

EFL Courses in the English Philology Syllabus: A Proposal for Basic Modular Design

Agustín Coletes Blanco
University of Valladolid

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to give an answer to the following question: How can we determine the minimal levels of proficiency and the fundamental characteristics of EFL courses at university level? Some final reflections on the importance of this teaching module bring to a close the proposals put forward here.

1. Introduction

The English Philology (EPh) syllabuses in Spanish universities are structured at present, and will continue to be so in the near future, around three main fields which vary in scope and depth (namely “linguistics,” “literature,” and “culture and civilization studies”), and a fourth area which although self-contained also affects the others: that is the field of “language,” commonly including subjects such as “Practical English” or “Instrumental English,” which are normally arranged in sequence and progressively: “English Language I” for the first year, “English Language II” for the second year, and so on.

The inclusion of this fourth teaching area in the degree syllabus, as part of the departmental courses on offer, is questionable. An alternative could be the creation of an independent inter-faculty institution for a primary stage, with the EPh departments able to demand from potential students a specified level of knowledge of the language (EFL, in this case) or a certain number of credits to be compulsorily added to their linguistics, literature, and civilization syllabuses. But it is a fact that the field in question is currently assigned to the EPh departments, and will probably continue to be so in the future. It is also a fact that the EFL teaching area is firmly included as an integral part of the general EPh syllabus.¹

This state of affairs therefore affects hundreds of students and a large number of departmental staff. The wide impact that this situation has leads to countless complications such as student overcrowding, subgrouping, the likelihood of pupils with different

academic interests being allocated in the same subgroup, classroom inadequacy, scarcity of resources, provisional and all-too-often improvised appointments of teachers, and so on.

This is then a subarea in which the need for both horizontal and vertical coordination is essential and urgent. In the same way that, for instance, one of the main objectives in the curricula of secondary education is to coordinate and harmonize the different stages, groups and subgroups of EFL courses as far as aims, contents, target levels, and even resources and devices are concerned, the need is no less real within the context of a university curriculum for EPh. Something so crucial as the proficiency level in English among future graduates in EPh, and therefore their own linguistic ability to deal with the subjects corresponding to the three modules mentioned above, will depend to a great extent on an adequate horizontal and vertical harmonization.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that, perhaps because of the difficulties already outlined, confusion prevails. The degree of internal coordination in the subareas of linguistics, literature or culture and civilization is frequently higher than in the subarea of instrumental language. This paper merely intends to put forward a few guidelines for basic modular design concerning the EFL area (or "supra-area") in the context of an EPh curriculum, which it is hoped might be of some use to the high number of university teachers in charge of such an area.

In order to outline this proposal, it has become necessary to refer to certain conventions which are as objective as possible both with regard to the present state of things and, above all, the foreseeable future. That is to say, this analysis will develop from the starting point of a hypothetical four-year syllabus containing an equal number of EFL courses arranged in sequence and progressively, each of them covering a period of one year; i.e., English Language I for the first year, English Language II for the second, English Language III for the third, and English Language IV for the fourth, with about 9 credits (all of them practical) corresponding to each course. A second starting point assumes the hypothesis that the EFL area is complementary to but not identified with subject courses on theoretical and descriptive linguistics, such as phonetics, morphology, syntax, semantics, etc., which should definitely merit their own presence as independent and sequenced subjects throughout the curriculum. The application of this to similar situations (longer or shorter periods of curricular design, a variety of individual situations) is possible and not too difficult to put into practice, and is therefore left to the discretion of the reader.

2. Entry level and exit level

There is little room for doubt, as I see it, as to the targets and even the content and methods of the module to be analysed. First of all, it is the only module that can be designed as requiring a terminal level *within* the degree syllabus. Nowadays it is difficult, and even questionable, to set a specific entry level of accuracy in English for the university degree, but it is indeed perfectly feasible, legitimate and in my opinion necessary, to require a minimum exit level. The degree in EPh involves, among other issues, a professional qualification, which very often will imply the continual use of English in teaching and in

other fields. It is widely accepted that to the EPh specialist in any area of activity, knowledge of the English language is not the only need, but it is an essential one. Thus, the EPh graduate must be expected to have reached a standard of the highest order. Universities are supposed to offer the utmost degree of knowledge and no EPh graduate should be below standard as far as proficiency in English is concerned.

