English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 17, No. 2 Summer 2011

On Directions for the Revision of Language Forms Listed in the 2007 Korean English Curriculum*

Hyunoo Lee
(Inha University)

Lee, Hyunoo. (2011). On directions for the revision of language forms listed in the 2007 Korean English curriculum. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 17*(2), 39-58.

This study highlights some very important future directions for the revision of language forms in the 2007 Korean English Curriculum, expected to be made public in the summer of 2011. A critical review of the 2007 National English Curriculum shows that language forms exemplified in that curriculum are not well-chosen or well-sequenced from the viewpoint of grammar selection and gradation, and that no mention of structural labels or grammatical terminologies makes it hard for teachers to recognize their formal properties. To fulfill the original purpose that languages should be listed in the curriculum so that functional-notional syllabuses can be complemented by form-focused instruction, the study presents partial inventories of grammatical items with well-chosen and well-sequenced examples. Minimal descriptions are given to these inventories that are based on general notions or well-known grammatical notions. Occasional suggestions are also made for which language forms should be taught in which schools.

[2007/2011 national English curriculum/language forms/notional-functional syllabus/grammar selection and gradation/ form-focused instruction]

I. INTRODUCTION

A preliminary study has been carried out to revise the 2007 Korean English Curriculum, and the final version will be posted in August 2011. The revision of the curriculum includes, among other things, the restatement of language forms, which were first included in the 7th National English Curriculum. The language forms of the current

* This work was supported by Inha University Research Grant.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

English curriculum were originally developed to complement functional-notional syllabuses with form-focused instruction. Despite this purpose, however, not many English teachers have found them particularly useful in their communicative teaching.

There are two serious problems with the statement of language forms in the 2007 Korean English Curriculum. These problems are main reasons why the language forms are not useful for teachers who want to balance their meaning-based teaching against forms, nor are they useful for those teachers who prefer structural syllabuses.

The first problem was triggered by the theoretical assumption that underlies the statement of the current language forms. In accordance with the assumption that grammar should be learned implicitly,[1] they are presented only in the form of example sentences. Whether this tenet is right or not, the writers of the present language forms have made a grave mistake: they ignored the fact that the curriculum is for teachers who want to teach English as a foreign language, not for students who want to learn English as a foreign language. If a curriculum of language teaching aims to give explicit instructions about which forms of the language should be taught, merely listing example sentences will not be enough; it invariably fails to serve this purpose. Teaching language forms means teaching the forms and the meanings or functions accompanying them. Language forms in separation from context, however, are often ambiguous in meaning, thus even experienced teachers sometimes do not know what they should teach by looking at example sentences of language forms.

The second problem is an empirical one. In order for the language forms listed in the national curriculum to be useful enough for English teachers, the presentation of them must fully satisfy principles of grammar selection and gradation. As listed in the present curriculum, the example sentences do not meet these principles. Furthermore, they fail to exhaust the grammatical items that were supposed to be selected, and some example sentences are not presented in the ascending order of structural difficulty.

Addressing the two problems noted above, this paper proposes partial inventories of grammatical items with well-chosen and well-sequenced examples. Minimal descriptions will be given to these inventories that are based on general notions or well-known grammatical notions. Occasional suggestions will also be made for which language forms should be taught in which schools.

Section II briefly reviews some previous proposals concerning grammar selection and gradation. Section III discusses the content and form of the language forms listed in the 2007 National English Curriculum, highlighting certain problems in relation to grammar

[1] This position, which is laid out by Krashen (1997) in his input hypothesis, is referred to as the zero option of no form-focused instruction at all by Ellis (1997). As pointed out by Brown (2001), only a small number of people support the position nowadays.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

selection and gradation. Section IV lays out the directions for the revision of language forms listed in the curriculum, discussing some aspects of it with examples. Section V provides a brief summary of the present work and some suggestions.

