthening learners' study abilities is more important than teaching them language abilities in this regard. Lynch (1996) discovered that students needed study skills classes before beginning their ESP classes after reviewing the

ESP courses at the University of Guadalajara in Mexico. [Dudley-Evans et al. \(1998\)](#) feel that learners whose first language is not English must acquire both study skills and academic language at this point. Furthermore, students must develop adequate study abilities in order to deal with subject-specific requirements, new technological modes, and modern employment conditions. Students can improve their grades, organize their time, and feel less stressed by learning the appropriate study techniques ([Payne and Whittaker, 2006](#)). Study skills encompass a broad range of activities. They include reading skills like scanning, skimming, identifying main vocabulary, and guessing word meanings from context, as well as listening comprehension and note-taking, writing skills like summarizing, paraphrasing, and report writing, oral presentation and seminar participation, and using the dictionary and library, using a bibliography, computers, a language lab, and a self-access center are all options. Students, for example, can learn and access the various uses of words and linguistic materials kept on computers, which is known as corpus analysis or linguistics ([Schmitt, and Schmitt, 2020](#)). Furthermore, Students can be taught to utilize several types of dictionaries (general and specialist) according to their levels (elementary or advanced) and demands (bilingual or monolingual). One of the most important benefits of improving pupils' study skills is that they become more independent. As a result, having a self-access center in every academic context is critical. Grammar references, dictionaries, workbooks, reading and listening texts, cassettes, tapes, films, CDs, and the internet can all be found in these locations. Students could be encouraged to visit the self-access facility and use the items during their leisure time.

Skills to be acquired

The four language skills are the most important components of a language. Listening and reading are sometimes referred to as receptive skills, whereas speaking and writing are referred to as productive skills ([Richards & Schmidt, 2002](#)). It is suggested that we identify the kind of language abilities that our pupils require. According to [Harmer \(2002\)](#), the curriculum or course book may have a role in this decision. [Jordan \(2007\)](#), on the other hand, claims that

it is dependent on our kids' requirements and local circumstances. Yet, according to [McDonough \(1984\)](#), it is based on learning objectives.

In general, the early EAP courses prioritized mastering reading skills. In reality, spoken communication was relegated to a secondary function in the classroom ([Brown, 2000](#)). As a result, the focus was on dealing with various sorts of written documents. Students must read and write a variety of texts, as well as participate in oral communication and language use, due to the multimodalities of today's university and industry ([Hyland, 2006](#)). Unfortunately, some courses, materials, professors, and instructional methods segregate the four language skills. Performing and practicing any one skill, on the other hand, necessitates the use of a variety of other abilities to varying degrees. To this end, [Johnson \(2001\)](#) asserts that language skills are remarkably comparable and intertwined. As a result, engagement necessitates the use of various language abilities for both receiving and producing language. Furthermore, written and spoken language are intertwined and mutually reinforcing. [Hutchinson and Waters \(1987\)](#) passionately believe that the same information will be richer and more easily accessible if it is received and generated through reading, hearing, writing, and speaking. [Farhady \(2005\)](#), on the other hand, vehemently opposes a mono-skill approach to reading in EGP courses. As a result, an integrated skills approach is chosen, in which all abilities are practiced at the same time. The main thing to remember is that through materials and other sorts of classroom activities, teachers should aim to achieve a balance of skills. Furthermore, the materials and activities should make it easier for the abilities to be transferred to the actual world ([Cunningsworth, 1995](#)). Therefore, teachers should integrate the four language skills to improve learning, avoid boredom, and provide variety.

Lexis

EFL and ESL students, without a doubt, need to grasp high-frequency vocabulary in order to accomplish some basic tasks and produce and receive language. [Cunningsworth \(1995\)](#) points out that prolonged communication necessitates pupils' having a large vocabulary at their disposal. Some students

believe that the English language's vocabularies are separate entities in and of themselves. English words, on the other hand, are more than solitary items; they take on meaning in a connected network, and their use is realized in a discourse environment, i.e. in a context-rich setting (Schmitt, and Schmitt, 2020). As a result, Nation (2003) suggests that vocabulary development be done in a systematic rather than spontaneous manner. In fact, vocabulary instruction is designed to facilitate language usage across all four language skills. Choosing vocabulary, on the other hand, is a difficult and time-consuming task. In general, the terms that should be taught are determined by the course's objectives and time constraints.

