

AN ASSESSMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE COURSE SYLLABI IN THE  
DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH AT UNIVERSITIES IN TAIWAN

Baysan Lin, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2010

APPROVED:

Ronald W. Newsom, Major Professor  
Marc Cutright, Committee Member  
Kathleen K. Whitson, Committee Member  
Janice Holden, Chair of the Department of  
Counseling and Higher Education  
Jerry R. Thomas, Dean of the College of  
Education  
Michael Monticino, Dean of the Robert B.  
Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Lin, Baysan, An assessment of undergraduate course syllabi in the Departments of English at universities in Taiwan. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), May 2010, 93 pp., 24 tables, references, 37 titles.

This exploratory, qualitative research explored the extent that course syllabi in the Departments of English in 13 public and 9 private universities in Taiwan reflect the inclusion of syllabus components to promote learning as recommended in the literature in the United States. Research questions included: what components can be inferred from the literature in the U.S. for the recommended components of a course syllabus, for the components for a learning-centered syllabus, and for a model to analyze Bloom's cognitive level of learning? And when these are applied to analyze course syllabi in English courses, are syllabi in these universities congruent with the models?

The research identified and analyzed 235 course syllabi from the core courses listed online at these universities. The findings indicated that these syllabi are highly congruent with the syllabus components template; 68% of the syllabi included seven or more of the ten components. Additionally, these syllabi reflect medium congruency with the learning-centered syllabus template. Verbs used in objectives and learning outcomes in different English courses indicate different levels of cognitive learning goals as identified by Bloom's cognitive domain. Additional findings indicate that there was no difference in inclusion of components based on where faculty earned their doctoral degree.

This research assumed similarities between higher education in Taiwan and the U.S, conclusions indicate that the course syllabi in Departments of English in Taiwan are congruent with the models recommended in the literature in the U.S.

Copyright 2010

by

Baysan Lin

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my beloved parents, Lin, Junq-Tzer and Tseng, Miao-Mei, who have always been there for me and given me confidence and peace of mind.

Warm thanks from my heart to my major professor, Dr. Ron Newsom, for his expertise, time, inspiration, guidance and instruction. His mentor characteristics will be always on my mind, and I wish to follow his step to dedicate myself in the field of higher education. Likewise, I am extremely grateful to my remaining committee members Dr. Kathleen Whitson and Dr. Marc Cutright for their guidance and advice. It was my pleasure and an honor to have this opportunity to have their inspiration during my doctoral learning process and on my dissertation guidance.

Special thanks go to Yao-Tsu Tung for his encouragement and support during the most difficult times.

I also acknowledge copyright for the material in Appendices A, B and C is shared between Baysan Lin and Yao-Tsu Tung, and is reproduced with permission of both authors.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
Chapters	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Research Questions	
Definition of Terms	
Significance of the Study	
Assumptions	
Delimitations	
Limitations	
Collaborative Process to Develop the Syllabus Templates	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	8
Introduction	
Definition of a Syllabus	
Eight Empirical Articles	
Twelve Articles and One Book Chapter	
Discussion of the Learning-Centered Course Syllabus	
Six Dissertation Studies of the Course Syllabus	
Four Main Functions of a Course Syllabus	
Syllabus Components	
Context of Syllabus Usage in Taiwan's Higher Education	
Conclusion	
III. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS .....	34
Introduction	
Research Design	
Three Instruments for Data Analysis	

Procedures for Collection of the Syllabi Data  
Three Sections for the Data Analysis  
Reporting of the Data

IV.	FINDINGS.....	45
	Date Processing	
	Answers to the Eight Research Questions	
	Other Findings	
V.	DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	66
	Major Findings	
	Discussion	
	Limitations	
	Conclusions	
	Recommendations for Future Research	
Appendices		
A.	COMPONENTS OF A COURSE SYLLABUS AS DISCUSSED IN TWENTY-TWO SOURCES .....	76
B.	SYLLABUS COMPONENTS ANALYSIS .....	80
C.	SYLLABUS COMPONENTS BY FREQUENCY .....	86
	REFERENCES.....	91

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Syllabus Components Template.....	37
2. Learning-Centered Syllabus Template .....	39
3. Bloom Cognitive Domain Taxonomy Template.....	40
4. Overall Findings for the Syllabus Components Template (Table 1): Number and Percentage for Each Component for the 235 Syllabi Reviewed .....	47
5. Rankings of the Top Five Components from Syllabus Components Template (Table 4 Results) which Appeared Most Frequently in the 235 English Department Syllabi .....	49
6. Overall Findings for the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template (Table 2): Number and Percentage for Each Component for the 235 Syllabi Reviewed ....	49
7. Rankings of the Top Five Components from Learning-Centered Syllabus Template (Table 6 Results) which Appeared Most Frequently in the 235 Syllabi Reviewed.....	50
8. Ranking of 28 Least Mentioned (under 39%) Components from the Syllabus Components Template (Table 4 Results) .....	51
9. Ranking of Least Mentioned (under 39%) Components from the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template (Table 6 Results) .....	51
10. Level of Congruence of Syllabi with Syllabus Components Template for All 235 Syllabi.....	52
11. Level of Congruence of Syllabi with the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template for All 235 Syllabi.....	53
12. Bloom Cognitive Domain Taxonomy Template Rankings for 7 English Courses: Composition, Conversation, Literature, Linguistics, TESOL, Western Literature, and Translation (in %) .....	55
13. Level of Congruence of Syllabi with the Syllabus Components Template Listed by the Country in which Faculty Member Earned Their Doctoral Degree (in %). 56	
14. Level of Congruence of Syllabi with the Learning-Centered Template Listed by the Country in which Faculty Member Earned Their Doctoral Degree (in %) .....	56

15.	Level of Bloom’s Cognitive Domain in the Syllabi for 7 Types of English Courses, Listed by the Country in which Faculty Member Earned Their Doctoral Degree (in %) .....	57
16.	Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Syllabus Components Template, Listed by the Instructors’ Gender and Degree (in %) .....	57
17.	Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template, Listed by the Instructors’ Gender and Degree (in %) .....	58
18.	Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Bloom’s Cognitive Taxonomy Template, Listed by the Instructors’ Gender and Degree (in %) .....	60
19.	Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Syllabus Components Template, Listed by the Instructors’ Nationalities (in %) .....	60
20.	Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template, Listed by the Instructors’ Nationalities (in %).....	61
21.	Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Bloom’s Cognitive Taxonomy Template, Listed by the Instructors’ Nationalities (in %) .....	62
22.	Fifteen Components from Syllabus Components Template Mentioned Least in the 235 Syllabi (Table 4 Results).....	64
23.	Percentage of Components from Learning-Centered Syllabus Template for 7 English Courses (Table 5 Results) .....	65
24.	Level of Congruence of the 7 English Courses with the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template (in %).....	65



# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Historically, higher education institutions have three missions: teaching, research, and service. The importance of teaching has been taken for granted for a long time, because teaching effectiveness has a direct impact on students' academic performance and on the evaluation results of an institution. Course syllabi represent a faculty member's teaching plan for both content and student learning; syllabi also provide the first impression of the instructor to potential students. As a result, an organized and informative course syllabus may guarantee a level of success in a course. If a syllabus is well written, it should contribute to improve teaching and learning outcomes in higher education.

For a long time, the course syllabus was not considered important in higher education; however, with more and more proof of academic effectiveness required from accrediting agencies, students, and the public; the syllabus plays a more and more essential role than ever. Not surprisingly, a well written, detailed, and informative syllabus usually helps students to make drop-and-add decisions before they choose a course, facilitates the teaching process for instructors, clarifies the professional ability for faculty members, helps the evaluation process for accrediting agencies, and communicates well by providing students useful information regarding a course.

The literature and research on teaching and learning in the U.S. identifies the recommended components to develop course syllabi to promote learning outcomes in higher education. However, limited research exists on the effects of these recommendations. In addition, research and the professional literature on course syllabi

in higher education in Taiwan literature are not prevalent. A review of the literature on the course syllabus in Taiwan indicates that research and discussions of the course syllabus are limited.

An additional point is that Boyer (1990) has congruent that to be a scholar is to be a research, and publication is the primary yardstick by which scholarly productivity is measured (p. 2). Boyer asserted that what we urgently need is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar—a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching (p. 24). Boyer's idea about the scholarship of teaching was followed by Barr and Tagg's (1995) argument for developing a learning paradigm as the focus on instruction and learning in higher education. Barr and Tagg (1995) stated that the instruction paradigm to the learning paradigm shift is taking hold in American higher education. The instruction paradigm focuses on the mission of a college to provide instruction. The learning paradigm emphasizes learning and in doing so implies that instructors are researchers and scholars of teaching and learning.

This study examined the importance, functions, and the roles of syllabi to better understand the characteristics of course syllabi, and to examine the extent to which the course syllabi in the English departments in Taiwan are congruent with what is described as the recommended syllabus proposed in the literature and practice in the U.S.

### Statement of the Problem

The main reason for this study is that I am interested in the syllabus functions, the recommended syllabi components, the learning-centered syllabi components inferred from the literature, and the Bloom's taxonomy verb table used to analyze the syllabi to

see the cognitive level being addressed in them. The problem of this study focuses on what components of a syllabus are recommended by professional educators in the literature and research in the United States; the extent to which syllabi in English departments at universities in Taiwan reflect these components and communicate a learning-centered orientation of the course to learners, and the status of the syllabi in the Department of English in Taiwan as analyzed by the Bloom's taxonomy verb table for the cognitive domain on course objectives and assignments.

#### Purposes of the Study

1. To infer from the literature a recommended syllabus components template.
2. To infer from the literature a learning-centered syllabus template.
3. To examine the degree of completeness of the syllabi in English departments at universities in Taiwan.
4. To examine the congruency level of the learning-centered syllabus template in English departments at universities in Taiwan.
5. To estimate the extent that course syllabi in English departments at universities in Taiwan illustrate model syllabi components recommended in the literature on teaching and learning in the United States.
6. To examine the extent to which course syllabi in English departments at universities in Taiwan may not be congruent with U.S. practices and may include other components in the course syllabi.
7. To examine the verbs used in the course objective and the assignment part of the syllabi with the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template for different courses in English departments at universities in Taiwan in order to know if there is any difference between the verbs chosen within different English courses.

#### Research Questions

1. What syllabus components can be inferred from the published literature on the use of syllabi for teaching and learning in the United States?
2. From the components derived from Question 1, what syllabus components template and what learning-centered syllabus template can be inferred?

3. Given the syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template, what are the most frequently mentioned syllabus components in these two templates in English departments at universities in Taiwan?
4. Given the syllabus component template and the learning-centered syllabus template, what syllabi components are the least mentioned in these two templates in English departments at universities in Taiwan?
5. To what extent are the syllabi in English departments at the universities in Taiwan congruent to the requirements suggested for inclusion in the syllabus components template?
6. To what extent are the syllabi in English departments at the universities in Taiwan congruent to the requirements suggested for inclusion in the learning-centered syllabus template?
7. Are the syllabi verbs reflected in the objective and the assignment part of English departments at universities in Taiwan differentiating in their cognitive level of learning with different courses according to the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template?
8. Is there any difference in the level of congruence with the three templates in the faculty members' academic background and the institution type (public or private)?

#### Definition of Terms

The course syllabus: *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (2007) identified that the syllabus is a concise statement or table of headings of a discourse, the subjects of a series of lectures, etc., a list of contents; an abstract, a summary. a statement or outline of the subjects covered by a course for teaching; a programme of study, also a statement of the requirements for a particular examination. For this study, the definition of the ideal syllabus model includes the fourteen main categories of items regarded as essential in the literature, and some items include sub-items. The Appendix B and C show the syllabus items mentioned by the literature; the difference between Appendix B and Appendix C is that Appendix C is arranged by the frequency order of the syllabus components.

The learning-centered syllabus: According to Grunert (2008), the learning-centered syllabus includes more information compared to the traditional course syllabus mentioned above. It focuses on the value of the syllabus as a learning tool in the class, and it also conveys the logic and organization of the course and clarifies instructional priorities and provides students with the resource of a course manual, with each component crafted to promote students' learning. The definition of a model for the learning-centered syllabus in this study includes these features: rationale/purpose of the course; teaching philosophy; course description/class type; course objective; readings; resources; course calendar; evaluation/assignment; grading procedure; tools and skills for study and learning.

Bloom's taxonomy: it is a way to classify instructional activities or questions as they progress in difficulty. The lower levels require less in the way of thinking skills. As one moves up the hierarchy, the activities require higher level thinking skills. When developing the curriculum for a course, the Bloom taxonomy helps the instructors to determine the level of learning response we are anticipating for our students.

#### Significance of the Study

The study developed two useful syllabus component models from the literature: the first was the syllabus components template and the second was the learning-centered syllabus template. In addition, the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template was used as a third tool to judge the learning level of the verbs in the course objective and the assignment parts of the syllabi in English departments at universities in Taiwan.

1. The study described any variation in course syllabi in English departments at universities in Taiwan when compared with the syllabus components template,

- the learning-centered syllabus template recommended in the literature, and the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template in the United States.
2. It described the extent to which these syllabi are congruent with both the recommended syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template to find out how the syllabi reflect educational philosophy and practices in Taiwan that may differ from the U.S. patterns.
  3. It describes the status of the learning level of the syllabi for different core courses in English departments in Taiwan with the examination of the verbs in the course objective and the assignment sections by using the Bloom's cognitive domain taxonomy template.
  4. The study offers informative reference in the design and writing a more complete, detailed, and informative syllabus for the faculty members and researchers in higher education.
  5. The study is important for research in the development of the syllabus in higher education.
  6. The study provides information for knowing the difference of the learning level judged by the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template in seven courses in English departments. They are composition, conversation, literature, linguistics, TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), western literature, and translation.

#### Assumptions

1. The two syllabus models for the syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template can be inferred from the U.S. published literature.
2. The two templates inferred from the literature are representative in the U.S. higher education.
3. The Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template is representative in the U.S. higher education as a tool for instructors to design the curriculum.
4. The syllabi from English departments at universities in Taiwan are representative of the syllabi in English departments in Taiwan's higher education institutions.
5. The syllabi selected for this study are written by the instructors of the courses.
6. The syllabi sample selected on the websites of the institutions are updated.
7. The syllabi sample selected on the website of the institutions are the same ones the instructors gave to their students.

### Delimitations

1. The study examined 235 syllabi from 7 courses of the Department of English at 13 public universities and 9 private universities in Taiwan.
2. The syllabi selected are delimited to only the ones put on the websites of the institutions.
3. The syllabi selected are mainly delimited to the ones used in the fall semester of the 2008 year.

### Limitations

1. The syllabi on the websites of the institutions may not be updated.
2. The syllabi on the websites of the institutions may not be the ones the instructors gave to the students.
3. Some institutions may have their standard format of syllabus writing for their instructors.

### Collaborative Process to Develop the Syllabus Templates

In order to develop a consistent standard for the syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template, and to examine more syllabi in Taiwan, a collaborative approach was used with doctoral student Yao-Tsu Tung to develop the first two templates. This approach provided additional cross-checking of sources in the literature to be reviewed and of the identifications of components. I also acknowledge copyright for the material in Appendices A, B, and C is shared between Baysan Lin and Yao-Tsu Tung, and is reproduced with permission of both authors

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Higher education institutions have three main missions, which are teaching, research, and public service. Since teaching and learning is one of the three missions, teaching plays a critical role in higher education. The issue of teaching and learning has been a concern for a long time, but as a part of teaching and learning, it seems that the syllabus has been overlooked for years. Boyer (1990) stated that “inspired teaching keeps the flame of scholarship alive. Almost all successful academics give credit to creative teachers who defined their work so compellingly that it became, for them, a lifetime challenge” (p. 24). The book *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990) discusses “four main academic activities for the college faculty members: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and the scholarship of teaching “(p. 25).