II. GRAMMAR SELECTION AND GRADATION

The question of who should be taught what kind of grammar has been one of the concerns of applied linguists since the 1920s. No one, however, has ever succeeded in giving a complete, standardized, unified structural syllabus. Only partial lists of grammatical items have been proposed. This is partially due to the varying classification of grammatical items, and partially due to the lack of research that shows how learners have acquired them. Before going further, it seems necessary to review some proposals concerning the selection of grammatical items and gradation.

White (1988) proposes frequency, range, substitution, and learnability as criteria for selecting grammatical items. As Richards (2001) claims, frequency has been considered less important, even though, when contrasted with sentence types, it is paid more attention when smaller grammatical units are dealt with. Range and substitution are useful for the selection of vocabulary items, but they are generally not applied to the selection of grammatical items. By contrast, learnability plays an important role in this process because it is based on the findings that simple linguistic forms are easier to acquire than complex forms and that the most different L2 forms from their corresponding L1 forms are most difficult to learn.

Li & Richards (1995) show the importance of the gradation of grammatical items. Comparing five Cantonese textbooks designed for learners of the same level of fluency, they find that there is a great difference in the range of grammatical items used. The total number of different grammatical items in the five textbooks is 221, but Textbook A uses 100 grammatical items; Textbook B 148; Textbook C 74; Textbook D 91; and Textbook E 84. The frequency of the common grammatical items used in the textbooks generally decreases as the number of textbooks to be compared increases: from 41.6% (92 out of 221 items) in one textbook to 24.4% in two textbooks to 16.3% in three textbooks to 7.7% in four textbooks to 10% in five textbooks.

Wilkins (1977) also provides a rationale for the gradation of grammatical items. Noting that the following 14 different sentences can be used to ask for permission, Wilkins (1977) considers it a very important issue to decide which sentence is assigned to and learned by which level of students.

(1) Can/May I use your telephone, please?

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Please let me use your telephone.
Is it all right to use your telephone?
If it's all right with you, I'll use your telephone.
Am I allowed to use your telephone?
Do you mind if I use your telephone?
Do you mind me using your telephone?
Would you mind if I used your telephone?
You don't mind if I use your telephone (do you)?
I wonder if you have any objection to me using your telephone.
Would you permit me to use your telephone?
Would you be so kind as to allow me to use your telephone?
Would it be possible for me to use your telephone?
Do you think you could let me use your telephone?

As implied above, the sequencing of grammatical items has been based on simplicity and learnability rather than the frequency of grammatical items (Richards, 2001). Simplicity and centrality dictate that basic, simple and central linguistic forms should be sequenced prior to complex and non-central forms in structural syllabuses. Learnability suggests that the gradation of grammatical items in L2 syllabuses generally conforms to the order of acquisition of grammatical items in an L1 language, which is dubbed the natural order hypothesis (Dulay et al., 1982; Hatch, 1978; Johnston, 1989; Pienemann, 1989). In particular, Pienemann (1989) compares the natural order of acquisition of grammatical items in L1 languages and the grading of them in ESL textbooks and concludes that there exist few differences between the two orderings, as shown in (2).

(2) Pinemann's (1989) comparison

Order of acquisition of English morphemes by L1 learners	Order in which English morphemes are sequenced in ESL textbooks
Progressive *-ing*	Articles
Plural	Plural
Copular *be*	Copular *be*
Auxiliaries	Auxiliaries
Articles	Progressive *-ing*
Irregular past tense	Irregular past tense
Regular past tense	Possessives
Singular	Regular past tense
Possessives	Singular

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

The comparison shows that the two orderings correspond to each other, except for the progressive *-ing*, articles and the possessive pronouns. Nonetheless, the sequencing of grammatical items guided by the natural order hypothesis is limited to the relatively small grammatical units (i.e., morphemes), and thus it has not played a further significant part in grading more complex elements of sentences.