The exit level here suggested is therefore an extended version of the so-called near-native proficiency level. The fact of its being "extended" will be argued below. Such a level would correspond to the sixth element (of seven) of Trim's hierarchy (1978), the so-called "comprehensive mastery" stage, above which there only remains the "ambilingual" one. That is to say, I think that every EPh graduate's active and passive knowledge of English should be close to that of an educated native speaker who shares with the former a similar age and cultural standing. A good command, for instance, of English horse-racing slang should not be expected from the EPh graduates, nor should their being able to write a formal request to an English court in correct legal terms, simply because these are not universal skills amongst educated native speakers. What can perfectly well be expected from our EPh graduate, however, is a sufficient passive knowledge and a minimum active knowledge of the most frequent marginal lexical segments in colloquial English, or the ability to read a professional report on the National Curriculum for compulsory education in Britain, because this does indeed correspond to the ordinary linguistic competence of the educated native speaker alluded to.

As I have pointed out above, an entry level (which would be an upper-intermediate level) probably cannot be demanded, but this does not exclude the legitimacy of its being required after a short period of time. The student who decides to register for a university degree in EPh does so freely and voluntarily and, as in the case of the student enrolling in Industrial Engineering, who must soon be ready to overcome difficulties in subjects such as Physics of Materials or Applied Calculus, the EPh pupil must be ready to encounter very early on what is difficult in the very distinctive field of the specialism, that is, English Language.

Unfortunately university entry exams do not ensure, as everyone knows, a minimum proficiency level among successful candidates, at least as far as EFL is concerned, despite the official programmes established for secondary education. And, what is more, any student who has passed the university entry exams, even if s/he has not previously studied English as a foreign language, or even if s/he has sat the French and not the English paper in the entry exam, may perfectly well enrol in the EPh degree. The fact is that the level of English of a great majority of first-year EPh students is disappointingly low. But it is also true that there is no strong reason for university departments to adapt to this situation. Otherwise the well-known zero-relative level would be the recurring starting point of all stages (secondary with respect to primary education; the new, post-compulsory baccalaureate with respect to secondary education, and so on), and this would surely lead to an unstable situation which would be difficult to surmount.

In legal terms, every student who is allowed to sit the English paper in the university entry exam is supposed to have reached what could be called an "extended threshold level," which would correspond to Trim's "third level" (1978). It is a "threshold," because both the legal terms concerning the English programmes for secondary education

and the common teaching-learning practice parallel Van Ek's proposals (1976) as far as level and progression are concerned. It is "extended," in two ways: on the one hand the proposals of the European Council date back to 1976 and from that time textbooks, supporting materials, and an important number of teachers have evolved towards more communicative approaches. On the other hand, current regulations demand the linking of English to "texts" involving such a cultural area, and standard teaching at pre-university level reflects this demand.² An enriching fulfilment of that link, which leads to a development of comprehensive reading and writing skills, depends to a large extent on the degree of professionalism of the university lecturers in charge of coordinating the English syllabus at the pre-entry level. EPh departments should not ignore these factors when designing an entry level.

My personal suggestion is then as follows: a specific entry level established by some kind of preliminary test should not be required; but as far as content and teaching strategies are concerned, initial teaching should be approached assuming an extended threshold level. At the end of the EPh degree course, an extended near-native level of English would be required.

"Extended," in this latter case, means the following: a near-native proficiency level or, according to Trim's 1978 terminology, a comprehensive mastery level, would not be *distinctive* for the EPh graduate. Such a level is acquired by anyone who obtains, for instance, the Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency, and it is supposedly the proficiency level of the student who gains a Diploma in English Language at the Official Schools of Languages in Spain. But the EPh graduate may and indeed must go beyond that. Therefore it is my belief that "additional elements" such as the following must be included in the exit level to be expected from the EPh student.