Broadly considered the scholarship of teaching could include reflection on classroom learning and on all of those factors which influence it. Developing and testing the outcomes of various syllabus models for classroom learning is within Boyer’s concept of the scholarship of teaching. A well-written syllabus might improve the teaching effectiveness. Additionally, if it is well organized or written, it might also improve teaching and learning effectiveness in order to meet the teaching mission of higher education.

The development of a course syllabus represents a first and important step for instructors to organize course content for teaching and learning during an academic term.



A complete and well-written syllabus provides a way to understand the instructors' philosophy, subject matter content, and the goals and objectives students need to achieve. Smith (1993) stated that "As more attention is given to improving classroom instruction and increasing overall student satisfaction, educators at all levels should re-evaluate their practices to increase their effectiveness. The course syllabus is a good place to start" (p. 8). Gambescia (2006) stated that " While the syllabus is a commonplace teaching tool for faculty and serves as one of the most visible elements of curriculum and academic administration, it generally does not get the development or oversight attention it deserves from faculty, chairs, and academic administrators" (p. 20). Though the syllabus is a small part of teaching, it does have direct impacts on the professors' teaching, students' learning, and it also provides criteria to evaluate teaching and student learning outcomes. This literature reviews what previous researchers found in their empirical studies and practical models for syllabi. I have reviewed articles published from 1989 to 2008 on institution syllabi in multiple electronic abstracts on higher education. This study identified 40 articles, 1 book, and 1 book chapter. After reviewing these 42 sources, I chose 20 articles, 1 book, and 1 chapter as the main sources and reference for this literature review.

#### Definition of a Syllabus

The word "syllabus" has many meanings in different contexts. *Webster's New World College Dictionary* (14<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2004) defines "a syllabus as a summary or outline of a course study". *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (6<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2007) identifies the syllabus as a concise statement or table of headings of a discourse, the subjects of a series of lectures, etc., a list of contents; an abstract, a summary, a statement or outline

of the subjects covered by a course for teaching; a programme of study, also a statement of the requirements for a particular examination. *The Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* identified a syllabus as a plan showing the subjects or books to be studied in a particular course, especially a course which leads to an examination. According to Altman (1992), syllabus means a "label" or "table" of contents. Parkes and Harris (2002) mentioned the following:

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word syllabus made its debut in the English language in 1656 in reference to a table of contents. Its more particular use in referring to an outline of lectures or a course dates to 1989. (p. 55)

Doolittle and Lusk (2007) stated," Due to its multiplicity, the syllabus flip-flops between uniformity and inconsistency to serve its various purposes and audiences" (p. 62).

In sum, the definition of syllabus varies according to different contexts and situations; but in this dissertation, the syllabus is the outline, content, and description of a course in the Department of English education.

The discussion that follows first reviews eight empirical studies that employed qualitative research design or quantitative quasi-experimental designs to analyze course syllabi. It then reviews the professional, higher education literature on the development and use of course syllabi as published to provide professional development for faculty who develop or revise and refine course syllabi for teaching and learning. It is evident in the literature in the United States on course syllabi that the empirical research is limited and no theory of syllabus design has been developed apart from the more extensive discussion of instruction design theories and that the majority of the published literature

is from the perspective of professionals discussing the pros and cons of the process for developing course syllabi.

### Eight Empirical Articles

Smith and Razzouk (1993) designed a study to examine the actual value of course syllabi to a group of college students, the study answered three questions: how often does a student refer to a course syllabus? How much of the vital syllabus information can the student recall at a given time? What are some of the strategies that instructors can use to increase the effectiveness of course syllabi and the overall communication process? The result of this study showed that:

Over half the students referred to the syllabus once a week, and most had difficulty recalling syllabus information (see Table 1). Obviously, most students knew what class they were taking and who the instructor was, but beyond that, students had difficulty recalling the instructor's office number, office hours, the chapter for the day's class, the textbook author, and the course objectives. (Results section, ¶ 2)

Lastly, Smith and Razzouk mentioned some strategies for instructors to increase the effectiveness of course syllabi and the overall communication process.

The article "Effects of a Syllabus Offer of Help, Student Age, and Class Size on College Students' Willingness to Seek Support from Faculty" by Perrine and James (1995) explored "college students' willingness to seek help from college instructors as a function of student age, class size, and whether a supportive statement was placed on the syllabus" (Perrine & James, 1995, Abstract). The result of the study showed that the students were more likely to express willingness to seek support from an instructor when the instructor explicitly offered outside help on the syllabus. Interestingly, younger students (under age 25) were significantly less willing than older than students to seek help in the neutral condition which means that the syllabus did not include statements

about helping students. The author also concluded that “instructors might be able to encourage more students to seek outside-of-class help by placing supportive statements on the class syllabus” (Perrine & James, 1995, Abstract).

Becker and Calhoun (1999) conducted a study on what introductory psychology students attend to on a course syllabus. The goal of this study was to ask 863 students to rate how much they attend to 29 syllabus items on a Likert-type scale from 1 (no attention at all) to 7 (a great deal of attention) to help instructors produce more comprehensive, informative syllabi. The result of this research showed that “younger students reported paying more attention to items pertaining to holidays and to late assignment and academic dishonesty policies than did older students” (p. 9). In sum, “the attention ratings differed depending on whether participants were first-semester or continuing students and whether they were of traditional age” (p.10).

Garavalia et al. (1999) conducted research named “Constructing the Course Syllabus: Faculty and Student Perceptions of Important Syllabus Components” to examine the students and faculty members’ responses to a survey on the perceived importance of the syllabus components. The findings indicated that faculty and students differ in their perceptions of important syllabus components, such as the instructors’ home phone number, basic format of examinations, length of required projects/papers and the listings of day-to-day class activities. Furthermore, the results of the research provide some guidance: the flexibility of the syllabus is important, so the syllabus should be revised as needed throughout the semester.

The research titled the “Syllabus Survey Spring 2002” written by Meuschke, Gibbons, and Dixon (2002) was conducted at the College of the Canyons, California, in

spring 2002. Eighty-three class sections were surveyed to determine the degree to which students agreed or disagreed that their course syllabus clearly described the eleven syllabus components. They are: course objectives, assignments required, attendance policy, late assignment policy, what is viewed as participation, how participation will be calculated in course grade, instructor's policy for make-up exams, how to compute grade throughout the semester, how the final grade will be computed, instructor's policy regarding classroom behavior, and instructor's policy regarding classroom honesty. Overall, the research comments were positive regarding their course syllabus. Specially, the majority of positive comments indicated that the layout and content of their course syllabus was easy to read and provided them with adequate information.

Doolittle and Lusk (2007) conducted research to explore the effects that gender and institutional classification have on the inclusion of syllabus components. The result of this article, "The Effects of Institutional Classification and Gender on Faculty Inclusion of Syllabus Components," showed that "females included more policy information than males" (p. 62). Furthermore, "while there were institutional classification effects, there were no clear patterns of effect" (p. 62). Additionally, this research provided additional evidence that the components of course syllabi are similar across a wide range of domains and institutions. "This research has also provided additional evidence that policy information is severely lacking on most syllabi and that this policy information should be included" (p. 75).

Thompson (2007) found suggestions on how to present and construct the syllabus more effectively by using the interpretive study approach in 13 classroom observations, 19 teacher interviews, and document analysis of the instructor's syllabi. In

addition, the findings underscore the importance of broadening research on syllabi because the observations and interviews provide a wealth of information on communication strategies teachers employ to address the challenges they face surrounding syllabi.

Becker and Calhon (2008), in their article on “How Students Use the Course Syllabus,” explored how often students consult their syllabi, what syllabus component they cared, and where they kept their syllabi. The results of this study concluded that most students “kept their syllabus with their binder or notebook where they kept their class notes” (p. 4). “More than 60% of students in each administration reported they last looked for whether there was a quiz scheduled for that day’s class, which was the most frequently endorsed item” (p. 6). In addition, “the students in this study, regardless of how late in the semester they were surveyed, reported that they still had their syllabus, and a large majority said they kept it nearby with their class notes” (p. 9). Although this is a positive result, the data showed that “students lack sophistication in using those planners effectively....over half of the students described themselves as having time management difficulties” (p. 10). Additionally, the “feedback from students could help instructors improve the syllabus so that students are better able to make use of it in effective ways” (p. 11).

#### Twelve Articles and One Book Chapter

Lowther, Stark, and Martens (1989) developed a syllabus-improving guide in response to faculty questions about how to prepare more effective course syllabi. The guide is organized into the following sections: basic information: instructor and course; course purpose, goals, and objectives; educational beliefs, content outline; assignments

and course calendar; textbooks; supplementary readings; methods of instruction; student feedback and grouping procedures; and learning facilities and resources for students. Lastly, Lowther suggested that faculty members experiment with longer and shorter syllabi and evaluate the effect on students.

The article “Writing a Syllabus” by Altman (1993) stated “the primary purpose of a syllabus is communication. Additionally, he also suggests two criteria used to decide what information to include in a syllabus: first, include all information that students need to have at the beginning of the course; second, include all information that students need to have in writing” (p. 1).

The article “Designing a Great Syllabus” by Matejka, Ken, Kurke, and Lance (1994) mentioned “four main purposes of a syllabus, which are: a contract, a communication device, a plan, and a cognitive map” (p. 1). In addition, the author also insisted that a syllabus always reveals an instructor’s personality, and it can be used as preventive medicine, because students could know the classroom or course rules in advance.

“The Learning-Centered Syllabus” by Beaudry and Schaub (1998) provides us with another perspective to see the syllabus as a tool to teach students how to learn the subject matter, not just teach the subject matter (p. 1). The author also claims that we could find three main sections in the learning-centered syllabus. First, the instructional goals will be linked with the student performance objectives to enhance student’s learning motives. Second, the instructor will construct the course with a simple organized framework, and just focus on three or four major concepts. Lastly, the instructor will use appropriate instructional activities linked to the performance objectives in the class.

Eberly, Newton, and Wriggins' article "The Syllabus as a Tool for Student-Centered Learning" (2001) analyzed the content of the syllabi of the general education curriculum. She concluded that "the syllabus can be an important learning tool, because it can articulate the goals of general education, and it can direct students' effort and outline expectations for student responsibility" (p. 72).

In the article "The Purposes of a Syllabus" by Parkes and Harris (2002), three main purposes of a syllabus are emphasized: a contract, a permanent record, and a learning tool. The authors also suggest that "the instructor designs a syllabus so that a reader can use it easily to achieve the three main purposes to enhance student learning" (p. 56).

The book *The Professor's Guide to Teaching* by Forsyth (2003) provides a table to describe some of the categories of information included on a syllabus and includes an analysis of course planning (p. 39).

Albers (2003), in her article "Using the Syllabus to Document the Scholarship of Teaching", stated "the reasons why a syllabus be used to document the scholarship of teaching. The reasons include that the syllabus provides the information in hiring and reviewing the faculty members; second, the students could use the syllabus to organize, integrate, and direct learning; lastly, the syllabus aids the faculty members to plan the classroom activities. In addition, the syllabus can also show the mastery of the subject matter of the instructor. As a result, these are reasons that the syllabus can be seen as a proof of teaching" (Albers, 2003, Abstract).

The article "Course Materials - Syllabus and Textbooks" by Wolfe (2004) mentioned the importance of the syllabus and textbooks. In addition, the author also



suggests twelve main syllabus items and tips in choosing a best textbook for the class.

“Preparing an Effective Syllabus” by Slattery and Carlson (2004) identified many functions and purposes of the syllabus, and mentioned three goals that a strong syllabus should meet. The three goals include the facilitation in teaching and learning, the overall pattern of the course communication, and the clarification of the relationship between the goals and the assignments. Lastly, nine main syllabus components are mentioned as well.

Johnson (2006) stated eight main syllabus component categories in her article “Best Practices in Syllabus Writing – Contents of a Learner-Centered Syllabus” and provided an overview of syllabus structure for faculty members and administrators to develop and evaluate their syllabi.

Gambescia (2006) identified the functions of a comprehensive syllabus, and he insisted that the syllabus must be understandable to all stakeholders in higher education in his article *Syllabus Construction with a Commitment to Shared Governance*.

#### Discussion of the Learning-Centered Course Syllabus

The book *The Course Syllabus-A Learning Centered Approach* written by Grunert (2008) provides an overview of the learning-centered syllabus purposes, its construction, and the usage of a syllabus. It is a very practical guide book for all college instructors, because goal of this book is to answer a question: what do students need to know to derive maximum benefit from their educational experience? The answer to this question is the checklist of the learning-centered syllabus components. The 17 items recommended in a complete learning-centered syllabus could help college instructors to meet students' needs in learning.

Appendix A is an arrangement of the reviewed articles and books. It shows the article type; there are eight empirical articles, ten articles from educational authorities, one chapter from a book, and one book.

As illustrated in Appendix A, the published literature mentioned the components of a syllabus, and eight articles identified the functions of a syllabus. Among the purposes of the syllabus, its communication function is especially emphasized by six articles.

#### Six Dissertations Studies of the Course Syllabus

The dissertation *A Content Analysis of Course Syllabi in Special Education Teacher Preparation* by Lucas-Fusco (1993), a content analysis, was “to ascertain if the special education teacher preparation programs are including skills necessary in light of the current reforms in special education” (Lucas-Fusco, 1993, Abstract, ¶ 2). Findings show that:

(1) content analysis procedures adequately answer questions about the content of special education courses; (2) there is limited instruction in content areas occurring in special education teacher preparation courses; (3) instruction in the content area of Science is particularly limited; (4) there seems to be an adequate amount of instruction on educational reform and collaboration; and (5) there appears to be no appreciable difference between courses focused on populations of students with different handicaps. (Lucas-Fusco, 1993, Abstract, ¶ 3)

The dissertation *A Content Analysis of Course Syllabi in Elementary Teacher Preparation* by Shepherd (1996) identified “the common elements for elementary teacher preparation course syllabi which indicate the development of a knowledge base” (Shepherd, 1996, Abstract, ¶ 1). The study found that “course syllabi show common elements which indicate the development of a knowledge base, and the professors of elementary methods courses do articulate the use of a knowledge base when instructing their classes” (Shepherd, 1996, Abstract, ¶ 2).

*The Development of a Model Public Relations Syllabus for Professors of*

*Educational Administration* written by Maher (1997) has three purposes:

to develop a model educational public relations syllabus which not only reflected current positions in educational public relations, but also may be conveniently used by professors who prepare educational administrators; to investigate the nature and extent of adoption of the National School Public Relations Association's (NSPRA) most recent educational public relations model syllabus; and to construct a change process that facilitates model acceptance. (Maher, 1997, Abstract, ¶ 1)

Maher also found that:

the responses of the professors to this survey reflected what an ideal public relations course should contain; the NSPRA's membership efforts were not as good as other professional groups; professors of educational administration are not well acquainted with the goals and objectives of the NSPRA; professors of educational administration are unfamiliar with the School Public Relations Syllabus published by the NSPRA; very little has changed in the essential elements of school public relations; the model school public relations syllabus developed by this study is most accurate, thorough, and complete; the NSPRA's School Public Relations Syllabus represents an excellent initial effort to standardize school public relations; and the model public relations syllabus developed by this study is more complete and replete than the School Public Relations Syllabus of the NSPRA. (Maher, 1997, Abstract, ¶ 3)

Phwandaphwanda's dissertation (2003) *An Assessment of Undergraduate Course Syllabi at the University of Arkansas* examined the extent to which the instructors who teach at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville wrote recommended components of the course syllabus in their syllabi in the undergraduate courses. The author used a quantitative study to collect online syllabi and paper copies of syllabi from colleges, departments, and faculty. Phwandaphwanda concluded:

(1) Nearly all colleges and departments had copies of course syllabi for course sections. Only three course sections did not have course syllabi. The wide usage of the course syllabus indicated that faculty at the University of Arkansas recognized the importance of the course syllabus. (2) Other than basic information and course requirements, faculty emphasized information about grading and evaluation in their syllabi more than they stressed other components. Overall, the extent to which they included essential components in their syllabi did

not satisfy the standards suggested by authors reviewed in the study.