In addition to simplicity and learnability, linguistic distance and intrinsic difficulty are said to be factors that are considered when sequencing grammatical items. The former, which is proposed by Lado (1975), says that the L2 forms that are similar to their corresponding L1 forms should be taught before the L2 forms that are not. The latter says that the linguistic forms that look simple to the naked eye are acquired earlier than the ones that look more complex. This view is practically the most common and it has been used widely in sequencing grammatical items.

III. LANGUAGE FORMS IN THE 2007 NATIONAL ENGLISH CURRICULUM

1. Presentation of language forms

The 2007 National English Curriculum presents language forms in 36 grammatical categories with 237 example sentences, as shown in Table 1.[2]

TABLE 1

Classification of language forms in the 2007 National English Curriculum

Order	Grammatical categories	Order	Grammatical categories
1	Tense: present, past, future	19	Usage of *enough*
2	Progressive: present, past, future	20	Subordinating conjunctions -simple -correlative
3	Perfective: present, past, future	21	Coordinating conjunctions: *and*, *but*, *or*
4	Negation -copular *be*, auxiliary verbs, *have*, lexical verbs -full forms vs contracted forms	22	Conjunctive adverbials

[2] In this paper, we borrow grammatical terms used in Leech & Svartvik (2002).

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

5	Interrogatives -yes-no questions -*wh*-questions	23	Relatives
6	Modal verbs	24	Embedded sentences
7	*To*-infinitives	25	Direct speech vs indirect speech
8	Causatives	26	Participial clauses
9	Gerundives	27	Conditionals
10	Passives: present, past, future	28	Inversion
11	Noun phrases -count nouns vs mass nouns -quantifiers -singular vs plural	29	Cleft sentences
12	Pro-forms	30	Omission
13	Existential sentences	31	Apposition
14	Expletive *it*: weather, days, time, distance	32	Attributive nonfinite clauses
15	Comparatives	33	Tag questions
16	Superlatives: regular vs irregular	34	Complex subordinating conjunctions
17	Equal comparisons	35	Postposition -expletive *it* vs notional subject - expletive *it* vs notional object
18	*Wh*-adjectives: *what*, *how*	36	Word order: SV, SVA., SVC, SVOA, SVOO SCOC

2. Problems of the presentation

As seen in TABLE 1, similar grammatical items are grouped together into categories in the 2007 Korean English Curriculum, but the way these categories and items are presented has several theoretical or empirical problems.

First and above all, there is no theoretical principle that underlies the ordering of grammatical categories or their items in the current curriculum. Although no one has been yet able to verify empirically the hierarchies of grammar sequencing, it is desirable to follow the principles of simplicity and learnability to the extent that they are applicable. It is not difficult to find some grammatical categories or items that are not

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

sequenced in an order of increasing linguistic difficulty, in violation of simplicity and centrality.

For example, Category 21 should be ordered prior to Category 20. As seen below, the former is about coordinating conjunctions, and the latter contains subordinating conjunctions as well as coordinating conjunctions:

(3) Category 21
John plays the guitar, **and** his sister plays the piano.
They are my neighbors, **but** I don't know them well.
I may stop by and see you tomorrow **or** (I) may just phone (you) late in the day.

(4) Category 20
Leave early **so that** you won't miss the bus.
We moved to London **so that** we could visit our friends more often.
I hurried **so that** I wouldn't be late.
It **not only** rained yesterday, **but** it also snowed.
You can have **either** tea **or** coffee.
David **both** loves Joan **and** wants to marry her.
The film was **neither** well-made **nor** well-acted.
He came **not** to complain, **but** to help us.
He went to bed **because** he was sleepy.
When we arrived, she was talking on the phone.
Since he left this morning, I haven't seen him.
We stayed home, **since** the weather was cold.
The weather was **so** nice **that** we went to the zoo.
We're going to play baseball tomorrow **unless** it rains.
Although/**Though** it was cold, I went swimming.