"High-frequency, wide range, teach ability, similarity, availability, coverage, and defining power," proposes Richards (2007) as some criteria for identifying the types of language to teach. (See pp. 7-8 for more information.) Language teachers, on the other hand, according to Coxhead and Nation (2001), can assist students in developing academic vocabulary but it is not their responsibility to teach technical terms. In general, teachers can utilize the strategies and guidelines listed below to teach vocabulary:

- carrying forth physical demonstrations, verbal explanations, and translations
- using visual aids such as photographs or sketches on a blackboard or whiteboard,
- promoting the usage of dictionaries among students
- reusing words in various situations and reintroducing them on a regular basis
- encouraging children to study word families, prefixes, roots, and suffixes, as well as word categories (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions),
- offering a big number of examples for pupils to practice and learn how to use the terms correctly,
- Using typographic characteristics like italics, bold text, and underlining to encourage people to notice text.

The most important method of learning vocabulary is to encounter it "in rich natural contexts." (Cobb & Horst, 2001, p. 320). However, the most prevalent issue that most students face is a lack of exposure to various word uses in various contexts. Our students' lexical knowledge appears to be more

passive than active. That is, individuals have a difficult time recalling and retrieving their vocabulary in order to develop and use language in speech and writing. Furthermore, due of the absence of use of words, pupils forget their vocabulary, resulting in attrition (Schmitt, and Schmitt, 2020). Finally, the most prevalent issue faced by university students is a restricted vocabulary of generic English words (Farnia, 2005). Reading comprehension issues appear to be caused by a lack of broad vocabulary rather than specialist words (Mahbudi, 2005). The following principles should be considered in relation to the students' vocabulary deficiencies and limitations in order to improve their lexical grasp:

- Both overtly (deliberately) and indirectly, vocabulary should be studied and taught
- Students must actively engage with words and work on them
- Phonological awareness aids in word recall
- Students should be accountable for their own vocabulary growth
- Word knowledge develops through time as a result of receptive and productive language use
- The students' L1, motivation, culture, competency level, objective, and number of classroom activities and objectives can all influence vocabulary learning
- The denotative (basic, core, or dictionary meaning) and connotative (additional, affective, emotive, or attitudinal meaning) meanings of the terms must be learned by students
- Vocabulary development is aided by extensive reading and listening

Language structure

Students must improve their grammatical proficiency in order to grasp and write accurate and correct phrases. Although grammatical knowledge is required, it should not be "learned for the sake of learning" (Stranks, 2003, p. 338). Students may struggle with grammar exercises if they are presented with excessively contrived sentences and asked to internalize them out of context. Students are required to learn the grammar principles without connecting them to their functions in real-life circumstances, as most coursebooks include isolated sentence-level tasks (Nunan, 1998). Students can learn the social usage of the language and build their

sociolinguistic and discourse competence in addition to their linguistic competence if teachers contextualize grammatical points (Hedge, 2002). According to Karimkhanlui (2005), university students have previously mastered grammar in school and merely need to apply what they have learned. As a result, students can work on diverse materials both within and outside of the classroom to improve their explicit and implicit grammatical knowledge (Schmitt, and Schmitt, 2020).

The worry about accuracy is why pupils require some basic grammatical understanding. In reality, clear grammar presentation can help to facilitate and speed up learning, as well as give input for pattern recognition, communicative use, and stylistic diversity of language. Brown (2000) highlights that "form focused instruction" (p. 280) can assist students improve their proficiency and develop their communication skills in this regard. However, Long (2001) stresses "emphasis on form rather than concentration on forms." (p. 183). That is, during courses where the emphasis is on use, meaning, and communication, learners' attention is focused to grammatical forms as needed. However, with the concentration on forms, the emphasis is mostly on linguistic forms, with their role in the discourse context being overlooked. The key challenge at this point is determining which grammar topics should be included in a coursebook and how they should be organized (Cunningsworth, 1995). According to Richards (2007), the number of grammatical forms is nearly infinite. The consensus is that the grammar points can be chosen and sequenced in a simple to sophisticated manner. The following guidelines can be used to teach grammar in general:

- Teachers should assign engaging assignments to children and provide free opportunities for them to create linguistic forms

- The planned structures can be assessed and introduced to the pupils in a systematic progression

- Good grammar rules and exercises should be straightforward, clear, relevant, learnable, practical, and accurate

- New grammar principles should be revisited often enough in subsequent courses for pupils to internalize their varied functions and applications

- The strategy of teaching grammar should be dependent on the goals, needs, and levels of skill of the pupils.

- Grammatical proficiency is a steady process that improves with time.

- Students should be given enough of examples so that they may figure out how form and meaning are related for themselves.

Ability assessment

Assessment is a valuable tool for language teachers to understand more about their students and their learning processes. Teachers should keep a close eye on their pupils' progress to ensure that they are making enough academic progress (Candlin and Mercer, 2001). Students, on the other hand, expect to be evaluated and learn about their learning rate as well as receive comments on their progress (Harmer, 2002). As a result, teachers must collect sufficient and appropriate information about their students using a variety of methods. Additionally, teachers must conduct assessments to ensure that they are performing their duties efficiently (Johnson, 2001). Effective assessment, in fact, enhances teaching and encourages the learning process. Rea-Dickins (2007) correctly distinguishes between testing and assessment. Additionally, teachers must conduct assessments to ensure that they are performing their duties efficiently (Johnson, 2001). Effective assessment, in fact, enhances teaching and encourages the learning process. Rea-Dickins (2007) correctly distinguishes between testing and assessment. Assessment, she argues, is more inclusive than testing. Assessment is ongoing and takes place over a long length of time. However, testing is one of the methods used in the evaluation process, and it merely assesses the students' understanding of the course objectives and contents. The mechanical methods of gauging the structure and grammatical knowledge of the student are more important in testing. It tells nothing about the students' functional and practical language use. Assessment, on the other hand, is to collect data on all areas of learning and learners. Only end-of-semester exams are used for testing, and they are conducted using the traditional paper and pencil method (i.e. written form) (Bachman and Palmer, 1996).

Students' work can be assessed in a variety of ways, including reports and comments (from both students and teachers), self-assessment (from students), classroom observation (from instructors), and portfolios (samples of students' written and oral work). Scores or grades, clearly, do not indicate anything about an individual's development. As a result, in addition to examinations and exams, various methods of tracking students' development are required. Assessment might provide a variety of approaches to implement pupils' progress at this point.

Exams and tests, obviously, have some influence upon students, their learning, and classroom activities in some way. Because some courses are exam-oriented, rote learning and rote memorizing of materials can be emphasized (Askari Arani, 2005). That is, instead of attempting to comprehend the meaning and application of the materials, pupils memorize them in preparation for the end-of-semester exam. As a result, negative washback effect refers to the negative influence of assessments on students (Johnson, 2001). As a result, according to Farhady (2005), we should move away from testing and toward assessment procedures in order to foster more student involvement and learning.

There are numerous examinations and assessment processes available, and teachers should try to select the most appropriate ones based on the course objectives and students' language skill levels. There are two types of tests, for example: discrete-point and integrative testing (Johnson, 2001). Discrete-point testing, on the other hand, only tests one item at a time. The language system is viewed as a collection of discrete pieces in this form of testing. The focus is on language structure, and testing is done in a decontextualized, sentence-level environment. Multiple-choice item format is an example of a discrete-point test. Multiple-choice items, on the other hand, have been questioned since they do not test students' typical language use, do not measure their genuine productive knowledge, and are passive in character (Brindley and Ross, 2001). Integrative assessment, on the other hand, makes no attempt to segregate linguistic parts or skills into discrete forms. Cloze, dictation, composition, and conversational/oral assessments, for example,

demand pupils to perform numerous abilities at once and combine linguistic elements.

There are numerous examinations and testing techniques available, and teachers should try to select the most appropriate approach based on the course objectives and students' language skill level. For example, discrete-point and integrative testing are two different types of tests (Johnson, 2001). Discrete-point testing, on the other hand, only tests one item at a time. The language system is viewed as a collection of discrete pieces in this form of testing. The focus is on language structure, and testing is done in a decontextualized, sentence-level environment. Multiple-choice item format is an example of a discrete-point test. Multiple-choice items, on the other hand, have been questioned since they do not test students' typical language use, do not measure their genuine productive knowledge, and are passive in character (Brindley and Ross, 2001). Integrative assessment, on the other hand, makes no attempt to segregate linguistic parts or skills into discrete forms. Cloze, dictation, composition, and conversational/oral assessments, for example, demand pupils to complete numerous abilities at the same time while also incorporating language aspects.

There is also a distinction between formative and summative assessment (Rea-Dickins, 2007). The majority of the time, formative assessment is used for pedagogical purposes. It tries to keep track of the pupils' development, identify areas where they require support, and come up with solutions to assist them. Summative testing, on the other hand, is concerned with determining the students' achievement of the course objectives and materials, with the emphasis on the learning outcome. Overall, it is thought that both methods of assessment should be used at the same time. In addition, from time to time, Teachers can utilize diagnostic exams to diagnose and identify the strengths and shortcomings of their students (Harmer, 2002). They will be able to recommend extra classroom work and boost the learning process in this way. Teachers can also administer achievement assessments at the end of the program to assess students' mastery of course topics (Bachman and Palmer, 2000). More importantly, any educational institution should ensure that students are placed in the appropriate classrooms. To this aim, students should take placement tests at the start of

the program to ensure that they are placed in the proper level classrooms (Mahdavi-Zafarghandi, 2005). Placement exams are a typical sort of proficiency test (i.e. generic test items) that assesses a new student's overall language competency. Students can obviously cause problems for themselves, their classmates, and their professors if they are not placed in appropriate and equal competence level classrooms. Managing and teaching a mixed-ability class, in other words, is extremely difficult for a language teacher.

Teachers often get overly obsessed with linguistic forms and patterns, ignoring the content of what their students write or say as a result. As a result, teachers must take into account both the form and content of what their students write and say (Harmer, 2002). Teachers can employ communicative examinations to achieve this, in which the focus is on the purpose of utterances rather than their structure. As a result, the authenticity of the contents and assignments is crucial. The students are given the opportunity to come up with their own responses. Texts and tasks used to test students' abilities are communicatively contextualized. Students could, for example, listen to a news story and repeat it in their own words, write a paragraph or two about their selected topic, or engage in a dialogue with their peers (Rea-Dickins, 2007). Finally, evaluation processes should be legitimate, dependable, equitable, and feasible. According to Brindley and Ross (2001), teachers should employ a variety of examinations and tasks to assess students' abilities. They also feel that instead of subject-specific questions and texts, teachers should give general assessments and activities in general English classes.

■ CONCLUSION

Without a doubt, the partnership of a language teacher and a course creator is crucial. Certainly, strong cooperation between these two parties can greatly enhance a program. In fact, a curriculum designer creates and organizes a course of study, and the language instructor is responsible for putting it into action. The primary responsibility for a course is placed in the hands of a language teacher, according to this article. If a language instructor wishes to

develop competent students, he or she must evaluate all aspects of the curriculum.

■ DECLARATIONS

Corresponding author

E-mail: hosein32h@gmail.com

Author's contribution

All authors contributed equally to this work.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

■ REFERENCES

- Askari Arani, J. (2005). Issues of learning EMP at university: An analysis of students' perspectives. In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayamdar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference* (pp. 127-143). Tehran: SAMT. [Google Scholar](#)
- Bachman, L.F. and Palmer, A.S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Breen, M. P. (2001). The social context for language learning: A neglected situation? In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 122-144). London: Routledge. [Google Scholar](#) ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100005337>
- Candlin and Breen, M.P. (1998). Navigating the discourse: On what is learned in the language classroom. *Anthology Series-Seameo Regional Language Centre*, Pp. 115-144. [Google scholar](#)
- Brindley, G. P., & Ross, S. (2001). EAP assessment: Issues, models and outcomes. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 148-166). Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Brinton, D. M., & Holten, C. A. (2001). Does the emperor has no clothes? A reexamination of grammar in content-based instruction. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 239-259). Cambridge: CUP. [Google scholar](#)
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Longman. [Google Scholar](#) ; [Link 1](#) ; [PDF](#)
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Boston, Mass: Heinle & Heinle Publishers. [Google Scholar](#); <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED397672>
- Clapham, C. (2001). Discipline specificity and EAP. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 84-100). Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Cobb, T., & Horst, M. (2001). Reading academic English: Carrying learners across the lexical threshold. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 315-329). Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Coxhead, A. and Nation, P. (2001). The specialised vocabulary of English for academic purposes. *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*, pp. 252-267. [Google Scholar](#)

- Dudley-Evans, T., St John, M.J. and Saint John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge university press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Farhady, H. (2005). Reflections on and directions for ESP materials development. In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayamdar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference* (pp. 2-32). Tehran: SAMT. [Google Scholar](#)
- Farnia, M. (2005). The role of web resources in ESP courses. In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayamdar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference* (pp. 174-186). Tehran: SAMT. [Google Scholar](#)
- Ferris, D. R. (2001). Teaching writing for academic purposes. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 298-314). Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). The EAP curriculum: Issues, methods, and challenges. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 177-194). Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Gatehouse, K. (2001). Key issues in English for specific purposes (ESP) curriculum development. *TESL Journal online*, 7(10). [Online] Available: <http://iteslj.org/articles/gatehouse-ESP.html> (July 9, 2007); [Google Scholar](#)
- Harmer, J. (2002). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman. Hedge, T. (2002). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: OUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning centered approach*. Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes*. London: Routledge. [Google Scholar](#)
- Johnson, K. (2001). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching*. Pearson Education, Longman: London. [Google Scholar](#)
- Jordan, R. R. (2007). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Karimkhanloui, G. (2005). EAP and the communicative use of language. In *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference* (pp. 51-69). [Google Scholar](#)
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2001). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 271-286). London: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587671>; [Google Scholar](#)
- Long, M. H. (2001). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 180-190). London: Routledge. [Google Scholar](#)
- Longman, D. G., & Atkinson, R. H. (2002). *College learning and study skills*. California: Thomson/Wadsworth. [Google Scholar](#)
- Lynch, B.K., Lynch, B.K. and Long, M.H. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Lynch, T. (2012). Promoting EAP learner autonomy in a second language university context. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 390-403). Cambridge University Press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Peacock, M. and Flowerdew, J. eds., 2001. *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge University Press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann. [Google Scholar](#)
- Mahbudi, A. (2005). ESP or general English? In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayamdar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference* (pp.202-218). Tehran: SAMT. [Google Scholar](#)
- Mahdavi-Zafarghandi, A. (2005). Failure of meeting EST objectives. In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayamdar (Eds.), [Google Scholar](#)
- Candlin, C. and Mercer, N. eds., 2001. *English language teaching in its social context: A reader*. Psychology Press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2001). Second language learning: Key concepts and issues. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 11-27). London: Routledge. [Google Scholar](#)
- Nation, P. (2003). Materials for teaching vocabulary. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 394-405). London: Continuum. [Google Scholar](#)
- Nunan, D., (1986). *The Learner-Centered Curriculum: Principles and Procedures*. University of Hawai'i Working Papers in English as a Second Language 5 (2). <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/38611>; [Google Scholar](#)
- Nunan, D. (1998). *Teaching grammar in context*. London: Routledge. [Google Scholar](#)
- Payne, E., & Whittaker, L. (2006). *Developing essential study skills*. Essex: Pearson Education. [Google Scholar](#)
- Peacock, M. (2001). Language learning strategies and EAP proficiency: Teacher views, student views and test results. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 268- 285). Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- McDonough, J. (1984). *ESP in perspective: A practical guide*. London: Collins ELT. *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference* (pp. 144-153). Tehran: SAMT. [Google Scholar](#)
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2003). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: OUP. *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference* (pp. 51-69). Tehran: SAMT. [Google Scholar](#) ; <http://www.cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp/information/tesl-ej/ej03/r19.html>
- Rahimian, M. (2005). Developing communicative syllabus in ESP/EAP classes and how to deal with it in EFL situations. In G. R. Kiany & M. Khayamdar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First National ESP/EAP Conference* (pp.86-98). Tehran: SAMT. [Google Scholar](#)
- Rea-Dickins, P. (2007). Classroom-based assessment: Possibilities and pitfalls. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 505-520). Springer, Boston, MA. [Google Scholar](#); DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-46301-8_36
- Richards, J. C. (2001). Beyond methods. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 167-179). London: Routledge. [Google Scholar](#)
- Richards, J. C. (2007). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. New York: Longman. [Google Scholar](#)
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Longman. [Google Scholar](#)
- Schmitt, N. and Schmitt, D. (2020). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge university press. [Google Scholar](#)
- Snow, M. A., & Brinton, D. M. (1997). *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content*. White Plains, NY: Longman. [Google Scholar](#)
- Stoller, F. L. (2001). The curriculum renewal process in English for academic purposes programs. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 208-224). Cambridge: CUP. [Google Scholar](#)

Stranks, J. (2003). Materials for the teaching of grammar. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 329-339). London: Continuum. [Google Scholar](#)

Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner*. Oxford: OUP.

Tarone, E., and Yule, G., (1989). *Focus on the language learner: Approaches to identifying and meeting the needs of second language learners* (pp. 34-39). Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Google Scholar](#) ; [Link](#)

Van Blerkom, D. L. (2011). *College study skills: Becoming a strategic learner*. California: Thomson/Wadsworth. [Google Scholar](#)