(3) Twenty-six of 34 heads of departments (76%) indicated that their departments provided guidelines about development of course syllabi. In addition, 22 of 26 heads of departments (85%) indicated that their departments provided guidelines to faculty and an example of course syllabi with components that their department considered important. In light of the frequent omission of essential components in most of the course syllabi assessed, it was clear that faculty did not follow guidelines given to them. (Phwandaphwanda, 2003, Abstract, ¶ 3)

Roman-Perez 's dissertation (2007) *Lessons for Everyone from the Basic Skills Classroom: A critical discourse analysis of basic writing syllabi* shows that: "a critical understanding of the importance of discourse in the syllabi for basic writing skills courses--courses for students who historically have been deemed as underprepared for higher education" (Roman-Perez, 2007, Abstract). Findings also provide "insight on how the way the syllabi is worded mirrors the instructors' ideologies, and how wording influences student perceptions--especially younger students and those with a lower grade point average" (Roman-Perez, 2007, Abstract).

Satterfield (2007), in her dissertation *Factors Influencing Faculty Members' Motivation in Integrating Service-Learning into Their Syllabi* studied multiple factors linked to the integration of service learning within course syllabi. Satterfield concluded that the analysis of the data revealed that there is considerable interest in service-learning as a teaching pedagogy among the faculty members who were surveyed.

#### Four Main Functions of a Course Syllabus

##### *Communication*

Communication is one of the syllabus' important functions. The communication of the syllabus has some characteristics which differentiate it from other kinds of communication tools. "The syllabus is a written communication tool and device between

the course instructor and students, colleagues and administrators” (Garavalia, 1999, p. 5). In addition, the timing of this communication is specifically at the beginning of the semester or in the first class; the syllabus plays a role as an initial *step* for students to know the information of the course.

In addition, Weimer (2003) stated that “many instructional approaches respond ineffectively to the learning needs and life time situations of today’s college students. And this disconnect between instructional approaches and students’ learning needs is occurring at a time when college graduates require increasingly sophisticated intellectual skills to function in the modern world” (p. 49). Moreover, she proposed five key change techniques for college instructors to practice in their class to effect a deeper change in the active learning climate. The first technique is to balance the power in the classroom, which means the faculty could open up to student involvement in decision making about all components in the learning process in the first class. The second techniques is to change the role of the teacher, which means the teacher can be a coach or a guide, instead of the sage, and tell students how to do something, not to do it for them. These two techniques stated the communication function syllabi can reach.

Garavalia (1999) stated that “the syllabus usually represents the initial contact between the instructor and students” (p. 8). Eberly et al. (2001) also concur “the syllabus is often the initial communication tool that students receive as well as being the most formal mechanism for sharing information with students regarding any course” (p. 56). Since the communication of the syllabus is always done in the early stage of each class, the syllabus has another characteristic as a problem prevention device. As a result, a well-written, organized, and comprehensive syllabus saves the students’ and the

instructors' time later, because the students could review their syllabus, and find out the information immediately they need. And when there are disputes or troubles in the class in the future, the syllabus can be a reference to solve the problems in the classroom (Matejka et al., 1994). Lastly, the syllabus could also reflect the instructors' teaching philosophy, attitudes and the things he/she valued for students. Wolfe (2004) found the following:

Well written materials, whether it is a syllabus, research proposal, or another course document such as an assignment or worksheet, demonstrates that the author is organized, committed, and enthusiastic about the topic. It is important that a syllabus convey these attributes to the students, because the syllabus serves as a means to introduce the instructor and the course to the students. (p. 56)

The syllabus is a communication tool used by the instructor to show students, administrators, or other people who want to know more about the course. Not surprisingly, the syllabus communication content reveals much information regarding the *overall course*. According to Lowther et al. (1989), a syllabus is the most commonly used technique to communicate the plans, expectations, course information, and instructor views to students. Another researcher Albers (2003) mentioned that the instructor uses the syllabus to convey the expectations for students, experiences, overall course purposes, and teaching strategies of the course that can enable the learners to reach the teaching goals. Additionally, the syllabus should tell the students about the overall pattern of the course so that learners know the role and the functions of each assignment and activity. Then a course becomes a well-organized and a meaningful journey (Slattery & Carlson, 2005). In addition to the overall patterns of the course, some syllabi also mention the course purposes, objectives, what students can do to reach the teaching goals and get a passing grade, classroom management policies, the role of this course

within the whole program, and the relationship of this course with other courses and its functions (Wolfe, 2004). It seems the content of the syllabus includes all aspects about a course, Altman (1993) discusses “how to write complete syllabus content with four questions: What the course is about? Why the course is taught? Where it is going? And what will be required of the students for them to complete the course with a passing grade?” (p. 1). These four questions convey most syllabus communication of its key contents. Lastly, the syllabus communicates not only to the learners, but sometimes also to the accrediting agencies, university administrators or other faculty members. In order to meet all these standards, “a comprehensive syllabus should consistently and accurately communicate the institution’s policies, procedures, expectation for students to ensure that students and other readers understand what is expected for tasks, time, and quality in all learning activities” (Gambescia, 2006, p. 25).

In addition to the syllabus communication characteristics and its communication content, it is critical to know what impact a syllabus has on student attitudes for learning. The literature review indicates that students tend to be more willing to seek the instructor’s out-of-class support when the syllabus explicitly reveals the instructor’s will to offer help (Perrine, 1995; Calhoon & Becker, 2008). As a result, if the syllabus is written with supportive statements, students are more willing to ask the teacher for help, then it might improve student learning in higher education. It is not only what we write in the syllabus, but how we write it is essential as well.

### *Teaching and Learning*

The syllabus could be a facilitator for both the instructor teaching as well as the student learning. In the first class, the instructor delivers the syllabus to the students; a

well-organized, personalized, professional and comprehensive syllabus might impress the students. It is possible that the instructors take this marvelous opportunity to make a manageable, profound first impression about who they are, what they value via the syllabus they design. The instructor is also like a tour guide of the intellectual journey, telling students the routes they will take, the detours needed, and the method of travel (Matejka et al., 1994). According to Gambescia (2006), “the syllabus has become better known as the course roadmap, students could know the academic route they might take in the course, and how they get to the destination with how much effort they make” (p. 20). In addition, the syllabus is also a planning device that helps the instructor to organize the course content and provides learners with the teaching methods, course expectations, and the overall course rationale (Lowther et al., 1989).

“In the first day of the course, it is normal for students to make decisions regarding taking or dropping a course. Therefore, it can be inferred that if a student enrolls in a course, they might agree to the “terms” of the syllabus written by the instructor” (Smith & Razzouk, 1993, p. 2). As a result, the syllabus has impacts on students’ decision making process in choosing the courses. Moreover, a well-written, organized, comprehensive, and thoughtful syllabus is also an effective learning facilitator for students, because it serves learners as an example of professional thinking and writing, and it provides the information which assists students become amore effective learners, and it also tells the learners that the instructor value these qualities (Parkes & Harris, 2002). The strongest syllabi set the proper assignments and papers related to process course objectives, this helps students to know if they meet each goal (Slattery & Carlson, 2005). Lowther et al. (1989) found that “recent research confirms that students learn



more effectively when they understand faculty intentions about course matters” (p. 8).

Albers (2003) found the following:

An effective syllabus can go beyond merely listing subject matter; it creates a thematic framework that assists students in organizing the component parts of a course into a conceptual whole. The syllabus serves as a cognitive map that helps students locate the final destination for the course and the markers that will keep them on track. Also, it shows them how the pieces of the course fit together and how the assigned work will lead them to the final goal. (p. 61)

There are some factors that impact the content of syllabi, such as the course level and the instructors’ educational philosophy. The syllabus content will vary according to the course level, for example, if it is an introductory course for all freshman students, the syllabus may be focus on the breadth and depth of a certain field. In contrast, if it is an advanced graduate course, the instructor might ask the students to participate in course design to develop a course more suited for the course level. Additionally, “if an instructor holds a behaviorist view of learning, his/her syllabus might be designed differently at some extent from the one who holds other learning theory view” (Parkes & Harris, 2002, p. 58).

When students read a syllabus, it is likely that the student can see the subject matter through the teacher’s eyes, and see how the instructor organizes, analyzes, and plans for learning this subject matter. “The goal of the learning-centered syllabus is to teach students how to learn the subject matter, not just teach the subject matter”

(Beaudry & Schaub, 1998, p. 2). Parkes and Harris (2002) stated the following:

A learning centered-syllabus will provide information about how to plan for the tasks and experiences of the semester, how to evaluate and monitor one’s performance, and how to allocate time and resources to areas in which more learning is needed. This information can help students develop self-management skills that are valuable beyond the demands of a particular course. (p. 58)

As a result, the learning-centered syllabus reveals how an instructor selects topics,

orders the sequence of them, and how students will learn and analyze the subject matter. A well-written syllabus does convey to students what the instructor finds important in the course, and at the same time, offers the learning a material to help students become better self-learners (Albers, 2003). "Some students use the syllabus to allocate their time effectively, and note the test date or paper due date on their schedule book, so they can manage their time better" (Slattery & Carlson, 2005, p. 160).

From Boyer's perspective (1990), the faculty can do their research on their teaching, making the research and teaching to be connected to improve the teaching and learning. He states that the definition of scholarship should be extended, and there are four main scholarly activities for college faculty: the scholarship of discovery, the discovery of integration, the scholarship of application and the scholarship of teaching (p. 23). Moreover, Barr and Tagg (1995) mentioned the shift of the instruction paradigm to the learning paradigm. Focus was moved from instructors' teaching to students' learning. How to re-design the course to gain better learning outcomes plays an essential role in the development of the higher education, and they supports any learning method and structure that works, where "works" is defined in terms of learning outcomes (p. 20). As a result, it is important for instructors to know the basic items of the syllabi in order to help students with better learning outcomes.

### *Contract*

The third function of a syllabus includes the characteristics of a contract, document, and an agreement. The syllabus as a contract has two meanings: the explicit contract, and the implicit contract. The difference between these two contracts is the explicit contract still has the administrative outline in words. In contrast, the implicit

contract is known by the non-verbal behavior, such as the inference or tones of the instructors. According to Eberly et al. (2001):

The syllabus as an explicit contract is still an administrative outline “they (syllabi) usually outline the protocols of the course: subject matter, number and times of class meetings, titles of texts and readings, grading policy, written and oral assignments, office hours, and the like” (Hansen, 1991, p. 128). In comparison, the implicit contract is negotiated through non-verbal behavior, such as the “nuances, overtones, implications and inferences (that) create the unspoken agreements by which the class conducts itself” (p. 128).

In recent years, the syllabus has become more of a contract and an agreement, because when the students enroll in the course, it means that the students implicitly agree on the rules and requirements of that course. In contrast, the instructors agree to follow and execute in good faith the terms of the syllabus as well. As a result, the syllabus is the core document for academic administrators to inspect” (p. 20). In addition, the syllabus should be a good faith agreement, and can be revised during the semester if needed, because it is not a static document. The instructor can amend it with good will, instead of changing it in a way to punish students (Gambescia, 2006).

If a syllabus is clear and detailed, it can be of great help with the lawsuits, grievances or disputes in the classroom. According to Parkes and Harris (2002), “the contract perspective of the syllabus is particularly helpful in settling formal and informal grievances. Many grievances arise out of unclear expectations or unclear communication of expectations” (p. 56).

### *Record*

With the coming of the Information Age, the online syllabus is essential as a permanent record, because it is easier to be amended and shared with others (McDonald, 2007). Moreover, “the climate of accountability and litigation in higher

education institutions makes the educational process place a new emphasis on the syllabus as an agreement between the instructor and the students” (Albers, 2003, p. 61). “There are two reasons why the syllabus becomes a permanent record: accountability and documentation. The institution needs evidence of instructional effectiveness for external reviews. The syllabus is a good tool to show the faculty members’ ability for their annual reviews or merit pay reviews” (Parkes & Harris, 2002, p. 57). Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1996) mentioned six standards to define and evaluate the quality of undergraduate education. They are: clear goals adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation and reflective critique. The first two standards can be proved and showed on a well written syllabus, because a syllabus usually mentions the clear goals of the course, and it is possible to see an instructors’ level of preparation and mastery for the subject. In sum, the syllabus may be a good tool to document the scholarship if it provides the evidence of the faculty member’s body of the scholarly work.

The syllabus is a document for outsiders to evaluate the instructor’s teaching ability, professional teaching effectiveness, and their teaching philosophy. It is reasonable that outsiders usually use the syllabus to evaluate and judge the instructor’s performance in academic settings.

Slattery and Carlson (2005) identifies the following:

A well-written syllabus effectively communicates the nature and quality of a faculty member’s teaching philosophy and abilities to tenure and promotion committees or search committees at other universities syllabi also serve a vital function in accreditation efforts, where accrediting bodies look to syllabi to ascertain what happens in specific courses and then look across syllabi to gauge learning more broadly (such as within a specific discipline or major). This function is an important one, as external bodies often must assess teaching indirectly. (p. 160)

Parkes and Harris (2002) also stated that a well-constructed syllabus could be used to show the effectiveness or the ineffectiveness of the instructors or academic programs.

The syllabus is used by the review committees to judge an instructor's professional ability, the attitudes towards students, and how they evaluate learners. Additionally, the review committees also use the syllabus as evidence to see if the teaching content fits the goals of the program or the institution. The teaching objectives and the student assignments may reveal if the instructor is cognizant of the level of the learners in the course. (p. 57)

Albers (2003) states the following:

The importance of the syllabus in documenting teaching is conveyed in teaching evaluation and employment. Teaching effectiveness is judged at various career points, including job applications, contract renewals, and tenure and promotion reviews. The September 2001 edition of the American Sociological Association's Employment Bulletin listed 199 positions in academic settings. Fourteen of those position announcements specifically required the submission of course syllabi as part of the application materials and three positions required teaching portfolios, which are assumed to include syllabi. (p. 62)

Gambescia (2006) states:

At the beginning of each semester, many students come to the department office to ask for credit transfer or course waiving; the syllabus is mostly the only document which can prove they have taken professional similar courses the department required. As a result, the syllabus should be understandable, comprehensive, clear and accurate to outsiders. (p. 23)

"The syllabus can be used to determine if the students' request for credit transferring is appropriate or not" (Parkes & Harris, 2002, p. 57).

The syllabus plays an important role in higher education nowadays, because many people depend on it for their decision making process, such as student credit transferring, course waiving, instructor teaching effectiveness, institution hiring, instructor promoting, curriculum developing, and accrediting agency reference. In order to satisfy each person's needs, Gambescia (2006) proposed the concept of the "comprehensive

syllabus,” which is a syllabus that meets the needs of all stakeholders. Developing a comprehensive syllabus should meet the needs of the stakeholders at every level: students, faculty, academic departments, respective colleges within the university, and the overall interest of the institution.