Coordinating conjunctions like *and*, *or* and *but* join together words, phrases or clauses, whereas subordinating conjunctions like *although*, *because*, *when* introduce dependent clauses. In this regard, coordinating conjunctions are more basic and more central than subordinating ones. Therefore, the sentences in (3), which exemplify the former, should be presented before the sentences in (4), which illustrate the latter, are introduced. In addition, Category 20 includes not only simple conjunctions like *since*, *when* and *although* but also correlative conjunctions like *so … that*, *both … and …*, *either … or …*, which are structurally more complex than simple ones. Since simple conjunctions are more basic and more central than correlative conjunctions, the former should be sequenced prior to the latter in a curriculum. The example sentences in (4), however, do

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

not follow this order. Note that the first eight sentences are examples of correlative conjunctions.

Category 20 is also problematic in another respect. The examples in this category are heterogeneous. They are not only subordinating conjunctions, whether simple or correlative, but also coordinating correlative conjunctions like *not only … but also, both … and …, either … or ….* This and other facts discussed above suggest that the examples in (3) and (4) should be sequenced as follows:

(5) Coordinating conjunctions
John plays the guitar, **and** his sister plays the piano.
They are my neighbors, **but** I don't know them well.
I may stop by and see you tomorrow **or** (I) may just phone (you) late in the day.
David **both** loves Joan **and** wants to marry her.
You can have **either** tea **or** coffee.
It **not only** rained yesterday, **but** it also snowed.
The film was **neither** well-made **nor** well-acted.
He came **not** to complain, **but** to help us.

(6) Subordinating conjunctions
When we arrived, she was talking on the phone.
Since he left this morning, I haven't seen him.
He went to bed **because** he was sleepy.
We stayed home, **since** the weather was cold.
Although/**Though** it was cold, I went swimming.
Leave early **in order that** you won't miss the bus.
I hurried **so that** I wouldn't be late.
We moved to London **so that** we could visit our friends more often.
The weather was **so** nice **that** we went to the zoo.

The second problem with the presentation of language forms in the 2007 Korean English Curriculum is that some important grammatical categories are missing in the presentation. For example, it lacks examples that illustrate the communicative potential of a sentence. Sentences with different structures often have different communicative functions. Thus, if a speaker wants to state that something is true, she will normally utter a declarative sentence such as *These flowers are expensive.* If the speaker wants to issue an order, request, or command, then she will probably use an imperative sentence such as *Leave the room!* If the speaker wants to ask a question, then the obvious choice is an interrogative sentence such as *What time* is *it?* For various communicative functions, it is

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

necessary that the language forms in a curriculum include declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives, exclamations, among others.

(7) Types of clauses
John and Mary **are** middle school students.
Does Mary work out on weekends?
Keep it in a safe place, please.
Let's go to the farewell party for Mary.
How beautiful she is!
What a wonderful achievement they've made!

Another grammatical category that should be included in the presentation of language forms is the distinction between generic sentences and specific sentences. In contrast to specific sentences, generic sentences express generalizations about kinds of things rather than about individual objects, as seen in (8).

(8) Generic vs specific sentences
A tiger is **in the cage**.
Firemen are **available**.
They **met** in the school yesterday.
A German is a good musician.
Germans are good musicians.
The German is a good musician.
The Germans are good musicians.
Dinosaurs were **extinct**.
We **(usually) meet** after school is over.

The first three sentences are specific sentences, and the others are generic statements.[3] For generic statements, *a(n) common noun (sg.)*, *common noun (pl.)*, *the common noun (sg.)*, or *the common noun (pl.)* are used. The last example in (8) is about specific individuals, but it expresses a dispositional property or a habit, which makes it treated as a kind of generic statement.