First of all mastery (in both written and oral performance) of the characteristic metalanguage of the basic EPh fields: linguistics, literature, and civilization. This does not mean that English Language IV students should, as part of their final examination, do exercises consisting of identifying and producing philological metalanguage, orally or in writing: they have already done so within the corresponding subjects (it is naturally taken for granted that the common vehicular language for all the subjects of the specialism is English). What I mean to say is that all the subjects of a specific area involve instrumental language besides specific positive knowledge, so that therefore all teachers should in this sense also teach language apart from their specific programme, and that language use must be considered as one of several criteria for final assessment in those subjects. It is not, for instance, one of the teachers' theoretical tasks to correct in a very detailed fashion the language mistakes they may come across in their students' papers, but they should perhaps try to make their pupils realize to what extent it would be absurd, for example, to know a great deal about Elizabethan literature without being able to express that knowledge in English, written and oral, which is grammatically, functionally and stylistically correct. Teachers should make the students aware of this, and act accordingly.

Secondly, "extended" also implies the following: since the EPh university student is supposed to possess a much higher proficiency in other fields of linguistics, including the linguistics of Spanish, than most other citizens, that knowledge must be taken advantage of in order to add to the student's own mastery of the English language. And, in terms of

assessment, it must be taken into account. In other words, activities such as the translation of well-nigh stylistically unmarked texts, and the successive interpretation of pieces of discourse equally unmarked from the point of view of style and register, are to be required when establishing the exit level: these activities are ignored, for instance, in the Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency exams, and in the final year of Spanish Official Schools of Languages but, in my opinion, they must certainly form a part of the specific assessment criteria of EFL courses at the university speciality level. On the other hand there is no doubt that within the context of a specialism in which translating and interpreting are more important, the requirements of both these techniques are stronger, giving way to specialized registers, simultaneous translation, etc., but this is not the case. The proposal here put forward is then intermediate in this sense.

Once the entry and exit levels (which are to set out below) have both been established along general lines, it becomes necessary to determine the intermediate levels, paying great attention to the sequential layout proposed in terms of academic discipline (that is to say, four English Language courses, one every year from first to fourth.)

3. Intermediate stages

In accordance with the previous outline the entry level for English Language would be the one I have called "extended threshold," which corresponds to a lower-intermediate stage: it is logical then to establish a level such as the one required for the Cambridge First Certificate (CFC), which corresponds to an upper-intermediate stage, as the exit level for the first year. In other words, this would be the same as reaching Trim's fourth stage, called the "adequate response" level (1978). The entry level for English Language II would then be similar to that of the CFC exam, and the exit level would have to be the bridging-stage between the former and the next Cambridge exam (The Certificate of Proficiency in English, CPE). This bridging-stage between CFC and CPE, which may be described as a pre-advanced level, is developed in text-books such as those written by Hinton-Marschen (1985), or in Archer-Nolan Woods' 1984 textbook significantly entitled *Bridge to Proficiency*. It would correspond to the actual mastery of Trim's fourth level already mentioned, "adequate response" (1978). Finally the exit level for English Language III would simply correspond to the CPE exam, which as far as requirements are concerned is practically equivalent to Trim's sixth level (1978), that is, "comprehensive mastery." Finally, we would reach the exit level for English Language IV which, according to what has been discussed above, would be an "extended proficiency level" or, to put it in another way, a "post-proficiency level," which would naturally be upper-advanced. (The suggested design is shown on Table 1.)

4. A basic repertoire of sequential contents

The question that now arises is, what should be the basic repertoire for sequential contents in each of the four levels? Nowadays it is clear that if the paradigm of pragmatics

(Alcaraz 1990) is firmly established at all, it is in the curricular design for the teaching of foreign languages, and more specifically in TEFL. The complete syllabus, therefore, would be based upon a communicative approach which implies a combination of the adequate notional registers with the relevant styles to suit a communicative treatment of such registers, and the socially appropriate functions to enable interaction. The so-called strict "grammaticality" is always conditioned by the already mentioned communicative treatment and not viceversa (Coletes 1985).

| YEAR | SUBJECT | EXIT LEVEL |
|------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1st | English Language I | CFC (upper intermediate) |
| 2nd | English Language II | CFC → CPE (preadvanced) |
| 3rd | English Language III | CPE (advanced) |
| 4th | English Language IV | Extended CPE (upper advanced) |