### Syllabus Components

The researchers I have reviewed mentioned a total of fourteen main components of the syllabus, and some sub-titles in each of them. The Appendices B and C show the syllabus items mentioned from the literature; the difference between Appendix B and C is that Appendix C is arranged by the frequency order of the syllabus components. These include the following fourteen items: content outline, course information, course calendar/schedule, course purpose, course objectives, course goal, course description, course rationale, instructor information, assignment information, exam information, grading information, policy information, and support services/resources. The seven syllabus items mentioned most frequently by the articles include the course information, grading information, instructor information, calendar/schedule, course objective, and the policy information. In other words, most authors identified the seven items as required syllabus components.

In contrast, the four items barely mentioned in the literature review include the exam types, course purpose, course rationale, and teaching philosophy. As indicated by the Literature, these were not included very often in the syllabi that I reviewed. To my surprise, these four items seemed rather important for student learning, but few researchers added them in the syllabus component list.

The book: *The Course Syllabus: A Learning-Centered Approach* written by

Grunert (2008) is a very detailed and insightful reference to the issue of the learning-centered syllabus, because the content of the book includes complete examples, discussion, and purposes of the learning-centered syllabus. An instructor who uses the learning-centered syllabus not only teaches the students the subject matter, but also teaches the students the method and the way of learning the subject matter actively in the future. Students will learn both the content of the subject matter and the methods they might need to reach the objectives of the course. Based on this book, there are ten main items included in a learning-centered syllabus. With this template, we can check the extent to how a syllabus matches the goal of the learning-centered syllabus as recommended by Grunert. If we compare the learning-centered syllabus model to the traditional course syllabi, in addition to the regular components, the learning-centered syllabus emphasizes how to develop an effective learning context. Therefore, a learning-centered syllabus provides a very well-structured knowledge base, desired outcomes and assessment measures, the structure of the learning involvement, and required resources for active learning.

According to Grunert (2008), a model for a learning-centered syllabus includes: rationale/purpose of the course; teaching philosophy; course description/class type; course objective; readings; resources; course calendar; evaluation/assignment; grading procedure; tools and skills for study and learning.

By reviewing the literature, it is reasonable to arrange and infer a syllabus components template which includes the main important syllabus components from the literature that could be used to analyze the syllabi in colleges and universities in Taiwan in order to gain better understanding of the syllabus usage and writing in Taiwan's higher

educational institutions, and then to improve the college teaching outcomes in Taiwan's higher education in the future.

#### Context of Syllabus Usage in Taiwan's Higher Education

Taiwan's higher education system is similar to that of the United States; in other words, Taiwan's higher education system is mostly based on the U.S. educational system. Many Taiwanese professors also earned their doctoral degrees from the U.S. universities, thus it is appropriate and logical to apply the U.S. syllabus components template, the learning-centered syllabus template, and the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template to assess the 235 syllabi in English departments in universities in Taiwan. Some institutions provide the faculty members with a standard syllabus format for them to put the content in it; however, some instructors still choose to write their syllabi with their own styles, but the syllabus components in Taiwan's universities are almost the same as those of the U.S.

#### Conclusion

In this literature review, 8 of 20 articles are empirical studies, the remaining 12 articles are the judgments of the professional educators. Six dissertations were found which analyzed syllabi in different instructional contexts. As the literature suggests, the syllabus has an impact on many aspects of learning and teaching in higher education, such as student learning, teaching improvement, hiring and instruction evaluation, permanent record and scholarship documentation.

The core value of the importance of the syllabus on higher education instruction still has much to be explored, and I could not deny the critical role it plays in individual professor teaching effectiveness, student learning improvement, and evaluation, and the



standard for the grievance in the classroom. The integrity of a syllabus includes its characteristics as an explicit public document, as evidence in judicial hearings, and as a standard to evaluate the course credit and transfer situations (Eberly, Newton, & Wiggins, 2001). From this literature, agreement emerges on the recommended components for a syllabus and for a learning-centered syllabus.

## CHAPTER III

### DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

#### Introduction

The study investigated the current syllabus context of English departments at universities in Taiwan. This chapter discusses the procedures for the collection and analysis of the data for the exploration of the following research questions:

1. What syllabus components can be inferred from the published literature on the use of syllabi for teaching and learning in the United States?
2. From the components derived from question one, what syllabus components template and what learning-centered syllabus template can be inferred?
3. Given the syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template, what are the most frequently mentioned syllabus components in these two templates in English departments at universities in Taiwan?
4. Given the syllabus component template and the learning-centered syllabus template, what syllabi components are the least mentioned in these two templates in English departments at universities in Taiwan?
5. To what extent are the syllabi in English departments at the universities in Taiwan congruent to the requirements suggested for inclusion in the syllabus components template?
6. To what extent are the syllabi in English departments at the universities in Taiwan congruent to the requirements suggested for inclusion in the learning-centered syllabus template?
7. Are the syllabi verbs reflected in the objective and the assignment part of English departments at universities in Taiwan differentiating in their cognitive level of learning with different courses according to the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template?
8. Is there any difference in the level of congruence with the three templates in the faculty members' academic background and the institution type (public or private)?

#### Research Design

In order to provide more critical, comprehensive insight to the research topic both from the representative of the literature in the U.S.A. and from the context on teaching

and learning in Taiwan, the syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template were developed with doctoral student Yao-Tsu Tung. This provided a check and balance review of sources for review and of identification of components for the syllabus template and for the learning-centered syllabus template. Thus, copyright for the material in Appendices A, B and C is shared between Baysan Lin and Yao-Tsu Tung, and is reproduced with permission of both authors. When collecting and analyzing the data, I worked by myself.

Also, I have an interest in English language study. My master's degree was in English as a Second Language. I taught English language courses for four years to students preparing to teach English in junior and high schools in Taiwan.

The study employed a descriptive, inductive and qualitative research method to infer two templates from the literature and research, and the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template to examine 235 syllabi from the Departments of English in 22 universities in Taiwan. Seven English courses in 22 universities in Taiwan were analyzed to describe the extent to which the syllabi from universities in Taiwan match the two U.S. syllabus templates. In addition, the learning-level characteristics of verbs were also assessed on the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template. This design examined multiple course syllabi in order to draw insights and inferences as to the characteristics of course syllabi in English departments at universities in Taiwan.

In this dissertation, I chose the syllabi from seven English subjects taught in the Departments of English at 22 universities in Taiwan as the syllabi for analysis, because of the following reasons. First, the syllabi in the English departments are mostly written in English; I assume it is more appropriate and easier for international researchers to

compare and understand the contents of the syllabi in Taiwan's higher education.

Second, personally, I am interested in the development of English teaching and learning program in Taiwan, and I assumed this research could help me gain more insight in this area. Lastly, the undergraduate courses of the English departments are mostly alike at each university, and they are regulated by the Minister of Education. As a result, it is reasonable to compare the syllabi on the seven main subjects taught in the Departments of English in different universities.

### Three Instruments for Data Analysis

Two syllabus templates were inferred from the literature reviews, and the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template was used as the third tool to assess the course syllabi verbs to see to what extent to which the syllabi in Taiwan match the ones of the U.S., and to describe their level of learning among different English courses. The first two templates inferred from the literature are called the syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template.

#### *The Syllabus Components Template*

The syllabus components template was the first analysis tool which came from the authorities' opinions and researchers' data from the literature review. Twenty-one articles, 1 book, and 1 book chapter regarding the syllabus components were reviewed. Some additional sources were removed because they barely mentioned the syllabus. Fourteen main categories of items were regarded essential in the literature, and some items include sub-items. Appendices B and C show the syllabus items mentioned by the literature; the difference between the two is that the Appendix C is arranged by the frequency order of the syllabus components. These include the following 14 items:

content outline, course information, course calendar/schedule, course purpose, course objectives, course goal, course description, course rationale, instructor information, assignment information, exam information, grading information, policy information, and support services/resources. By reviewing the literature, it is reasonable to arrange and infer the syllabus components template which includes the main important syllabus components from the literature that could be used to analyze the syllabi in colleges and universities in Taiwan. The following is the syllabus components template:

Table 1

*Syllabus Components Template*

Institution		College	
Department		Course	
Instructor		Gender	
Degree		Country	
Nationality			
Components		Included	Comments
1. Course Information		1.	
.1 Name / Title			
.2 Number			
.3 Term/Semester			
.4 Location			
.5 Time			
.6 Credit			
.7 Type/Format			
.8 Topics			
.9 Requirement			
.10 Textbooks			
.11 Readings			
.12 Activities			
2. Instructor Information		2.	
.1 Name			
.2 Office Location			
.3 Office Hours			
.4 Phone No.			
.5 Email Address			
.6 Academic Background			
.7 Teaching Philosophy			
.8 Teaching Type			
3. Course Objective		3.	
.1 Rationale			
.2 Course Purposes			
.3 Course Goals			

*(table continues)*

Table 1 (*continued*).

Components	Included	Comments
4. Content Outline	4.	
1. Course Description		
5. Course Calendar	5.	
6. Assignment	6.	
.1 Type		
.2 Due Time		
7. Exam	7.	
.1 Date / Time		
.2 Type		
8. Grading	8.	
.1 Policy		
.2 Procedure		
.3 Criteria		
.4 Weights/Points		
9. Policy	9.	
.1 Attendance		
.2 Late Assignment		
.3 Make Up		
.4 Missed Work		
.5 Academic Honesty		
.6 Disability		
10. Services / Resources	10.	
Total		

### *The Learning-Centered Syllabus Template*

The book, *The Course Syllabus: A Learning-Centered Approach* written by Grunert (2008), is a very detailed and insightful reference to the issue of the learning-centered syllabus, because the content of the book includes complete examples, discussion, and purposes of the learning-centered syllabus. An instructor who uses the learning-centered syllabus not only teaches the students the subject matter, but also teaches the students the method and the way of learning the subject matter actively in the future. Students will learn both the content of the subject matter and the methods they might need to reach the objectives of the course. Based on this book, there are ten main items included in a learning-centered syllabus. With this template, we can check the extent to how a syllabus matches the goal of the learning-centered syllabus as

recommended by Grunert (2008). If we compare the learning-centered syllabus model to the traditional course syllabi, in addition to the regular components, the learning-centered syllabus emphasizes how to develop an effective learning context. Therefore, a learning-centered syllabus provides a very well-structured knowledge base, desired outcomes and assessment measures, the structure of the learning involvement, and required resources for active learning.

According to Grunert (2008), a model for a learning-centered syllabus includes: rationale/purpose of the course; teaching philosophy; course description/class type; course objective; readings; resources; course calendar; evaluation/assignment; grading procedure; tools and skills for study and learning. Table 2 is the learning-centered syllabus component table:

Table 2

*Learning-Centered Syllabus Template*

Institution		College	
Department		Course	
Instructor		Gender	
Degree		Country	
Nationality			
Component		Included	
1. Purpose/Rationale			
2. Teaching Philosophy			
3. Course Description			
4. Course Objective			
5. Readings			textbooks or handouts
6. Resources			published materials, individuals, writing & math centers
7. Course Calendar			
8. Evaluation/Assignment			
9. Grading Procedure			grading percentage/point and criteria/rubric
10. Tools and Skills for Learning			tools or skills listed
Total			

*Bloom Cognitive Domain Taxonomy Template*

With the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template (Table 3), the verbs

appeared in the course objective and the assignment of the syllabi were examined to see if there any characteristics or variance in the seven different English subjects. The verbs appeared on the syllabi were categorized to one of the six learning levels in order to examine if there are any variance for different courses in the English departments. The verbs in the syllabi can match or be the same as the verb list on the Bloom template or consider if the verbs on the syllabi are not the exact same verb but a verb that implies or means the same that I can count it as being the same as the Bloom suggested verb.

Table 3

*Bloom Cognitive Domain Taxonomy Template*

Level	Suggested Verbs
1. Knowledge	Count, Define, Describe, Draw, Find, Identify, Label, List, Match, Name, Quote, Recall, Recite, Sequence, Tell, Write
2. Comprehension	Conclude, Demonstrate, Discuss, Explain, Generalize, Identify, Illustrate, Interpret, Paraphrase, Predict, Report, Restate, Review, Summarize, Tell
3. Application	Apply, Change, Choose, Compute, Dramatize, Interview, Prepare, Produce, Role-play, Select, Show, Transfer, Use
4. Analysis	Analyze, Characterize, Classify, Compare, Contrast, Debate, Deduce, Diagram, Differentiate, Discriminate, Distinguish, Examine, Outline, Relate, Research, Separate
5. Synthesis	Compose, Construct, Create, Design, Develop, Integrate, Invent, Make, Organize, Perform, Plan, Produce, Propose, Rewrite
6. Evaluation	Appraise, Argue, Assess, Choose, Conclude, Critic, Decide, Evaluate, Judge, Justify, Predict, Prioritize, Prove, Rank, Rate, Select

Procedures for Collection of the Syllabi Data

These procedures were used to locate and download the selected course syllabi from the university websites.

1. Go to the website of the Ministry of Education (MOE) of Taiwan.
2. Then go to the official websites of the universities from the website of MOE.



3. Go to the websites of the universities individually.
4. To access the main page of Course System, I went to the main page of school first, and then search for the Course Searching System Icon: Then I can access the Course Information Platform System.
5. After entering into the Course Information Platform System, then I went to find the syllabi from the specific department.
6. I repeated this method to find out each course syllabus of the Department of English of each university.

### *Syllabi Data Characteristics*

There are the criteria for selection of syllabi for this study:

1. Online course syllabi
2. Posted at university websites
3. Year 2008 fall semester
4. Undergraduate courses
5. Courses of the Department of English

For the example of the ABC University, the core courses include: (1) English composition, (2) English listening and speaking practice, (3) introduction to western literature, (4) introduction to linguistics, (5) approaches to literary works, (6) history of English literature, (7) English conversation, (8) introduction to the sentence structure, (9) English phonetics, (10) translation and (11) American literature.

### *Procedure for Data Collection*

1. Go to the website of each of universities individually
2. Go to the web page of course syllabi system, including all course syllabi
3. Go to the course syllabi of the Department of English
4. Identify the course syllabi and print them out, in addition, all the syllabi are written in English, as a result, there is no need to translate them to English

5. Complete the checklists of the syllabus components template for all course syllabi, and note their characteristics.
6. Complete the checklists of the learning-centered syllabus template for all course syllabi, and note their characteristics
7. Complete the examination of the verbs appeared in the objective and the assignment parts of the syllabi according to the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template to judge the learning level in the syllabi, not down the cognitive domain level.

### Three Sections for the Data Analysis

#### *Syllabus Components Template Analysis*

Based on the syllabus components template (Table 1), there are 10 major items.

The levels of the completeness of each syllabus were identified by the total frequencies of each component item:

1. From 0% to 30% of completeness as low completeness (L)
2. From 31% to 60% of completeness as medium completeness (M)
3. From 61% to 100% as high completeness (H)

With this three-level standard, each course syllabus can be easily judged and assigned to a level.

#### *Learning-Centered Syllabus Template Analysis*

Based on the learning-centered syllabus template (Table 2), there were 10 major items. The levels of the learning-centered of each syllabus can be identified by the total numbers of items matched with the model.

1. From 1 to 3 as low learning-centered (L)
2. From 4 to 6 as medium learning-centered (M)
3. From 7 to 10 as high learning-centered (H)

### *Bloom Cognitive Domain Taxonomy Template Analysis*

Based on the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template (Table 3) in the cognitive domain, each syllabus was examined for verbs appeared in the objective and the assignment part. After I noted the verbs in the syllabi, then the learning level (1-6) was assessed.