The third problem with the presentation of language forms in the 2007 Korean English Curriculum is that some categorizations are overgeneralized or undergeneralized, as already implied. For example, Category 12 includes the sentences that exemplify *one*,

[3] In fact, the sixth and the seventh sentences can be construed to be about a specific German and specific Germans, respectively, that the interlocutors can indentify.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

the other(s), and *another* and the sentence that illustrates the reciprocal pronoun *each other*. The pro-form *one* is used to substitute for a previously mentioned noun in the same sentence or in a preceding sentence, and *the other(s)* and *another* are quantificational (Leech & Svartvik, 2002). The reciprocal pronoun *each other* is called an anaphor that lacks inherent reference and thus must have an antecedent in a certain local domain (Chomsky, 1981). Therefore, it is misleading to group these three pro-forms into one category. Furthermore, Category 12 is also undergeneralized. Before pro-forms like *one*, *the other(s)*, and *another* are introduced, traditional personal pronouns, *I*, *you*, *he*, *her*, and *them* must be so because the latter are more basic and more central. Likewise, before reciprocal pronouns like *each other* are introduced, reflexive pronouns like *myself*, *himself*, and *themselves* must be so.

The above discussion naturally suggests that the grammatical items in question should be categorized in the 2011 National English Curriculum, as follows:

(9) Personal pronouns
I like **your** glasses.
We are very glad to hear that.
They're very expensive.
She works for the company, and **he**'s a scientist.
You must be proud of **yourself**.
He criticized **himself** in the meeting.
They're talking to **each other**.

(10) Pro-forms
I don't like the black **coat**, but I like the brown **one**.
I have three books. **One** is mine. **The others** are yours.
The biscuit was delicious. I'm going to have **another one**.
These cups are dirty. Could I have some clean **ones**?
The climate of Seoul is milder than **that** of New York.
Pakistan **flood victims** may outnumber **those** of tsunami, Haiti quake.
I'd like to **write a journal**, but I'm too busy **to do so**.
I will **stay longer** if you want me **to**.

This classification reflects the traditional categorization in that personal pronouns and anaphors are treated as members of the same category, but they are differentiated from other types of pro-forms whose forms and meanings are varied.

Category 23, which is intended to illustrate relative clauses, is also problematic. Virtually all the examples are restrictive relative clauses, and nominal relatives are

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

missing. Thus, it is recommended that it be supplemented by the sentences that exemplify non-restrictive relative clauses or nominal relative clauses, as in (11).

(11) Relative clauses in the 2011 National English Curriculum
The girl **who** is playing the piano is called Ann.
The pen **which** is on the desk is mine.
This is the book **(that)** I bought yesterday.
I met the girl **whose** father is a musician.
She is the girl **who/whom** I told you about.
The town **in which** I was born is very small.
The house **where** she lives is very nice indeed.
Mrs. Lee, **who** teaches English, has two children.
My kids work very hard, **which** makes me happy.
Nobody understood **what** she said about that plan.
That's just **how** he talks, always serious about his work.
Whoever wins this game will win the series.

Category 19 is an extreme case of undergeneralization since it deals with only the usage of *enough*. Some sentences that exemplify the usage of *too* and those that illustrate the notions of role, standard and viewpoint should be added, as in (12).

(12) Role, standard, point of view
Bill is good **at** swimming.
As a swimmer, she's outstanding.
Bill is a good swimmer **for** a youngster.
For a learner, she swims well.
Morally, it was not an easy problem.
Bill is a good swimmer **in a technical sense**.
To his parents, his behavior was shocking.
Is the room warm enough **for** you?
The TV was too big **for** the room.
This new ship is big enough **to** cross the Pacific.
This just sounds too good **to** be true.
Some of the new laws are too complex **for the ordinary citizen to** understand.
Are you warm enough?
These bags are too expensive.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

In connection with Category 19, it is possible to add another grammatical category that shows the formal properties of *to*-infinitive clauses that adjectives take as their complements.

(13) Adjectives that take *to*-infinitive clauses as their complements
Bob is **splendid to** wait.
Bob is **slow to** react.
Bob is **furious to** hear it.
Bob is **hesitant to** agree with you.
Bob is **hard to** convince.

In addition, Category 22, which exemplifies conjunctive adverbials, should be supplemented by more examples, as in (14).