Table 1: EFL courses in the EPh degree: a staging proposal

The task of defining and designing a communicative syllabus in a harmonic and gradual way, starting from a threshold entry level and ending up with an extended proficiency exit level, would be extremely complicated: it would in fact demand an in-depth research project in the field of applied linguistics, no doubt to be carried out by a well-funded professional team. There are of course different basic proposals: Van Eck (1976), Wilkins (1976), Ek and Alexander (1977), Trim (1978), Hindmarsh (1980), Finocchiaro-Brumfit (1983), Clark (1987); but they do not suffice. Nunan seems to have had the same impression: in a recent book of his he writes, somewhat dejectedly, that one has to determine the notional-functional components of an EFL course "largely through intuition" (1988, 23). Alexander's 1975 book, though widely accepted in the past, is clearly dated nowadays. Hindmarsh's *Cambridge English Lexicon* (1980), characterized by its useful word-frequency indexes and subindexes, surpasses in richness and accuracy earlier word-frequency counts, but it is still taxonomy-based rather than functional in approach. The Collins-Cobuild Project is undoubtedly the farthest-reaching initiative in the field. A wide computerized database has been organized and shaped with modern criteria. It includes not only millions of words, but also thousands of collocations and many other interesting data (Sinclair ed. 1987, for more details). This has allowed the project team to publish several independent lexicons, all of them grounded on a very sound communicative approach, viz. two monolingual dictionaries (a standard reference one and a basic-language one), one lexicon specifically devoted to phrasal verbs (a most crucial issue in TEFL), and one reference grammar, the first comprehensive book of its kind to have been developed using functional patterns based on real English. Several guides and exercise books which supplement the said grammar, as well as the initial parts of an EFL method for adult learners based on identical premises, comprise the Collins-Cobuild Project so far.

However, one must accept the fact that there is at present nothing like a graduated, inter-related repertoire of notions, stylistic levels and functions shaping a communicative

framework for an EFL syllabus, from the threshold level all the way into the extended near-native level. Leading publishers do have multiple working records but, naturally enough, these are “domestic documents” for the use of the firms and their authorial teams, thus unavailable to the general public. What is of course ready to be used is the end-product, i.e., the coursebooks themselves. Underestimating the usefulness of the enormous number of EFL textbooks currently in the market (these include courses for all possible levels and specific needs) would thus be simply impractical. Naturally, not all of them excel, but some are really good. The working proposal here put forward therefore consists in shaping the subarea’s graded contents, firstly, departing from a specific communicative approach (a foundation which can never be rejected); secondly, working on the basis of a careful selection of the coursebooks suitable for each different level, and thirdly, using supplementary material of all kinds. This material should in its turn be graded and adjusted to the relevant stage, and is to be contributed by the teacher and the teaching institution.

As a consequence of what has been written so far, I am not in favour of including descriptive grammar, seen as a course section which is half-isolated and half-complementary, *within* the four EFL courses. There are specific curricular subjects for that, and such was precisely my initial hypothesis, which included the premise that all credits assigned to the EFL courses were practical credits. Obviously linguistic ability in the EFL subarea is bound to include pronunciation, grammar, lexis, and discourse, but this should integrate within the four modes of language behaviour or *skills* (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and, above all, within certain patterns of pragmatic interaction which are in turn combinations of the appropriate registers, styles, functions and notions.

Everybody agrees (because we are dealing with something that comes from life itself) on what the most frequent “functions” are (see Vez-Valcárcel 1989 for a useful basic list), but “notions” are different: preference forms part of notions; one should not confuse both things. Not long ago, a pilot-study was carried out by a certain EPh department with the purpose of ascertaining the notions which ought to be developed in the curricular context of EFL courses. The EFL students were surveyed, and the results were as follows: “cars” (sic) in the first place, closely followed by “disco music,” “*movida*” and similiar issues. In other words, a process of equation took place between “notions” and “preferences,” so that, naturally enough, no syllabus was developed on the basis of such “preferential notions”—rightful ones, too. (One can add that De las Cuevas [1989] offers interesting guidelines for our present purpose, but the results of his pilot study, as far as their concrete projective value is concerned, suffer from the same shortcomings.)