Data analysis followed the general process suggested by Miles and Huberman (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and included data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. In addition, data reduction included acquiring the course syllabi to be analyzed, the review of each syllabus, and entering its component parts onto the syllabus component and learning-centered templates. Data display involved organizing the existence of components, learning-centered criteria and the result of the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template analysis into categories and frequencies in each syllabus analysis template. Drawing conclusions based on the summary data consisted of deciding what the meaning of the summary data as present in the three syllabus templates implies or indicates.

Based on the outcomes of the completeness levels of all course syllabi for the syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template, the extent to which course syllabi of English departments at universities in Taiwan are congruent, different or similar to the U.S. models can be easily identified. To a great extent or some, if there are some other differences regarding some specific items, I discussed them in the findings.

Lastly, for the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template analysis result, each syllabus was examined for its verbs found in the objectives and/or the learning

assignment sections of the syllabus, then I noted the learning levels for each syllabi to summarize findings and to draw conclusions regarding any differences or learning levels within the seven English courses.

#### Reporting of the Data

The data analysis included a thorough interpretation of the results of the syllabus components template, the learning-centered syllabus template and the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template in different courses in English departments in Taiwan. In addition, the distribution of each syllabus item for each subject, and the findings of the learning level characteristics for different English courses are shown.

Finally, a conclusion on whether college course syllabi components of Taiwan are congruent or not to the U.S. model was made. Furthermore, the difference or any findings regarding the learning-centered syllabus template between each English subject was addressed. The difference of the cognitive level showed in the syllabi was also addressed.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

This study reviewed 235 syllabi from 7 core courses of Departments of English at 13 public and 9 private universities in Taiwan. Two templates were developed from the literature: the syllabus components template, the learning-centered syllabus template; the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template was also used as the third tool to analyze the syllabi. The task was to review the 235 syllabi from universities in Taiwan with these three template models to estimate the extent of congruence between each of the templates and these syllabi. The seven courses in the English departments of these universities included: composition, conversation, introduction to literature, linguistics, TESOL (teaching English to speakers of other languages), western literature and translation.

#### Data Processing

The 235 syllabi were chosen from the websites of the 13 public and 9 private universities in Taiwan. Each syllabus was reviewed by the three templates separately, and then the data results of each syllabus were typed into database software to process the results. In this study, most syllabi (155) were written by female instructors, and 80 syllabi were written by male instructors. As a result, most instructors (66%) are female in the Departments of the English in these universities in Taiwan.

#### Answers to the Eight Research Questions

Q1. What syllabus components can be inferred from the published literature on the use of syllabi for teaching and learning in the United States?

From the literature, ten main syllabus items and some sub-items within the main items are mentioned by the professional practitioners and researchers. The components

are arranged in ten main categories, and the sub-components of each main component that have more specific details or characteristics within the main components. Any syllabus with one of the sub-components was categorized to the main component category when reviewed. I listed the recommended components in the Table 1 (the syllabus components template).

Q2. From the components derived from Question 1, what syllabus components template and what learning-centered syllabus template can be inferred?

There were two templates derived from the literature, the syllabus components template (see Table 1) and the learning-centered syllabus template (see Table 2); both list the basic components for each template. The syllabus component template can be a model to check the syllabi's completeness for the recommended items, and the learning-centered syllabus template can be a tool to check whether a syllabus includes the items which reflect the goals or the philosophy of a learning-centered class.

The syllabus components template which comes from the authorities and researchers' opinions from the literature was the first analysis tool. Ten main categories of items were regarded essential in the literature, and some items include sub-items.

In addition, the book: *The Course Syllabus: A Learning-Centered Approach* by Grunert (2008) provides a detailed reference to the issue of the learning-centered syllabus, because the content of the book includes complete examples of the learning-centered syllabus. Grunert argues that an instructor who uses the learning-centered syllabus not only teaches the students the subject matter but also teaches the students the method of learning the subject matter actively. Based on this book, there are ten main items included in a learning-centered syllabus. With this template, we can check the extent that a syllabus matches the goal of the

learning-centered syllabus as recommended by Grunert (2008). If we compare the learning-centered syllabus template to the traditional course syllabi, in addition to the regular components, the learning-centered syllabi emphasizes how to develop an effective learning context and provide a well-structured knowledge base, desired outcomes and assessment measures, the structure of the learning involvement, and required resources for active learning as well. According to Grunert (2008), a learning-centered syllabus includes: rationale/purpose of the course; teaching philosophy; course description/class type; course objective; readings; resources; course calendar; evaluation/assignment; grading procedure; tools and skills for study and learning.

Q3. Given the syllabus components template and the learning-centered syllabus template, what are the most frequently mentioned syllabus components in these two templates in English departments at universities in Taiwan?

Among the 235 syllabi, an overall finding for the syllabus component template is shown in Table 4. From Table 4, the number and frequency of the appearance of each component is reported.

Table 4

*Overall Findings for the Syllabus Components Template (Table 1): Number and Percentage for Each Component for the 235 Syllabi Reviewed*

Component	Number	%
1. Course Information	235	100
1.1 Title	235	100
1.2 Course Number	120	51
1.3 Semester	128	54
1.4 Location	74	31
1.5 Time	92	39
1.6 Credit	147	63

*(table continues)*

Table 4 (continued).

Component	Number	%
1.7 Format	76	32
1.8 Topic	8	3
1.9 Requirement	31	13
1.10 Textbook	152	65
1.11 Reference	75	32
1.12 Activity	2	1
2. Instructor Information	235	100
2.1 Name	235	100
2.2 Office Location	42	18
2.3 Office Hours	51	22
2.4 Phone Number	43	51
2.5 E-Mail Address	65	28
2.6 Academic Background	1	0.4
2.7 Teaching Philosophy	11	5
2.8 Teaching Type	76	32
3. Course Objective	147	63
3.1 Course Rationale	22	9
3.2 Course Purposes	0	0
3.3 Course Goals	5	2
4. Content Outline	160	68
4.1 Course Description	107	46
5. Course Calendar	160	68
6. Assignment	135	57
6.1 Type	22	9
6.2 Due Date/Time	10	4
7. Exam	164	70
7.1 Type	10	4
7.2 Date/Time	2	1
8. Grading Policy	193	82
8.1 Grading Policy	3	1
8.2 Procedure	2	1
8.3 Criteria	25	11
8.4 Weight/ Point	167	71
9. Policy	157	67
9.1 Attendance	155	70
9.2 Late Assignment	4	2
9.3 Make Up	1	0.4
9.4 Missed Work	1	0.4
9.5 Academic Honesty	3	1
9.6 Disability	0	0
10. Service. Resource	25	11



Based on the data in Table 4, Table 5 includes the rankings of the top five components which appeared the most frequently in the 235 syllabi.

Table 5

*Rankings of the Top Five Components from Syllabus Components Template (Table 4 Results) which Appeared Most Frequently in the 235 English Department Syllabi*

Rank (1-5)	Component	Number	%
1	Course Title (1.1)	235	100
1	Instructor Name (2.1)	235	100
2	Grading Policy (8)	193	82
3	Exam (7)	164	70
4	Content Outline (4)	160	68

The course title and the instructors' name appeared most frequently in all the 235 syllabi. Course title, instructors' name, grading policy, exam and the content outline are the five items included the most frequently from the 235 syllabi of the Department of English in Taiwan.

Table 6 is the overall result for the number and the percentage of the learning-centered syllabus template.

Table 6

*Overall Findings for the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template (Table 2): Number and Percentage for Each Component for the 235 Syllabi Reviewed*

Component	Number	%
Course Rationale	22	9
Teaching Philosophy	11	5
Course Description	206	88
Course Objective	148	63
Readings	160	68
Resources	86	37
Course Calendar	152	65
Evaluation/Assignment	207	88
Grading Policy	193	82
Tools/Skills for Learning	10	4

The evaluation/assignment item is the most frequently mentioned component in the learning-centered syllabus template.

Table 7

*Rankings of the Top Five Components from Learning-Centered Syllabus Template (Table 6 Results) which Appeared Most Frequently in the 235 Syllabi Reviewed*

Rank (1-5)	Component	Number	%
1	Evaluation/Assignment	207	88
1	Course Description	206	88
2	Grading Policy	193	82
3	Readings	160	68
4	Course Calendar	152	65

Q4. Given the syllabus component template and the learning-centered syllabus template, what syllabi components are the least mentioned in these two templates in English departments at universities in Taiwan?

From Table 4, the frequency of the appearance of each component is clear. As a result, we can arrange the least frequently mentioned components from the 235 syllabi from English departments in Taiwan. The course purpose and the disability policy were not included in any of the 235 syllabi. In addition, the instructors' academic background, policy for make-up, and the policy for the missed work all were mentioned only once among the 235 syllabi. As a result, the course purpose, disability policy, instructors' academic background, make up policy and the missed work policy are the least five frequently mentioned components from the 235 syllabi of English departments in Taiwan. The remaining components were only mentioned by less than 39% syllabi.

In addition, there are four components which were mentioned under 39% of the 235 syllabi.

Table 8

*Ranking of 28 Least Mentioned (under 39%) Components from the Syllabus Components Template (Table 4 Results)*

Rank	Component	Number	%
1	Disability	0	0
1	Course Purpose	0	0
2	Academic Background	1	0.4
2	Make Up	1	0.4
2	Missed Work	1	0.4
3	Activity	2	1
3	Grading Procedure	2	1
4	Grading Policy	3	1
4	Academic Honesty	3	1
5	Late Assignment	4	2
6	Course Goals	5	2
7	Topic	8	3
8	Assignment due date/time	10	4
8	Exam Type	10	4
9	Teaching Philosophy	11	5
10	Assignment Type	22	9
10	Course Rationale	22	9
12	Grading Criteria	25	11
12	Service/Resource	25	11
13	Requirement	31	13
20	Office Location	42	18
21	Office Hours	51	22
22	E-mail Address	65	28
23	Location	74	31
24	Reference	75	32
25	Format	76	32
25	Teaching Type	76	32
26	Time	92	39

Table 9

*Ranking of Least Mentioned (under 39%) Components from the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template (Table 6 Results)*

Rank (1-5)	Component	Number	%
1	Tools/Skills for Learning	10	4
2	Teaching Philosophy	11	5
3	Course Rationale	22	10
4	Resources	86	37

Q5. To what extent are the syllabi in the English departments of universities in Taiwan congruent to the requirements suggested for inclusion in the syllabus components template?

Results from Table 4 (overall findings for the syllabus component template) were divided into three groups, low, medium, and high congruency levels, after they were reviewed. If the total numbers of the ten main syllabus components were three or less, the syllabus is categorized as low congruency. If the total numbers of the ten main syllabus components were identified to have four to six, then the syllabus is categorized as medium congruency. All syllabi were categorized as high congruency if they included seven to ten items of the syllabus components.

According to the Table 10, the total congruency level can be categorized as high congruency, because 68 % syllabi out of the 235 are in the high level congruency. Most syllabi (194 or 82.4%) are in Levels 6, 7, 8 and 9. Consequently, the syllabi for the English departments in Taiwan have high congruency with the items in the syllabus components template.

Table 10

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi with Syllabus Components Template for All 235 Syllabi*

	Level	Number	%
Low	1	0	0
	2	0	0
	3	4	2
Medium	4	8	3
	5	24	10
	6	39	17
High	7	67	29
	8	58	25
	9	30	13
	10	5	2

Q6. To what extent are the syllabi in English departments in universities in Taiwan congruent to the requirements suggested for inclusion in the learning-centered syllabus template?

Each syllabus was compared to the learning-centered syllabus template. The syllabi's congruency level was judged with the total numbers of the ten components. If a syllabus had three or less components, it was categorized as low level of congruency, four to six components were the medium level, and seven or more components included were classified as a high level of congruence.

According to the Table 11, 73% syllabi fell in the medium level, that is to say, most syllabi in the English departments in Taiwan have medium congruency with the learning-centered syllabus template. Most syllabi components were in the Level 4, 5, and 6. The syllabi in Taiwan have an opportunity in understanding and adopting the components in the learning-centered syllabus template to improve the learning depth and effectiveness.

Table 11

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi with the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template for All 235 Syllabi*

	Level	Number	%
Low	1	0	0
	2	10	4
	3	20	9
Medium	4	51	22
	5	67	29
	6	53	23
High	7	24	10
	8	8	3
	9	2	1
	10	0	0

Q7. Are the syllabi verbs reflected in the objective and the assignment part in English departments at universities in Taiwan differentiating in the cognitive level of learning in different courses according to the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template?

Using the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template (Table 3), the verbs that appeared in the course objective and the assignment of the syllabi were examined to see if any differences in the seven different English courses occur based on the levels of Bloom's cognitive domain existed. The verbs appeared on the syllabi were categorized to one of the six learning levels in order to examine if there are any variance for different courses in the Departments of English. The verbs in the syllabi were matched with the verbs listed on the Bloom template, or if the verbs on the syllabi were not the exact same verb but a verb that implied or means the same, that was counted same as the Bloom suggested verb.

According to Table 12, it is interesting that different English courses tend to focus on different cognitive level verbs. For example, the verbs in the composition syllabi tend to focus on the Level 1 (Knowledge) and Level 5 (Synthesis), while most verbs in linguistics, western literature, and translation focus mainly on the Level 1 (Knowledge) and Level 2 (Understanding). In addition, the TESOL courses emphasize Level 3 (Application) most. Furthermore, the verbs in the conversation courses showed the tendency for the Level 5 (Synthesis). Interestingly, the linguistics courses did not include verbs in the objectives or assignments sections that typically appear in suggested lists of verbs for Bloom's cognitive Levels 4, 5, or 6. The reason for this result maybe the different difficulty levels for various English courses that the cognitive domain verbs may be restricted in the lower levels for the linguistics course. Apparently, the results

indicated that different English courses have different cognitive level goals as described by Blooms' cognitive taxonomy.

Table 12

*Bloom Cognitive Domain Taxonomy Template Rankings for 7 English Courses: Composition, Conversation, Literature, Linguistics, TESOL, Western Literature, and Translation (in %)*

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
Composition ( <i>n</i> = 54)	100	24	28	22	100	6
Conversation ( <i>n</i> = 58)	33	36	22	9	45	2
Literature ( <i>n</i> = 40)	85	73	20	3	10	0
Linguistics ( <i>n</i> = 22)	86	82	27	0	0	0
TESOL ( <i>n</i> = 21)	81	81	48	5	10	0
Western Literature ( <i>n</i> = 20)	75	75	5	15	5	0
Translation ( <i>n</i> = 20)	85	80	35	5	10	0

*Note.* Level 1: Knowledge, Level 2: Understanding, Level 3: Application, Level 4: Analysis, Level 5: Synthesis, Level 6: Evaluation. Verbs of the 235 syllabi appeared in the course objectives and the assignment component.

Q8. Is there any difference in the level of congruence with the three templates in the faculty members' academic background and the institution type (public or private)?

This question can be answered in two sections: the results of the (a) faculty members' academic background and (b) institution type from Table 4 results.

None of the syllabi from the instructors who hold the degree from the USA or other countries fell in the low completeness level in Table 13. Most instructors got the high completeness level in the review of Table 13. Only 6% of the syllabi of instructors who earned degrees in Taiwan were classified as low congruency.