(14) Conjunctive adverbials
He's selling you those for two hundred and fifty dollars? **Well**, seventy-five.
Ted didn't study at all. **Therefore**, he failed the test again.
I gave the book to Tom. **However**, he didn't like it.
I like spending my holidays in the mountains. **On the other hand**, my sister prefers the seaside.
A good example is a plant, proverbial for its bitter taste, **namely** wormwood.

The fourth problem with the presentation of language forms in the 2007 National English Curriculum is the classification of grammatical categories itself. For example, in the current curriculum, tag questions are categorized as one independent category, i.e., Category 33. Tag questions and other special questions such as rhetorical questions and echo questions should be grouped together and assigned to Category 5, which includes yes-no questions and *wh*-questions or to an entirely new category.

(15) Special types of questions in the 2011 National English Curriculum
Is this a reason for doing that silly thing?
What difference does it make?
[A] It cost five dollars.
[B] **How much** did (you say) it cost? (with a rising intonation)/
It cost **how much**?

In the 2007 Korean English Curriculum, conditionals and constructions containing hypothetical clauses are grouped together into one category, i.e., Category 27. However,

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

the meaning difference between the two types of conditionals, open and hypothetical ones, suggests that it would be better to assign them to two different categories. One is for open conditionals, and the other is for hypothetical conditionals as well as other hypothetical meanings, as in (16) and (17).

(16) Open conditionals
If oil **is** mixed with water, it **floats**.
If I **wash** the dishes, Jane **dries** them.
If Peggy **said**, "Jump!" Dan **jumped**.
If it**'s** raining out there, my car **is** getting wet.
If someone**'s** at the door, it **must/should** be Sean.
I**'ll** lend Jack the money **if** he **needs** it.
If you **feel** seasick, **take** one of these pills.
If it **should/happens to/should happen to** rain, I**'ll** stay home.
We**'re going to** play baseball tomorrow **unless** it rains.
Take these pills **in case** you feel ill on the boat.
I**'ll** lend you the money **on condition that** you **return** it within six months.
Provided that/As long as they **had** plenty to eat, the crew **seemed** to be happy.

(17) Hypothetical conditionals and other constructions for hypothetical meanings
If Joe **had** the time, he **would** go to Spain.
If I **were** a bird, I **could** fly home.
If Joe **should/happened to/should happen to** have the time, he **would** go to Spain.
If you **had** studied harder, you **would have** passed the exam.
Had I had enough money, I **would have** bought a tape-recorder.
Without/But for your advice, I **would have** failed.
It's time you **were** in bed.
I wish I **spoke** English well.
He acts as if he **knew** you.
I'd rather we **had** dinner now.

IV. DIRECTIONS FOR THE REVISION OF LANGUAGE FORMS

In the previous section, some theoretical or empirical problems concerning the presentation of language forms in the 2007 National English Curriculum were pointed out. Based on the discussion there, some directions for the revision of language forms will be laid out in this section.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

First, the way language forms are presented should be based on the approach that Leech & Svartvik (2002) have taken for their description of English grammar. The following is a synopsis of their position.

> … by presenting grammar through the eyes of the communicator. The question it tries to answer, in as much detail as space permits, is: Given that I want to communicate certain meanings in certain situations or contexts, which grammatical forms and structures can I use?

On this communicative approach to grammar, they represent four types of meaning or meaning organization: Concepts; information, reality and belief; mood, emotion and attitude; and meanings in connected discourse. Concepts include the basic meaning categories of grammar, among which are 'number', 'definite meaning', 'amount', 'time', 'manner' and 'degree'. Information, reality and belief represent logical aspects of communication and deal with such categories as 'statements, questions and responses', 'affirmation and denial', 'possibility' and 'certainty'. Mood, emotion and attitude involve the social dimension of communication, relating grammar to the attitudes and behavior of interlocutors. Such speech acts as commanding, requesting, advising and promising will be addressed. Finally, meanings in connected discourse deal with the organization of communication and thus take account of 'context' in the sense of 'the preceding or following aspects of the discourse'.