To summarize, I believe that all four EFL courses should have the following components, considered as the basic elements which make up the teaching/learning process: a coursebook (or several coursebooks), suitable for the level and the methodology chosen, a number of reference works on grammar and phonetics, also adapted to the level in question and of the “learner’s grammar” type (that is, thought out for the advanced learner of EFL and displaying a clearly marked functional approach), and finally all kinds of supporting materials (written, aural, visual, audiovisual, computer-based), which may or may not form part of the “method” to which the coursebook belongs, and which show level-adequacy and a definite communicative approach.

With this end in mind, I will try to be specific over the next few paragraphs, putting forward a number of definite proposals for each of the four courses (naturally I have not been exhaustive; but at least I have tried to select carefully).

English Language I

Entry level: extended threshold level (lower intermediate).

Exit level: CFC (upper intermediate).

Recommended coursebooks: One or several of the following items: Coe (1980), Fowler et al. (1984), Swan-Walter vol. 2 (1985), Hinton et al. (1988).

Reference works (learner's grammars): One or several of the following: Alcaraz-Moody (1980), Thomson-Martinet (1986), Sánchez Benedito-Dawson-Lavín (1991). For pronunciation and intonation, O'Connor (1967), Arnold-Gimson (1973), Trim (1975), Thompson (1981), Baker (1982), Bradford (1988), Bozman (1988).

Complementary material: practice books and video/audio records of the previous methods and/or of other similar methods, teaching/learning material on computer software including (ideally at least) interactive programmes of the CD-ROM type, series Reading and Thinking in English, series Oxford Supplementary Skills, English graded readers of the adequate level.

English Language II

Entry level: CFC (upper intermediate).

Exit level: CFC → CPE (preadvanced).

Recommended coursebooks: One or several of the following: Archer-Woods (1984), Hinton-Marschen (1985), Swan-Walter vol. 3 (1985), Fowler vols. 1-2 (1985).

Reference works (learner's grammars): Those selected above for English Language I are still useful. De Devitiis *et al.* (1989) can be added as more suitable for this level.

Complementary material: practice workbooks and audio/video recordings of the methods and levels mentioned above or similar ones, as well as the appropriate computer software if possible. The various series mentioned for English Language I are still useful, using the same or other exponents. Simple works (not necessarily literary ones), neither summarized nor simplified, should gradually substitute stage readers.

English Language III

Entry level: CFC → CPE (preadvanced).

Exit level: CPE (advanced).

Recommended coursebooks: Swan-Walter vols. 3-4 (1985), Fowler vols. 3-4 (1985), O'Connell (1989), Morris-Stanton (1990).

Reference works (learner's grammars): *Collins Cobuild English Grammar* (1990), apart from the ones on pronunciation and intonation already referred to.

Complementary Material: The one included in the selected coursebooks (practice books, audio/video recordings, etc.), Graver (1986), and, again, different exponents adequately graded of the series *Reading and Thinking in English* and *Oxford Supplementary Skills*.

English Language IV

Entry level: CPE (advanced).

Exit level: extended CPE (upper advanced).

Recommended textbooks: Probably no specific coursebook should be used for English Language IV. Having reached a very high starting level, teaching/learning should be organized in a particularly dynamic and "horizontal" way: each learner teaches himself and the other learners. The teacher's specific task would consist of promoting a complex interaction of language ability, and patterns of behaviour and action. This would then lead to the practice of what we may call "linguistic judgement": in other words, it is not only the learner's knowledge of notional-functional repertoires that counts (such a knowledge is in fact taken for granted), but rather a critical appraisal of those repertoires; not only language but also metalanguage, discussion or essay-work on the complexities of academic discourse; expansion, summarizing, improvisation in the oral code, etc. Room should be allowed for an appreciation of culturally and historically marked texts, as well as for translation (books such as the ones by Merino-Sheerin (1990) and García Arranz (1991), among others, are useful for this purpose), and also for successive interpretation, if this has not been done before. It hardly needs to be said that teaching and learning material from English Language III, such as coursebooks or other practice material, can still be used in an intermittent fashion. The learner's grammar for general reference should be the one suggested for the previous year.

5. Conclusion

The above is intended to show the importance I attach to a good organization of the EFL subarea within the context of an EPh degree course. This would perhaps be a good opportunity to state that such interest should always be institutional, not only to be shared by all professionals in the EPh area, but also to constitute a stable policy of the area in itself.

EFL courses are commonly concentrated or at least start in the first years of the degree syllabus, when the students are still hardly considered "English Department pupils" at all. These courses are all-too-often assigned to the youngest and less experienced members of the academic staff, teachers who have been appointed very recently -sometimes even immediately after having obtained their degree. Some kind of pernicious philosophy is often aired to explain this. A certain teaching project written for an EPh teaching post excluded all EFL subjects because, according to the project's author, these are taught by

lecturers “of a different academic category (assistants, associate teachers, etc.),” for which reason they had been ignored in the project and there was no syllabus for them. But there is no possible reason to justify this misconception: the fact that these subjects are usually taught by teachers of an “academically different category” should not imply their being academically disregarded by teachers of the “other” category.

This issue is not easy to deal with: an English Psycholinguistics or an Anglosaxon Literature lecturership needs long training—and a good university teacher of Instrumental English, too. Some of the ordinary lecturers in university departments should ideally specialize in and carry out research into the teaching of subjects corresponding to the subarea of instrumental English, in the same way as other ordinary lecturers specialize in other subareas. Perhaps this is the only way to enhance instrumental English, since it deserves the same professional treatment as any other subject. But, from a realistic point of view, this will probably not be the case, and the teaching concerned with that field will be left to a great extent in the hands of “assistants or associate teachers, etc.”

Under these circumstances university departments may and I think should do something. One suggestion might consist of an ordinary teacher, perhaps taking turns with her/his colleagues, regularly teaching subjects from the language subarea and, simultaneously, taking over the necessary coordination among all the teachers involved in the field. What is more, the said teacher does not necessarily have to be a specialized linguist: instrumental language is a matter everybody has to deal with. This and similar control measures may be adopted. The one which is unavoidable and which most gets to the heart of the matter is, I think, the following. Institutional policy should include making it clear to the students, as far as the field of instrumental language is concerned, that teaching and assessment are two different things. The department members should by all means accord EFL teaching the high level of importance it deserves; but they, as well as their students, must above all take for granted that there is a series of minimum successive exit levels which will be required and which the students will necessarily have to pass in order to qualify. All candidates sitting the Cambridge University Examinations Syndicate tests (PET, FCE, CPE, DES), the Royal Academy of London exams, the Oxford-ARELS, or the American TOEFL or Michigan exams know perfectly well beforehand what is expected from them—they are familiar with examination formats, the level required, and so on. The way in which they will manage to reach that level is a different matter: some of them are successful at the age of fifteen and others when they are over forty, some of them after a great deal of hard work, and others more easily. This is precisely the direct basis of the prestige that these exams enjoy: a neat and stable organization with defined criteria, absolute reliability on the administration as much as on the marking of the different exercises, etc. This is naturally not our case: the Eph areas should include the teaching of instrumental English and the corresponding teachers should do their best; but, even more important than that (the reader is invited to notice how momentous a statement this is) is the fact that the setting of those target levels and the assessment process in itself must be equal for everybody, rigorous and, of course, fair.

To talk about teaching procedures applied to the area of instrumental language in general, examination formats, marking, assessment, etc. would imply opening up another whole area greatly exceeding the limits of this paper. Suffice it to say that there is no

reason why the assessment procedures employed by the institutions mentioned above should be copied. However, it is legitimate and even sensible to take their methods into account when designing the examination formats and the marking criteria for the subarea of Instrumental English Language, after a thorough discussion by the teachers of the corresponding area level.

Finally, it may be interesting to remember that the law recommends the fulfilment of a final exam summarising the EPh degree contents as a whole, in order to guarantee the existence of a minimum level of knowledge on the part of the graduating student. As I see it, this exam might just consist of the final English Language IV exam, conceived as the final exam of a specific subject, of a course area, in this summarizing and ratifying sense, of an EPh curriculum.

Notes

1. As is known, present-day curricula are changing substantially in accordance with legislation based on arts. 28 and 29 of the LRU or University Reform Law, which have been developed in RRDD 1496/1987 of 6 November, 1494/1987 of 27 November (BOE of 14.12.87 in both cases), and 1442/1990 of 26 October (BOE of 20.11.90).

2. Legislation in force concerning EFL courses in BUP and COU (secondary education) is contained in Decreto 160/1975 of 23 January, which has been developed by OM of 22 March 1975 (BOE of 18.4.75). This is also bound to change substantially in accordance with the different developments of the LOGSE or new basic law on primary and secondary education: RD 1007/1991 of 14 June (ESO core subjects), RD 1345/1991 of 6 September (ESO syllabus), RD 1700/1991 of 29 November (new baccalaureate design), and RD 1778/1991 of 2 October on basic subject areas for baccalaureate (BOE of 21.10.92).

Works Cited

- Alcaraz Varó, E. *Tres paradigmas de la investigación científica*. Alcoy: Marfil, 1990.
- Alcaraz, E. and B. Moody. *Morfosintaxis inglesa para hispanohablantes*. Alcoy: Marfil, 1980.
- Alexander, L. G., et al. *English Grammatical Structure: A General Syllabus for Teachers*. London: Longman, 1975.
- Archer, M. and E. Nolan-Woods. *Bridge to Proficiency*. London: Nelson, 1984.
- Arnold, C. F. and A. C. Gimson. *English Pronunciation Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Arnold, 1973.
- Baker, A. *Ship or Sheep?* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Bozman, T. *Sound Barriers: A Practise Book for Spanish Students of English Phonetics*. Zaragoza: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Zaragoza, 1988.
- Bradford, B. *Intonation in Context: Intonation Practice for Upper-Intermediate and Advanced Learners of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Clark, A. *Curriculum Renewal in School Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.
- Coe, N. *A Learner's Grammar of English*. London: Nelson, 1980.
- Coletes Blanco, A. "Sociolingüística y enseñanza del inglés." *Aula Abierta* 43 (1988): 99-138.
- Collins-Cobuild English Grammar*. London: Collins, 1990.
- De Devitiis, G., et al. *English Grammar for Communication*. London: Longman, 1989.

- De las Cuevas, J. "Definición de las áreas de interés y motivación en la enseñanza de idiomas." Doct. Diss. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1989.
- Finocchiaro, M. and C. Brumfit. *The Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Fowler, W. S. *New Proficiency English*. 4 vols. London: Nelson, 1985.
- Fowler, W. S., et al. *New First Certificate English*. London: Nelson, 1984.
- García Arranz, A. *Traducciones de español a inglés para estudiantes de nivel avanzado*. 4 vols. Madrid: SGEL, 1991.
- Graver, B. D. *Advanced English Practice*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Hindmarsh, R. *Cambridge English Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- Hinton, M., et al. *The Cambridge First Certificate Course*. London: Nelson, 1988.
- Hinton, M. and R. Marschen. *Options*. London: Nelson, 1985.
- Merino, J. and P. Sheerin. *Manual de traducción inversa: Español-Inglés*. 3rd ed. Madrid: Anglo-Didáctica, 1990.
- Morris, S. and A. Stanton. *The Nelson Proficiency Course*. London: Nelson, 1990.
- Nunan, D. *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- O'Connell, S. *Focus on Proficiency*. London: Collins, 1989.
- O'Connor, J. D. *Better English Pronunciation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.
- Sánchez Benedito, F., A. S. Dawson and E. Lavín Camacho. *English Grammar for Spanish Speakers*. Madrid: Alhambra/Longman, 1991.
- Sinclair, J. M., ed. *Looking Up*. London: Collins, 1987.
- Swan, M. and C. Walter. *The Cambridge English Course*. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.
- Thompson, I. *Intonation Practice*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981.
- Thomson, A. J. and A. V. Martinet. *A Practical English Grammar*. 4th ed. London: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Trim, J. *English Pronunciation Illustrated*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975.
- Trim, J. L. M. *Some Possible Lines of an Overall Structure for a European Unit/Credit Scheme for Foreign Language Learning by Adults*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1978.
- Van Ek, J. A. *The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools*. London: Longman, 1976.
- Van Ek, J. A. and L. G. Alexander. *Waystage*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1977.
- Vez, J. and M. Valcárcel. *La formación de profesores en didáctica del inglés*. Murcia: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Murcia, 1989.
- Wilkins, D. A. *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.