Table 13

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi with the Syllabus Components Template Listed by the Country in which Faculty Member Earned Their Doctoral Degree (in %)*

	Table 4 Results		
	L	M	H
Taiwan Degree	6	32	63
USA Degree	0	27	73
Degrees from other countries	0	38	60

The syllabi from the instructors who earned their degree from other countries had the lowest percentage in the low learning-centered level (see Table 14). Most syllabi fell in the medium level in the learning-centered template regardless of where the degree was earned. Most instructors who earned the degree in Taiwan were classified in the medium level of congruence with the learning-centered template. However, the largest percentage of syllabi classified as having high congruence was written by faculty who had earned the degree in Taiwan.

Table 14

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi with the Learning-Centered Template Listed by the Country in which Faculty Member Earned Their Doctoral Degree (in %)*

	Table 5 Results		
	L	M	H
Taiwan Degree	14	68	17
USA Degree	12	72	16
Degrees from other countries	8	81	10

In Table 15, it is clear that most verbs in the objectives and the assignment sections fell in Level 1 (Knowledge), no matter where the instructors' degrees are from. Most instructors who earned their degree in Taiwan emphasized verbs in Level 1 (Knowledge) and Level 2 (Understanding). In addition, most instructors who got their



degrees in the U.S. tended to use the verbs from Level 1 (Knowledge) and Level 5 (Synthesis). Syllabi written by instructors whose degrees are from other countries tend to use more verbs in the Level 1 (Knowledge), Level 2 (Understanding), and Level 5 (Synthesis).

Table 15

*Level of Bloom’s Cognitive Domain in the Syllabi for 7 Types of English Courses, Listed by the Country in which Faculty Member Earned Their Doctoral Degree (in %)*

	Table 6 Results					
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
Taiwan Degree	83	62	33	5	38	2
USA Degree	69	5	21	9	41	2
Degrees from other countries	79	58	27	21	40	4

*Note.* Level 1: Knowledge, Level 2: Understanding, Level 3: Application, Level 4: Analysis, Level 5: Synthesis, Level 6: Evaluation. Verbs of the 235 syllabi appeared in the course objectives and the assignment component.

In Table 16, we see that female instructors with a master’s degree got the highest percentage in the high congruency level. In contrast, females with a doctoral degree got the lowest percentage in the congruency level. No syllabus written by the male instructors fell in the low congruency regardless of whether he had earned the master’s degree or the doctorate.

Table 16

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Syllabus Components Template, Listed by the Instructors’ Gender and Degree (in %)*

	Table 4 Results		
	L	M	H
Doctorate - Female	3	38	59
Master’s - Female	2	21	79
Doctorate - Male	0	24	76
Master’s - Male	0	28	72

Table 17 shows that most male instructors with a master's degree got the highest rate in the medium level in the learning-centered goals. Males with a doctorate and the female instructors with a master's degree had the highest level of congruency with the learning-centered template.

Table 17

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template, Listed by the Instructors' Gender and Degree (in %)*

	Table 5 Results		
	L	M	H
Doctorate - Female	16	73	11
Master's - Female	10	71	19
Doctorate - Male	8	73	20
Master's - Male	7	76	17

Table 18 shows that male instructors with a doctorate and the female instructors with a master's degree tend to emphasize the Level 1 (Knowledge) and Level 2 (Understanding) cognitive domains. Male instructors with a master's degree and the female instructors with a doctorate most often applied Bloom's Level 1 (Knowledge), Level 2 (Understanding) and Level 5 (Synthesis) in the cognitive domains in their class. Few syllabi included the verbs from Level 4 (Analysis) and Level 6 (Evaluation) in the English departments in Taiwan.

More syllabi from private institutions reached the high level for the Table 1 completeness level than the public institutions did. In addition, private institutions also had a slightly lower (1%) percentage in the low completeness level. But overall these appear to be limited difference between public and private universities on this issue.

Most institutions' syllabi fell into the medium level in the learning-centered template. More private institutions reached the high level than the public institutions did. And while there is some variance, the variance appears not to be major.

The percentage of the public and the private institutions in Level 1 (Knowledge), Level 2 (Understanding), Level 3 (Application) and Level 5 (Synthesis) are almost same. Few syllabi from both institutions mentioned the verbs in Level 4 (Analysis) and Level 6 (Evaluation).

The syllabi written by male faculty had a larger percentage of high congruence with the component syllabus template, and no male instructor's syllabus was placed in the lowest level of congruence. Most instructors designed a high level completeness syllabus. The congruency level of the syllabi with the U.S. syllabi also was high for the gender of faculty. More syllabi written by male instructors are in the high level, and fewer male instructors fell in the low level. Furthermore, the rates of the medium level are almost same no matter what the gender was.

The syllabi written by male and female are almost the same in Level 1 (Knowledge) and Level 3 (Application). In addition, the male instructors tend to use more verbs in Level 2 (Understanding) than the female instructors do. In sum, on the gender issues there is no distinguishable difference and the conclusion might be that whether institutions are private or public it makes no difference in the quality of syllabi in regard to the syllabus components template and in terms of the learning-centered syllabus template.

Table 18

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Bloom's Cognitive Taxonomy Template, Listed by the Instructors' Gender and Degree (in %)*

	Table 6 Results					
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
Doctorate - Female	73	49	21	14	38	3
Master's - Female	79	60	35	10	48	2
Doctorate - Male	78	67	25	4	22	0
Master's - Male	66	48	17	3	52	0

*Note.* Level 1: Knowledge, Level 2: Understanding, Level 3: Application, Level 4: Analysis, Level 5: Synthesis, Level 6: Evaluation. Verbs of the 235 syllabi appeared in the course objectives and the assignment component.

### Other Findings

There are some findings besides the answers to the 8 research questions in chapter 4. Using detailed results from the syllabus components and learning-centered syllabus templates (Tables 4 and 5) for the 7 English courses, the findings are arranged in the order of the instructors' nationalities.

No syllabi written by the foreign instructor fell in the low level in the Table 19. More Taiwanese instructors' syllabi were rated at high level than were syllabi of faculty from other countries.

Table 19

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Syllabus Components Template, Listed by the Instructors' Nationalities (in %)*

	Table 4 Results		
	L	M	H
Taiwanese Faculty ( $n = 213$ )	2	30	69
Faculty from other countries ( $n = 22$ )	0	36	64

According to Table 20, the percentages in the medium level of the syllabi written by Taiwanese and instructors from other countries are same. Fewer instructors from other countries earned the high level in the Learning-centered syllabus template.

Table 20

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template, Listed by the Instructors' Nationalities (in %)*

	Table 5 Results		
	L	M	H
Taiwanese Faculty ( $n = 213$ )	11	73	16
Faculty from other countries ( $n = 22$ )	18	73	9

The greatest variation was at Level 1 and possibly Level 2. There appears to be no major difference at the other levels.

Regards the frequency of specific syllabus components as suggested by the detailed results of the Table 4, there are some variations among the frequency and inclusion of components. All the 235 syllabi mentioned two components: the course information-course title, and the instructor's name. None of the 235 syllabi mentioned one component: the policy for the disability. According to the policy component section, only five English courses mentioned the attendance component in the policy section. The components in the policy section are those that were seldom mentioned in the English syllabi in Taiwan. A few syllabi (under 20) mentioned the following 15 components: course information- topic, course information-activity, instructors' academic background, course goals, assignment due date, exam-type, exam-date, grading-policy, grading-procedure, grading-criteria, policy-late assignment, policy-make up, policy-missed work, policy-academic honesty and the policy-disability.

Table 21

*Level of Congruence of Syllabi for All Courses with the Bloom's Cognitive Taxonomy Template, Listed by the Instructors' Nationalities (in %)*

	Table 6 Results					
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6
Taiwanese Faculty	77	56	26	11	39	2
Faculty from other countries	45	41	23	5	45	0

*Note.* Level 1: Knowledge, Level 2: Understanding, Level 3: Application, Level 4: Analysis, Level 5: Synthesis, Level 6: Evaluation. Verbs of the 235 syllabi appeared in the course objectives and the assignment component.

Given Table 21, it is may be of value that English departments pay more attention to these categories in course syllabi. These components appear to be considered as less important, but these are important to communicate policies and requirements to successfully complete a course.

The detailed syllabi review results of each English course is reported according to each course.

Composition: The syllabi of the composition course have some characteristics different from the other seven English courses. The 22 composition syllabi mentioned the course rationale, which none of the other six English courses mentioned. In addition, the composition syllabi showed more detailed information than the other courses in the policy components, such as the policy-late assignment, policy-make up, and the policy-missed work. None of the other six English course syllabi mentioned these three components.

Conversation: The syllabi of the conversation course included three components more often than the other courses. They are exam-type, exam-date, and the

service/resource components. The other six English course syllabi did not mention these three items at all.

Literature: Only some of the literature syllabi mentioned the instructor's academic background, other six courses did not mention this component at all.

Linguistics: The findings of Table 1 syllabus components template in the linguistics syllabi impressed me, because in these courses 13 components rated the highest percentage among other six courses besides the course title and the instructor's name. The components are: course information-semester, course information-location, course information-time, course information-requirement, course information-textbook, instructor's office location, instructor's office hours, instructor's phone number, content outline, course description, course calendar, grading police-weight, and policy-attendance. The syllabi in the linguistics course included the most components and placed in the highest frequency.

TESOL: The syllabi in the TESOL course had three items which appeared the most frequent, they are the instructor's teaching type, course information-reference (same as the composition), and the assignment (same as the translation course).

Western literature: The components of the western literature course syllabi only had one item which appears more frequently than other courses. Only the instructor's e-mail address appears the most.

Translation: There are four components which appeared most frequently in the translation course syllabi, they include the course information-number, course information-format, course information-activity and the assignment (same as the TESOL course).

Each English course had its different characteristics and each course emphasized different components. From these results, the English syllabi developer could pay more attention to the items which are seldom mentioned to improve their syllabi to promote quality instructional outcomes.

Table 22

*Fifteen Components from Syllabus Components Template Mentioned Least in the 235 Syllabi (Table 4 Results)*

Components	Frequency
Course Information: topic	20
Course Information: activity	7
Instructors academic background	3
Course Goals	7
Assignment due date	11
Exam type	2
Exam date	10
Grading policy	9
Grading procedure	5
Grading criteria	13
Policy: Late assignment	6
Policy: make up	2
Policy: Missed work	2
Policy: Academic Honesty	7
Policy: Disability	0

According to Table 23, only the composition syllabi mentioned the course rationale; no syllabi from the other six courses included this item. Few syllabi mentioned the teaching philosophy and the tools/skills for learning. Most translation course syllabi mentioned the resources part. Additionally, the linguistics syllabi more frequently included these five components: course description, readings, course calendar, evaluation/assignment, and grading. The syllabi from the Linguistics courses were more complete than syllabi of the other courses. As indicated in Table 23, the syllabi for the



western literature courses contained fewer syllabus components than any of the other courses reviewed.

Table 23

*Percentage of Components from Learning-Centered Syllabus Template for 7 English Courses (Table 5 Results)*

Component	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Course Rationale	41	0	0	0	0	0	0
Teaching Philosophy	0	5	10	9	5	0	5
Course Description	89	81	88	100	86	95	85
Course Objectives	69	69	60	45	62	45	65
Readings	61	64	75	86	71	60	70
Resources	44	43	25	32	48	20	50
Course Calendar	63	59	78	86	57	60	60
Evaluation/Assignment	80	88	95	100	95	80	95
Grading	78	86	75	100	90	70	90
Tools/Skills for Learning	4	5	3	5	5	5	5

*Note.* A=Composition, B=Conversation, C=Literature, D=Linguistics, E=TESOL, F=Western literature, G=Translation.

According to the Table 24, none of the syllabi from the Linguistics course fell in the low congruency, and most syllabi from western literature, F, fell in the low congruency. The composition courses had the largest percentage of components in the in the high category. In sum, over 70% of the 235 syllabi are in the medium congruency for the learning-centered goals.

Table 24

*Level of Congruence of the 7 English Courses with the Learning-Centered Syllabus Template (in %)*

Level	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Low	7	12	8	0	5	40	25
Medium	70	74	80	82	86	55	55
High	22	14	13	10	10	5	20

*Note.* A=Composition, B=Conversation, C=Literature, D=Linguistics, E=TESOL, F=Western literature, G=Translation.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research explored and developed a recommended syllabus component model from the literature, practitioners, and researchers. This resulted in a syllabus component template, a learning-centered syllabus template, and a template to apply verbs characteristic of Bloom's cognitive domain taxonomy to the learning objectives and learning tasks of selected syllabi. These models were then applied to review syllabi from several universities in Taiwan. The higher education system in Taiwan is similar to that of the U.S. in many ways, and many faculty members in Taiwan's universities earned their degrees from the U.S. institutions. Given these general similarities between the two systems, this research explored the extent to which the models were evident in course syllabi in selected universities in Taiwan. Additionally, the third model Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template was used to analyze the syllabi to develop advanced understanding regarding the focus on learning-centered syllabus components in English courses. The results can be helpful for the educators who are interested in the syllabus development.

#### Major Findings

1. According to the literature reviews, there are fourteen main categories of syllabus components regarded as essential in the literature, and some items include sub-items. Additionally, according to Grunert (2008), the syllabus components for a learning-centered syllabus include: rationale/purpose of the course; teaching philosophy; course description/class type; course objective; readings; resources;

course calendar; evaluation/assignment; grading procedure; tools and skills for study and learning.

2. Syllabus templates for the components of a syllabus (Table 1) and for a learning-centered syllabus (Table 2) can be derived from the published literature on the topic.
3. As to the most frequently mentioned syllabus components, the course title and the instructors' name appeared most frequently in all the 235 syllabi. Additionally, the grading, exam, and the content outline are the third, fourth, and the fifth in the rankings. To summarize, course title, instructors' name, grading, exam and the content outline are the five items mentioned the most frequently in the syllabus components template. In addition, the evaluation/assignment component is the most frequently mentioned item in the learning-centered syllabus template. The other four items that appeared the most frequently in the learning-centered syllabus template according to the rankings are the course description, grading, reading, and the course calendar.
4. As for the components least mentioned in the 235 syllabi, the course purposes and the disability policy are not mentioned once in any of the 235 syllabi. None of the 235 syllabi in this study mentioned a single component: policy for the disability (physically-challenging) student. This is a big difference between the U.S. and the Taiwan's syllabi. The course purpose, disability policy, instructors' academic background, make up policy and the missed work policy are the least five frequently mentioned components from the 235 syllabi of English departments in Taiwan. Additionally, as to the learning-centered syllabus template, four components are

mentioned least: tools/skills for learning, teaching philosophy, course rationale, and the resources.

5. The total congruency level of the syllabus components template can be categorized as high congruency, because 68 % syllabi out of the 235 are in the high level congruency and 30% were classified as medium congruency. Linguistics course syllabi showed a positive result in the syllabus components template, because none of the syllabi fell in the low level. The syllabi in the Linguistics courses are the most detailed than other six English courses.
6. Most syllabi in English departments in Taiwan have medium congruency with the learning-centered syllabus template, because 73 % syllabi fell in the level medium.
7. According to the data results, it is obvious that different English courses tend to focus on different cognitive level verbs. Every core course would not be expected to reflect every level of Bloom's taxonomy. But over the course of study for the degree, it would be logical for core courses to reflect appropriate levels of Bloom's taxonomy.
8. The results indicated that female instructors with a Master's degree got the highest percentage in the high congruency level in the syllabus components template. More private institutions reached the high level for the Table 1 completeness level than the public institutions did, but overall there appears to be limited difference between public and private universities on this issue.

### Discussion

After reviewing the 235 syllabi in the 22 universities, there is a tendency that the qualities of the syllabi are close in the congruency levels; the similarities may be because of professional cooperation and modeling among the faculty in the English departments

and may be influenced by policies that departments have established for course syllabi.

From the least mentioned components in the Table 8, there are 28 components that have been mentioned in the syllabi under 39% percentage. There is large difference in the percentage rate between the frequently mentioned items and the least mentioned items in the syllabi in Taiwan. Even though there is a relatively high level of congruence, there are also 28 components that are not often included. In my opinion, there may be some explanations for these results. For example, in the instructors' information section, some items may be missed in the syllabi because it is likely that these components are on the web pages of the instructors on the websites of the institution. As a result, the instructors might omit this information in their syllabi: academic background, office location, office hours, and their E-Mail address. In addition, most instructors just mentioned the assignment and the exams, but they did not stated the details of the these two components; sometimes the instructors are likely to maintain some flexibility for the course or they may want to discuss with their students about these issues according to different class context, so they did not mentioned the details. As to the detail information for the course information , the course goals, course rationale, teaching philosophy and the teaching type, less than 38% mentioned these items, even though these components are essential for students' knowing about the course. Personally, these items are strongly recommended to add to the syllabi for the English departments' courses in Taiwan.

From the Table 9, there are four items which were least mentioned (under 39%) when reviewed with the Table 2. To my surprise, the teaching philosophy is one of them, because personally I think it is a rather important component, because the course

syllabus design usually derived from the instructors' philosophy to write the syllabus. Thus, every syllabus has its style and objective.

Most syllabi fell in the medium level in the learning-centered syllabus template. It is obvious that most syllabi in the English departments still remain in the basic syllabus component stage. There is room to review and determine the value of the inclusion of those components not included or rarely included in the learning-centered syllabus. Achievement of this should improve the probability of improved teaching and learning outcomes.

According to the Table 12, only the composition and the conversation syllabi mentioned the cognitive domain Level 5 Synthesis verbs. No syllabi in the other five English courses mentioned the synthesis verbs; and the syllabi of the other five courses focus mainly in the Level 1 Knowledge and Level 2 Understanding.

Regarding Bloom's cognitive domain it should be noted that every core course would not be expected each or every level of Bloom's cognitive domain, but the levels suggested by a syllabus should logically follow the purpose and goal of a specific core course. However, over the program of study in English departments it would be expected that core courses would reflect appropriate levels of Bloom's cognitive domain. Table 15 indicates the level of cognitive domain practice in syllabi by where faculty earned their degree. According to Table 15, it is interesting that the instructors who earned the degree from the institutions in Taiwan tend to focus on the Level 1 Knowledge and Level 2 Understanding domain; the instructors who earned the degree from the U.S.A. are more likely to emphasize the synthesis ability in their syllabi. Lastly, the instructors who earned the degree from other countries tend to cover more cognitive domain levels in their

syllabi. However, there are multiple factors that probably influence these issues more than where the instructors earned a degree.

Another insight is that the syllabi of the Taiwanese instructors were classified in higher congruency levels in both the Table 1 and Table 2 results than the instructors from other countries did. This may suggest differences in nationality, but it is likely that other factors account for this variation.

Compared with the syllabus component template, the learning-centered syllabus template emphasizes components that foster content organization and instructional process that promote learning at a more intensive level. It is not just writing the basic syllabus components, it is more like telling the students a way for success in a course. The instructor needs to build a complete context for learning, to teach students the methods and ways to learn by themselves in the subjects, not just to teach the subject content, but to teach students how to see and understand the rules and rationales behind the subjects.

None of the 235 syllabi in this study mentioned a single component: policy for the disability (physically-challenging) student. This is a big difference between the U.S. and the Taiwan's syllabi. After reviewing 235 syllabi in this study, personally, I found that the policy components are not as frequently included in syllabi in Taiwan as are other syllabus components. The reason maybe the cultural factor, because Asians tend not to talk about the law or policy issues.

There are some interesting characteristics of these English course syllabi:

1. Only the composition syllabi mentioned the course rationale components.
2. The conversation course syllabi tend to focus on the exam items.

3. The TESOL course syllabi tend to focus on the instructors' information.
4. The translation course syllabi tend to focus on the course information and the resource components.
5. Most western literature course syllabi mentioned the instructors' e-mail address.
6. Lastly, as to the linguistics course syllabi, there were 13 items that appeared the most frequently among the seven courses. And, the syllabi in the linguistics courses had a 100 % high congruency rating. The Linguistics syllabi were the most detailed in comparison with the rest six English courses.

### Limitations

Some limitations of the research should be mentioned before reviewing the conclusions drawn from the data. The limitations include:

1. Only 235 core course syllabi chosen from the English departments' websites of the 13 public universities and 9 private universities in Taiwan were studied.
2. The syllabi on the websites of the institutions may not be updated.
3. The syllabi on the websites of the institutions may not be the ones the instructors give to the students.
4. Some institutions may have their standard format of syllabus writing for their instructors.

### Conclusions

The study inferred a list of recommended components of a course syllabus from the literature and developed two models which could be used to analyze and evaluate the completeness of course syllabi in terms of the components of a syllabus and the components of a learning-centered syllabus. The results indicated that both types can be



inferred from the literature. Thus, recommended models for the syllabus components and for learning-centered syllabi exist in the literature and are identifiable. Based on the results the conclusions for the study are:

1. The two templates developed from the literature and the Bloom cognitive domain taxonomy template are three recommended tools that in fact can be applied to analyze course syllabi. Additionally, these templates and actual course syllabi are similar in terms of the components included in a syllabus. But it is evident, based on the syllabi examined, that there are multiple components in the recommended syllabi templates that frequently are not included in actual course syllabi. From the analysis of the learning-centered and the Bloom templates it is evident that both models provide faculty specific guidance for critically reviewing their course syllabi and revising them, if necessary, to include the components that create a learning-centered instruction and for creating objectives and learning activities to the appropriate cognitive learning levels.
2. The congruency level of the syllabus components and the syllabi for courses in English at these universities is high. As a result, I conclude that syllabi in English departments at universities in Taiwan are generally congruent with the syllabus component template derived from the literature on education in the United States. And this is likely the case for the majority of syllabi in higher education in Taiwan.
3. The congruency level of the English syllabi in the learning-centered syllabus template (Table 2) is medium. This result indicated that the standard of the learning-centered syllabus requires more elaboration of syllabus components which in turn are expected to promote learning outcomes. Because most of the syllabi were classified

as medium in their congruence, these results suggest that instructors may need to be more aware of the inclusion of components that scholars indicate to improve student learning. It is not just writing the basic syllabus components noted in the Table 1, it is communicating to students the information and learning processes that promote success in the course.

4. Based on the findings, I conclude that different courses in English departments seek to achieve different levels of cognitive learning based on Bloom's taxonomy. This appears logical in that some courses may focus more on developing knowledge more than the application or synthesis.
5. Linguistics course syllabi showed an impressive result in the Table 1 syllabus components template, because none of the syllabi fell in the low level in all the syllabi. In addition, in the results in learning-centered syllabus template, 100 % of the linguistics syllabi included most frequently the three learning-centered components. I conclude that the syllabi in the linguistics courses include more components than the syllabi in the other English courses in the English departments.
6. None of the 235 syllabi in this study mentioned a single component: policy for the disability (physically-challenging) student. This is a big difference between the US. and Taiwan's syllabi. Thus, I conclude that disability policy is not included in course syllabi at universities in Taiwan, and the disability policy statements, for whatever reason, are not perceived to be needed in course syllabi.

#### Recommendations for Future Research

There are some questions yielded from this study. Here are some recommendations for future studies:

1. A study to assess if the students perform better in two sessions of the same course taught by a same instructor with two syllabi with different levels of completeness. Also, a study with a learning-centered syllabus used in a course and a non-learning-centered syllabus used in a similar course to explore any differences in learning outcome that might occur.
2. A study to know how instructors organize and perceive their course syllabi, and how the instructors decide their priority for the components in the syllabi.
3. A study to assess or analyze the syllabi components for other departments.
4. After reviewing 235 syllabi in this study, the policy components are not as frequently included in syllabi in Taiwan as are other syllabus components. The reason maybe the culture factor that Asian people tend to prevent to talk about the law or policy issues. As a result, I recommend that the syllabi developers in Taiwan may pay more attention to the policy components in their syllabi to make the syllabi more complete, informative and helpful.

## APPENDIX A

### COMPONENTS OF A SYLLABUS AS DISCUSSED IN TWENTY-TWO SOURCES

Copyright for the material in Appendix A is shared between Baysan Lin and Yao-Tsu Tung, and is reproduced with permission of both authors.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	total
Empirical study (E), Practical discussion ( )			E		E		E	E		E									E	E	E		8
Topic(s) covered:																							
1. Syllabus components	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x		x			x	x	x	x		x	16
2. Functions of a Syllabus			x	x							x		x		x	x			x			x	8
3. Design of a Syllabus		x		x				x						x	x			x				x	7
4. Communication Function	x		x						x							x				x		x	6
5. Learning / Student-Centered Syllabus						x			x		X						x					x	5
6. How Students Use Syllabus							x														x	x	3
7. A Learning Tool Function									x				x									x	3
8. Contract Function									x													x	2
9. Student Perception of Syllabus Content								x														x	2
10. Document Scholarship Function													x										1
11. Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness Function													x										1
12. Textbook Choosing														x									1
13. Construction with a Shared Governance																		x					1
14. Institutional classification and gender issue																			x				1
15. Student Support Seeking					x																		1
16. Presenting the Syllabus																					x		1
Total	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	3	5	1	3	1	4	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	9

## Legend

1. Lowther, M. A., Stark, J. S., & Martens, G. G. (1989). *Preparing course syllabi for improved communication*. (Report No. HE023163). Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED314997)
2. Altman, H. B. (1992). *Writing a syllabus*. (IDEA Paper No. 27). Kansas State University. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
3. Smith, M. F., & Razzouk, N. Y. (1993). Improving classroom communication: The case of the course syllabus. *Journal of Education for Business*, 68(4), 215-221.
4. Matejka, K., & Kurke, L. B. (1994). Designing a great syllabus. *College Teaching*, 42(3), 115-117.
5. Perrine, R. M. & Lisle, J. (1995). Effects of a syllabus offer of help, student age, and class size on college students' willingness to seek support from faculty. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 64(1), 41-55.
6. Beaudry, M. L., & Schaub, T. (1998). The learning-centered syllabus. *The Teaching Professor*, 12(2), 1-2.
7. Becker, A. H. & Calhoun, S. K. (1999). What introductory psychology students attend to on a course syllabus. *Teaching of Psychology*, 26(1), 6-11.
8. Garavalia, L. S., Hummel, J. H., Wiley, L. P., & Huitt, W. G. (1999). Constructing the course syllabus: Faculty and student perceptions of important syllabus components. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 10(1), 5-21.
9. Eberly, M. B., Newton, S. E., & Wiggins, R. A. (2001). The syllabus as a tool for student-centered learning. *The Journal of General Education*, 50(1), 56-74.
10. Meuschke, D. M., Gribbons, B. C., & Dixon, S. P. (2002). *College of the Canyons Syllabus Survey, Spring 2002* (Rep. No. R-119). Santa Clarita, CA: College of @ Canyons, Office of Institutional Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 474852)
11. Parkes, J. & Harris, M. B. (2002). The purposes of a syllabus. *College Teaching*, 50(2), 55-61.
12. Forsyth, D. R. (2003). The professor's guide to teaching: Psychological principles and practices. *The Syllabus* (pp. 39-41). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
13. Albers, C. (2003). Using the syllabus to document the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching Sociology*, 31, 60-72.

14. Wolfe, K. (2004). Course materials - syllabus and textbooks. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 4(4), 55-60.
15. Slattery, J. M., & Carlson, J. F. (2005). Preparing an effective syllabus. *College Teaching*, 53(4), 159-164.
16. Habanek, D. V. (2005). An examination of the integrity of the syllabus. *College Teaching*, 53(2), 62-64.
17. Johnson, C. (2006). Best practices in syllabus writing: Contents of a learner-centered syllabus. *The Journal of Chiropractic Education*, 20(2), 139-144.
18. Gambescia, S. F. (2006). Best practices in syllabus construction with a commitment to shared governance. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 54(1), 20-27.
19. Doolittle, P. E., & Lusk, D. L. (2007). The effects of institutional classification and gender on faculty inclusion of syllabus components. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 7(2), 62-78.
20. Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communication document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 54-71.
21. Calhoon, S. & Becker, A. (2008). How students use the course syllabus. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 1-12.
22. Grunert O'Brien, J., Millis, B. J., & Cohen, M. W. (2008). *The course syllabus: A learning-centered approach*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

## APPENDIX B

### SYLLABUS COMPONENTS ANALYSIS

Copyright for the material in Appendix B is shared between Baysan Lin and Yao-Tsu Tung, and is reproduced with permission of both authors.



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	Total	
<b>1. Content outline</b>	X		x				x		x				x	x				x				X	<b>8</b>	
<b>2. Course information</b>	X	X	X	x			X	x	X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x	x	X	X	<b>20</b>	
2.1 Name/title	X		X	X				x		x	X						x	X	X			x	10	
2.2 Number	X		X	X					x	x								X	x		X	X	9	
2.3 Term/semester									X	x	x							x	X			X	6	
2.4 Location	X		X				X				X							x	X	X			7	
2.5 Time	X		x	X			x		x		X							X	X	x			9	
2.6 Credit	X		X							x								X	X			x	6	
2.7 Type/format				X			x	x	x					x					x			X	7	
2.8 Topic	X		x	X			x	x	x	x	x	X		X		x				x		x	13	
2.9 Requirement	X		X				X				X	x		X	x			x		x		x	X	11
2.9.1 Pre-requisite	X		X				x				X	x		x	x			x				x	X	10
2.9.2 Co-requisite											x							x					X	3
2.10 Textbook	X	X	X	X	x		x		x	x	X	x		X	x			x	X		x	x	x	17
2.11 Reading	x	x	x	X			x		X		x	x		x	x				x			X	X	13
2.12 Activities			x				x	x				x		x		x			x				x	8
<b>3. Calendar/ Schedule</b>	X	X	x	X			x	x		x	x	x		x	x	X	x	x	x		x	X	<b>17</b>	
<b>4. Course purpose</b>	x			x										X				x					x	<b>5</b>
<b>5. Course objective</b>	x	x	x	x			X	x		x	x		X	x		X	x	x	x	x	X	x	<b>17</b>	
<b>6. Course goal</b>	x	x	x	x			x	x					x		x	x	x		x		x	X	<b>13</b>	
<b>7. Course description</b>		X	x				x	x			x			x	x	x			x	x			X	<b>11</b>
<b>8. Course rationale</b>	x			x									x		x								X	<b>5</b>
<b>9. Instructor information</b>	x	x	X	x			X	x	X	x	X	x			x	x	x	X	x	x	X	x	<b>18</b>	
9.1 Name	x	x	X	x			X	x	x	x	x	x						x	x	x			x	14

9.2 Office location	x	x	X				X		X	x	X	x			x		x	X	x			x	13
9.3 Office hours	x	x	X	x			x	x	x	x	X	x			x	x	x	X	x			x	16
9.4 Office phone number	x	x	x	x			X	x	X	x	X				x		x	X	x			x	14
9.5 Email address/website	x						x	x	x	x	X				x		x	X	x			x	11
9.6 Academic background				x				x	x		x	x						X				x	7
9.7 Teaching philosophy	x													x							x	x	4
9.8 Teaching types	x			x				x			x						x					x	6
<b>10. Assignment information</b>	<b>x</b>		<b>X</b>				<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>17</b>
10.1 Assignment type								x	x		X	x										x	5
10.2 Assignment due time	x		x				x			x	x	x		x	x	x					x	x	11
<b>11. Exam information</b>	<b>x</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>		<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>			<b>x</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>						<b>X</b>	<b>12</b>
11.1 Exam date/time	x		x	x			x	x				x		x	x	x						X	10
11.2 Exam types				x			x	x	x														4
<b>12. Grading information</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>		<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>20</b>
12.1 Grading policy		x	X	x					x	x	X			X	x			x	x		X	x	12
12.2 Grading procedure		x	X	x			x			x	X			X	x		x	X			X	x	12
12.3 Grading criteria/rubric		x	x	x				x		x	X	x	x	X	x		x	X	x			x	14
12.4 Grading weights		x	X	x				x		x	x	x		x	x			x				x	11
<b>13. Policy information</b>		<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>			<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>		<b>x</b>		<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>16</b>
13.1 Attendance		x	X	x			X	x	x	x	X	x		X				X	x			x	13
13.2 Late assignment							x			x	X			X		X				x			6
13.3 Make-up							x			x	X	x		x								x	6
13.4 Missed work		x	X				X									x				x			5
13.5 Academic honesty		x	x				x			x	X	x		x				x	x		X	x	11
13.6 Disability											x			x		x		x	x			x	6

<b>14. Support services/resources</b>	x	x	x				x			x	x	x			x	x	x		x			x	<b>12</b>
Total	30	22	36	30	3	0	35	27	24	27	37	24	8	30	25	20	26	32	28	7	20	42	

## Legend

1. Lowther, M. A., Stark, J. S., & Martens, G. G. (1989). *Preparing course syllabi for improved communication*. (Report No. HE023163). Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED314997)
2. Altman, H. B. (1992). *Writing a syllabus*. (IDEA Paper No. 27). Kansas State University. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
3. Smith, M. F., & Razzouk, N. Y. (1993). Improving classroom communication: The case of the course syllabus. *Journal of Education for Business*, 68(4), 215-221.
4. Matejka, K., & Kurke, L. B. (1994). Designing a great syllabus. *College Teaching*, 42(3), 115-117.
5. Perrine, R. M. & Lisle, J. (1995). Effects of a syllabus offer of help, student age, and class size on college students' willingness to seek support from faculty. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 64(1), 41-55.
6. Beaudry, M. L., & Schaub, T. (1998). The learning-centered syllabus. *The Teaching Professor*, 12(2), 1-2.
7. Becker, A. H. & Calhoun, S. K. (1999). What introductory psychology students attend to on a course syllabus. *Teaching of Psychology*, 26(1), 6-11.
8. Garavalia, L. S., Hummel, J. H., Wiley, L. P., & Huitt, W. G. (1999). Constructing the course syllabus: Faculty and student perceptions of important syllabus components. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 10(1), 5-21.
9. Eberly, M. B., Newton, S. E., & Wiggins, R. A. (2001). The syllabus as a tool for student-centered learning. *The Journal of General Education*, 50(1), 56-74.
10. Meuschke, D. M., Gribbons, B. C., & Dixon, S. P. (2002). *College of the Canyons Syllabus Survey, Spring 2002* (Rep. No. R-119). Santa Clarita, CA: College of @ Canyons, Office of Institutional Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 474852)
11. Parkes, J. & Harris, M. B. (2002). The purposes of a syllabus. *College Teaching*, 50(2), 55-61.
12. Forsyth, D. R. (2003). The professor's guide to teaching: Psychological principles and practices. *The Syllabus* (pp. 39-41). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
13. Albers, C. (2003). Using the syllabus to document the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching Sociology*, 31, 60-72.

14. Wolfe, K. (2004). Course materials - syllabus and textbooks. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 4(4), 55-60.
15. Slattery, J. M., & Carlson, J. F. (2005). Preparing an effective syllabus. *College Teaching*, 53(4), 159-164.
16. Habanek, D. V. (2005). An examination of the integrity of the syllabus. *College Teaching*, 53(2), 62-64.
17. Johnson, C. (2006). Best practices in syllabus writing: Contents of a learner-centered syllabus. *The Journal of Chiropractic Education*, 20(2), 139-144.
18. Gambescia, S. F. (2006). Best practices in syllabus construction with a commitment to shared governance. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 54(1), 20-27.
19. Doolittle, P. E., & Lusk, D. L. (2007). The effects of institutional classification and gender on faculty inclusion of syllabus components. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 7(2), 62-78.
20. Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communication document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 54-71.
21. Calhoon, S. & Becker, A. (2008). How students use the course syllabus. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 1-12.
22. Grunert O'Brien, J., Millis, B. J., & Cohen, M. W. (2008). *The course syllabus: A learning-centered approach*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

## APPENDIX C

### SYLLABUS COMPONENTS BY FREQUENCY

Copyright for the material in Appendix C is shared between Baysan Lin and Yao-Tsu Tung, and is reproduced with permission of both authors.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	Total
<b>2. Course information</b>	X	X	X	x			X	x	X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	X	x	x	X	X	20
2.10 Textbook	X	X	X	X	x		x		x	x	X	x		X	x		x	X		x	x	x	17
2.8 Topic	X		x	X			x	x	x	x	x	X		X		x			x		x		13
2.11 Reading	x	x	x	X			x		X		x	x		x	x			x			X	X	13
2.1 Name/title	X		X	X				x		x	X						x	X	X			x	10
<b>12. Grading information</b>	x	x	X	x	x		x	x	X	x	X	x	X	X	x	x	x	x	x		X	x	20
12.3 Grading criteria/rubric		x	x	x				x		x	X	x	x	X	x		x	X	x			x	14
12.1 Grading policy		x	X	x					x	x	X			X	x			x	x		X	x	12
12.2 Grading procedure		x	X	x			x			x	X			X	x		x	X			X	x	12
12.4 Grading weights		x	X	x				x		x	x	x		x	x			x				x	11
<b>9. Instructor information</b>	x	x	X	x			X	x	X	x	X	x			x	x	x	X	x	x	X	x	18
9.3 Office hours	x	x	X	x			x	x	x	x	X	x			x	x	x	X	x			x	16
9.1 Name	x	x	X	x			X	x	x	x	x	x					x	x	x			x	14
9.4 Office phone number	x	x	x	x			X	x	X	x	X				x		x	X	x			x	14
9.2 Office location	x	x	X				X		X	x	X	x			x		x	X	x			x	13
9.5 Email address/website	x						x	x	x	x	X				x		x	X	x			x	11
9.7 Teaching philosophy	x													x						x		x	4
<b>3. Calendar/schedule</b>	X	X	x	X			x	x		x	x	x		x	x	X	x	x	x		x	X	17
<b>5. Course objective</b>	x	x	x	x			X	x		x	x		X	x		X	x	x	x	x	X	x	17
<b>10. Assignment information</b>	x		X				x	x	X	x	X	x	x	x	x	X		X	x	X	X	x	17
10.2 Assignment due time	x		x				x			x	x	x		x	x	x					x	x	11
<b>13. Policy information</b>		x	X	x			X	x	X	x	X	x		x		x	x	x	x	X		x	16
13.1 Attendance		x	X	x			X	x	x	x	X	x		X				X	x			x	13
13.5 Academic honesty		x	x				x			x	X	x		x				x	x		x	x	11

<b>6. Course goal</b>	x	x	x	x			x	x					x		x	x	x		x		x	X	13	
<b>11. Exam information</b>	x		X	x	x		x	x	X			x		X	x	X						X		12
11.1 Exam date/time	x		x	x			x	x				x		x	x	x						X		10
11.2 Exam types				x			x	x	x															4
<b>14. Support services/resources</b>	x	x	x				x			x	x	x			x	x	x		x				x	12
<b>7. Course description</b>		X	x				x	x			x			x	x	x		x	x				X	11
<b>1. Content outline</b>	X		x				x		x				x	x					x				X	8
<b>4. Course purpose</b>	x			x										X				x					x	5
<b>8. Course rationale</b>	x			x									x		x								X	5



## Legend

1. Lowther, M. A., Stark, J. S., & Martens, G. G. (1989). *Preparing course syllabi for improved communication*. (Report No. HE023163). Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED314997)
2. Altman, H. B. (1992). *Writing a syllabus*. (IDEA Paper No. 27). Kansas State University. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
3. Smith, M. F., & Razzouk, N. Y. (1993). Improving classroom communication: The case of the course syllabus. *Journal of Education for Business*, 68(4), 215-221.
4. Matejka, K., & Kurke, L. B. (1994). Designing a great syllabus. *College Teaching*, 42(3), 115-117.
5. Perrine, R. M. & Lisle, J. (1995). Effects of a syllabus offer of help, student age, and class size on college students' willingness to seek support from faculty. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 64(1), 41-55.
6. Beaudry, M. L., & Schaub, T. (1998). The learning-centered syllabus. *The Teaching Professor*, 12(2), 1-2.
7. Becker, A. H. & Calhoun, S. K. (1999). What introductory psychology students attend to on a course syllabus. *Teaching of Psychology*, 26(1), 6-11.
8. Garavalia, L. S., Hummel, J. H., Wiley, L. P., & Huitt, W. G. (1999). Constructing the course syllabus: Faculty and student perceptions of important syllabus components. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 10(1), 5-21.
9. Eberly, M. B., Newton, S. E., & Wiggins, R. A. (2001). The syllabus as a tool for student-centered learning. *The Journal of General Education*, 50(1), 56-74.
10. Meuschke, D. M., Gribbons, B. C., & Dixon, S. P. (2002). *College of the Canyons Syllabus Survey, Spring 2002* (Rep. No. R-119). Santa Clarita, CA: College of @ Canyons, Office of Institutional Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 474852)
11. Parkes, J. & Harris, M. B. (2002). The purposes of a syllabus. *College Teaching*, 50(2), 55-61.
12. Forsyth, D. R. (2003). The professor's guide to teaching: Psychological principles and practices. *The Syllabus* (pp. 39-41). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
13. Albers, C. (2003). Using the syllabus to document the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching Sociology*, 31, 60-72.

14. Wolfe, K. (2004). Course materials - syllabus and textbooks. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 4(4), 55-60.
15. Slattery, J. M., & Carlson, J. F. (2005). Preparing an effective syllabus. *College Teaching*, 53(4), 159-164.
16. Habanek, D. V. (2005). An examination of the integrity of the syllabus. *College Teaching*, 53(2), 62-64.
17. Johnson, C. (2006). Best practices in syllabus writing: Contents of a learner-centered syllabus. *The Journal of Chiropractic Education*, 20(2), 139-144.
18. Gambescia, S. F. (2006). Best practices in syllabus construction with a commitment to shared governance. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 54(1), 20-27.
19. Doolittle, P. E., & Lusk, D. L. (2007). The effects of institutional classification and gender on faculty inclusion of syllabus components. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 7(2), 62-78.
20. Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communication document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 54-71.
21. Calhoon, S. & Becker, A. (2008). How students use the course syllabus. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 1-12.
22. Grunert O'Brien, J., Millis, B. J., & Cohen, M. W. (2008). *The course syllabus: A learning-centered approach*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

## REFERENCES

- Albers, C. (2003). Using the syllabus to document the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching Sociology, 31*, 60-72.
- Altman, H. B. (1992). *Writing a syllabus*. (IDEA Paper No. 27). Kansas State University. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Barr, R.B. & Tagg, J. (1995, November/December). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27(6)*, 12-25.
- Beaudry, M. L., & Schaub, T., (1998). The learning-centered syllabus. *Teaching Professor, 12(2)*, 1-2.
- Becker, A. H. & Calhoun, S. K. (1999). What introductory psychology students attend to on a course syllabus. *Teaching of Psychology, 26(1)*, 6-11.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Ivy Lane.
- Calhoun, S. & Becker, A. (2008). How students use the course syllabus. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 2(1)*, 1-12.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (3rd ed.). (2008). Cambridge University Press
- Doolittle, P. E., & Lusk, D. L. (2007). The effects of institutional classification and gender on faculty inclusion of syllabus components. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 7(2)*, 62-78.
- Eberly, M. B., Newton, S. E., & Wiggins, R. A. (2001). The syllabus as a tool for student-centered learning. *Journal of General Education, 50(1)*, 56-74.
- Forsyth, D. R. (2003). The professor's guide to teaching: Psychological principles and practices. *The syllabus* (pp. 39-41). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gambescia, S. F. (2006). Best practices in syllabus construction with a commitment to shared governance. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 54(1)*, 20-27.
- Garavalia, L. S., Hummel, J. H., Wiley, L. P., & Huitt, W. G. (1999). Constructing the course syllabus: Faculty and student perceptions of important syllabus components. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 10(1)*, 5-21.
- Glassick, Charles E., Huber, Mary T. and Maeroff, Gene I. (1996). *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grunert O'Brien, J., Millis, B. J., & Cohen, M. W. (2008). *The course syllabus: A learning-centered approach* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

- Habaneck, D. V. (2005). An examination of the integrity of the syllabus. *College Teaching*, 53(2), 62-64.
- Johnson, C. (2006). Best practices in syllabus writing: Contents of a learner-centered syllabus. *Journal of Chiropractic Education*, 20(2), 139-144.
- Lowther, M. A., Stark, J. S., & Martens, G. G. (1989). *Preparing course syllabi for improved communication*. (Report No. HE023163). Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED314997).
- Lucas-Fusco, L. M. (1993). A content analysis of course syllabi in special education teacher preparation (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1993). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 54(06), 2116A.
- Maher, J. W. (1997). The development of a model public relations syllabus for professors of educational administration. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 58(04), 1250A. (UMI No. 9729231).
- Matejka, K., & Kurke, L. B. (1994). Designing a great syllabus. *College Teaching*, 42(3), 115-117.
- Maxwell, K. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Meuschke, D. M., Gribbons, B. C., & Dixon, S. P. (2002). *College of the Canyons syllabus survey, spring 2002* (Rep. No. R-119). Santa Clarita, CA: College of @ Canyons, Office of Institutional Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 474852).
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Sage.
- Parkes, J. & Harris, M. B. (2002). The purposes of a syllabus. *College Teaching*, 50(2), 55-61.
- Perrine, R. M. & Lisle, J. (1995). Effects of a syllabus offer of help, student age, and class size on college students' willingness to seek support from faculty. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 64(1), 41-55.
- Phwandaphwanda, K. (2004). An assessment of undergraduate course syllabi at the University of Arkansas. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 64(07), 2406A. (UMI No. 9729231).
- Roman-Perez, R. I. (2007). Lessons for everyone from the basic skills classroom: A critical discourse analysis of basic writing syllabi. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 69(01). (UMI No. 3299045).

- Satterfield, B. F. (2007). Factors influencing faculty members' motivation in integrating service-learning into their syllabi. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 68(03). (UMI No. 3257532).
- Shepherd, H. (1996). A content analysis of course syllabi in elementary teacher preparation. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 57(06), 2444A. (UMI No. 9633426).
- Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (6th ed.). (2007). Oxford University Press.
- Slattery, J. M., & Carlson, J. F. (2005). Preparing an effective syllabus. *College Teaching*, 53(4), 159-164.
- Smith, M. F., & Razzouk, N. Y. (1993). Improving classroom communication: The case of the course syllabus. *Journal of Education for Business*, 68(4), 215-221.
- Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communication document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 54-71.
- Webster's New World College Dictionary* (4th ed.). (2004). Webster's New World.
- Weimer, M. (2003, Sep/Oct). Focus on learning, transform teaching. *Change*, 35(5), 48-54.
- Wolfe, K. (2004). Course materials - syllabus and textbooks. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 4(4), 55-60.