Since language forms are used to complement notional-functional syllabuses with form-focused instruction, it would be ideal if the presentation of language forms in the curriculum can reflect the orientation of notional-functional syllabuses as closely as possible. It is for this reason that we choose to present language forms the way Leech & Svartvik (2002) present English grammar.

Table 2 shows how language forms may be presented in the 2011 National English Curriculum. In the table, they are grouped into 38 grammatical categories that are supposed to illustrate the above four types of meaning or meaning organization.

TABLE 2

Classification of language forms in the 2011 National English Curriculum

Order	Grammatical categories	Order	Grammatical categories
1	Noun phrases -singular vs plural -count nouns vs mass nouns -quantifiers	20	Interrogatives -yes-no questions -tag questions -*wh*-questions

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

			-rhetorical questions -echo questions
2	Generic vs Specific sentences	21	Direct speech vs indirect speech
3	Personal pronouns	22	Embedded sentences
4	Other pro-forms	23	Conditionals
5	Tense: present, past, future	24	Other constructions for hypothetical Meanings
6	Progressive: present, past, future	25	Modal verbs
7	Perfective: present, past, future	26	Coordinating conjunctions: *and*, *but*, *or*
8	Expletive *it*: weather, days, time, distance	27	Subordinating conjunctions -simple -complex -correlative
9	Complement patterns of verbs	28	Relatives
10	Role, Standard, Point of view	29	Inversion
11	Equal comparisons	30	Attributive nonfinite clauses
12	Comparatives	31	Participial clauses
13	Superlatives: regular vs irregular	32	Omission
14	Causatives	33	Inversion
15	*To*-infinitives	34	Existential sentences
16	Adjectives and their *to*-infinitive complements	35	Cleft sentences
17	Gerundives	36	Postposition -expletive *it* vs notional subject - expletive *it* vs notional object
18	Types of clauses	37	Apposition
19	Negation -copular *be*, auxiliary verbs, *have* -lexical verbs	38	Passives: present, past, future

Categories from 1 through 17 are about the first type of meaning, concepts. Categories from 18 through 24 are about the second type of meaning, information, reality and belief, but category 25 is about the third type of meaning, mood, emotion and attitude. The

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

remaining categories are all about the last type of meaning, meanings in connected discourse.

Second, it seems necessary to provide minimal, well-known descriptors to each category in the table.[4] These labels will then help the reader recognize what formal properties that the examples in each category carry. Let us now take Category 25, for which the following examples and descriptors will be used in the 2011 Korean English Curriculum:

(18) Deontic modal
Can we sit down in here?
May I borrow your book?
You **could** leave the camp by permission of the manager.
Could we ask you what your opinion is?
You **should do** as he says.
You **had better not say** anything about this.
They **must do** well on the test.
You **will** report back for duty on Friday morning.
The committee **shall** meet at least four times per year.
Shall I close the window?
You **don't have to go** to school tomorrow.
You **needn't worry** about the test.
You don't **need** to pay that fine.
Children **may not** use the swimming pool.
You **shouldn't** be so impatient.

(19) Epistemic modal verbs
He **may** be sick.
He **can't** be working at this time.
There **might be** some complaints.
The whole plan **could** be ruined.
Our guests **should**/**ought to** be home by now.
There **shouldn't**/**oughtn't to** be any difficulties.
You **have to**/You'**ve got to** be joking.
Someone **had to** lose the game.
They'll fight to the end **rather than give up**.
That **must**/**will** be my daughter.
She **may** have made an important discovery.

[4] Note that Kim & Sung (2007) make the same point.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

They **must**/**will** have arrived by tomorrow.

(20) Dynamic modal verbs

She **can** play the violin.
Could you **show** me the way to the nearest post office?
I **will be able to** help you get to the party tonight.
Will you please help me with my English?
My father **won't** give me any money.
Would you like me to open these letters?
Are you **going to** catch the last train?
Oil **will** float on water.
He **would take** a walk every morning.

By assigning example sentences to appropriate labels, it is expected that the exemplification of modal sentences will be more well-organized than before, and so the reader will have a chance to understand better which modal sentences express which modalities. More specifically, the reader will be able to tell epistemic modality from deontic modality. The former concerns the speaker's attitude to the factuality of past and present time situations whereas the latter concerns the speaker's attitude to the actualization of future situation. In addition, the reader will also recognize dynamic modality, which is concerned with properties and dispositions of persons, etc., referred to in the clause.

The third direction to purse in this work is the use of diacritics that tells which language forms should be taught in which schools. Consider (21), which is a diacritics version of (20).

(21) Dynamic modal verbs

*She **can** play the piano.
Could you **show** me the way to the nearest post office?
I **will be able to** help you get to the party tonight.
Will you please help me with my English?
My father **won't** give me any money.
Would you like me to open these letters?
***Are** you **going to** take a bus?
Oil **will** float on water.
He **would take** a walk every morning.

It is recommended that the language forms with an asterisk be used in elementary schools.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

V. CONCLUSION

This study first reviewed the language forms listed in the current 2007 National English Curriculum and found that they were not well-chosen or well-sequenced from the viewpoint of the communicative approach to language teaching and two principles of grammar selection and gradation, namely, simplicity and learnability. The study also pointed out that no mention of structural descriptors or labels makes it hard for teachers to recognize the structural properties of example sentences.

Given the difficulties mentioned above, this paper proposed some important future directions for the revision of language forms in the 2011 National English Curriculum. It is argued that language forms should be presented in a parallel way that grammar is presented in the communicative approach to language teaching. It is also shown how the language forms listed in the current curriculum can be supplemented by more appropriate examples and how they are better organized or better ordered in accordance with simplicity and learnability. Furthermore, it is claimed that minimal descriptors assigned to grammatical categories containing well-chosen and well-sequenced examples will definitely help the reader more readily understand formal properties of the language forms and their functions. Finally, it is hoped that diacritics regarding which language forms should be taught in which schools encourage students to use more language forms more often in their speaking as well as writing activities.

Even though the systematic presentation of language forms in the 2011 National English curriculum does not say about how these forms can be used in the communicative classroom, it will help teachers more effectively and more efficiently design various communicative activities or tasks where their students are expected to learn formal properties of language forms.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (second edition)*. New York: Longman.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dulay, H., Burt, B., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Ek, J. A., & Trim, J. L. M. (1998). *Threshold (revised edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Ek, J. A., & Trim, J. L. M. (2001). *Vantage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The Functional-notional Approach: From Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hatch, E. M. (1978). *Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (Eds.). (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, R. K. (1989). *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, Inseok & Sung, Choonja. (2007). A comparative study of grammar selection and grading between the newly revised Korean English Curriculum and ELT commercial textbooks. *English Language and Linguistics, 23*, 43-68.

Krashen, S. D. (1997). *Foreign Language Education: The Easy Way*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Lado, R. (1975). *Linguistics Across Cultures.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Larson-Freeman. D. (1991). *Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research.* London: Longman.

Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (2002). *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Li, D., & Richards, J. (1995). Cantonese as a Second Language: A Study of Learner Needs and Cantonese Course Books. *Research Monograph 2*, English Department. City University of Hong Kong.

Nunan, D. (1988). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypothesis. *Applied Linguistics,10*(1), 52-79.

Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Minister of Education, Science and Technology. (2009). *The 2007 National English Curriculum*. Seoul: Hansol.

White, R. V. (1988). *The ELT Curriculum: Design, Innovation and Management*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Wilkins, D. A. (1977). *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary

Hyunoo Lee
Dept. of English Language Education
Inha University
253 Yonghyun-dong, Nam-gu
Incheon 402-751, Korea
Tel: 032-860-7851
Fax: 032-865-3857
Email: hylee@inha.ac.kr

Received in March 15, 2011
Reviewed in April 20, 2011
Revised version received in May 15, 2011

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre