



Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) Among Iranian EFL Teachers: A Comparative Study of Novice and Experienced Teachers in Public High Schools and Private Language Institutes

Farinaz Rahnamaei

Department of English, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran.

f.rahnamaei23@gmail.com

Mehdi Vaez-Dalili  (Corresponding Author)

Department of English, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran.

[E mvaezdalili@iau.ac.ir](mailto:mvaezdalili@iau.ac.ir)

Bahram Hadian 

Department of English, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran.

bah-hadian@iau.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFO:

Received date:

2025.10.05

Accepted date:

2025.11.02

Print ISSN: 2251-7995

Online ISSN: 2676-6876

Keywords:

Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK), Teaching Experience, Experienced Teacher, Novice Teacher, Institutional Context, Syllabus Type



Abstract

This quantitative, causal-comparative study investigated differences in Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) between novice and experienced Iranian EFL teachers in public high schools and private language institutes. A sample of 120 EFL teachers, stratified into four equal groups (novice/experienced x public/private), completed a validated Syllabus Design Knowledge Test (SDKT). This 33-item instrument measured overall SDK and three related domains of SDK: theoretical/conceptual knowledge, knowledge of syllabus types, and knowledge of technical terminology. Data were analyzed using a set of two-way ANOVAS. The results revealed that both teaching experience and working in a private institute had significant, positive effects on EFL teachers' overall SDK and their specific knowledge of different types of syllabi. By contrast, no statistically significant differences were found for theoretical/ conceptual knowledge or knowledge of technical terminology based on either experience or educational setting. The findings suggest that practical, context-driven experience in private institutes significantly enhances specific aspects of pedagogical content knowledge, while other, more theoretical components may be equally developed regardless of experience and educational setting. It is concluded that SDK is a complex construct, shaped by teaching experience and influenced by the specific institutional context.

Citation: Rahnamaei, F.; Vaez-Dalili, M. & Hadian, B. (2025). Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) Among Iranian EFL Teachers: A Comparative Study of Novice and Experienced Teachers in Public High Schools and Private Language Institutes. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 17 (36), 209-232. DOI:10.22034/elt.2025.69512.2824

Introduction

Nowadays, the pivotal role of teacher knowledge in shaping educational quality is well-established, influencing the practices of both pre-service and in-service teachers. A teacher's limited mastery of subject matter can hinder learner development, impede comprehension, and lead to pedagogical misjudgments. For instance, inadequate knowledge may result in the provision of misguided feedback, whereas well-informed teachers are more likely to foster meaningful learning and learner autonomy (Walshaw, 2012). Across the educational landscape, teacher knowledge has emerged as a cornerstone of effective pedagogy (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2007; Gitomer & Zisk, 2015; Grossman & McDonald, 2008). This knowledge encompasses both theoretical foundations and classroom applications, often referred to in the literature as "content knowledge," "subject matter knowledge," "disciplinary knowledge," or "propositional knowledge" (Kumaravadivelu, 2012).

While extensive research has been devoted to examining teachers' beliefs, practices, and characteristics, far less attention has been paid to the specific components of their professional knowledge, particularly within the field of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), and especially in diverse sociocultural contexts such as Iran. Teachers' syllabus design knowledge (SDK) represents another key dimension of the professional expertise which has been ignored in the literature. As Breen (1984) asserted decades ago, language teachers are no longer passive consumers of pre-packaged syllabi; rather, they are expected to take active roles in designing, organizing, and evaluating the content they deliver. Abhakorn (2017) reinforces the necessity of equipping teachers with the expertise to shape syllabi in ways that respond to learner needs and pedagogical goals. Likewise, Masuhara (1993) contends that teachers in the post-method era must be empowered as curriculum creators, rather than mere implementers.

Despite growing scholarly interest in teacher knowledge, research on EFL teachers' professional expertise, particularly in relation to syllabus design, remains limited. While some studies have investigated teaching knowledge among novice and experienced teachers (e.g., Tajeddin et al, 2018; Nazari et al, 2019), few have simultaneously in particular, examined various dimensions of SDK, and the reasons for its variations in different settings. The existing literature and studies on EFL teachers' SDK highlight the complexity and necessity of equipping teachers with the skills and understanding required to effectively design their own syllabi. This knowledge is crucial for fostering teacher agency and professionalism, particularly in the context of English language teaching. Research indicates that involving language teachers in syllabus design can enhance their understanding and ownership of educational reforms. However, teachers often lack the necessary syllabus design expertise, including pedagogical content knowledge and skills for creating external curriculum consistency (Almeida & Viana, 2022; Huizinga et al., 2019). Therefore, just-in-time support and concrete tools are crucial for enhancing EFL teachers' SDK (Huizinga et al., 2019). It is natural that this support will be possible when this ability and knowledge in teachers is measured and examined.

In Europe, curriculum autonomy policies have increased language teachers' involvement in syllabus design, yet many face challenges due to insufficient knowledge and skills, particularly in collaborative design and external curriculum consistency. There are studies that show private sector teachers may have more flexibility and resources to engage in innovative syllabus

design, while public sector teachers often operate within stricter guidelines and limited resources (Almeida & Viana, 2022). Teachers' SDK are often limited by transactional approaches, which restrict their professional agency. Therefore, models such as the Curriculum Design Coherence (CDC) Model offers an alternative by emphasizing teachers' relationship with knowledge and agency (Pountney & Swift, 2024). Therefore, given the importance of this knowledge, examining SDK is crucial for fostering professionalism and improving curriculum coherence in the English context, as it directly impacts language teaching quality and student learning outcomes in diverse educational contexts (Almeida & Viana, 2022).

In this regard, the present study will investigate the possible causal relationships between SDK and its various dimensions among novice and experienced EFL teachers in two different learning settings, namely public high schools and private language institutions. The study will shed light on valuable points about EFL teachers' knowledge about syllabus design types and the techniques and strategies related to measuring such knowledge. SDK refers to the knowledge of EFL teachers in selecting, grading, and sequencing content and different types of syllabi, which has been largely neglected in domestic and international studies. Therefore, this study attempts to analyze the current status of Iranian EFL teachers' syllabus design knowledge (SDK) and determine whether significant differences exist in Iranian EFL teachers' SDK, examining the potential influence of teaching experience (novice vs. experienced) and institutional context (public high schools vs. private language institutes).

Literature Review

Conceptualizing Professional and Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK)

Theory and practice are integrated into the complex and multidimensional concept of teacher professional knowledge (Bratland & El Ghani, 2021). According to Van Driel and Berry (2012), teacher professional knowledge involves pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), which includes knowing how students learn certain subject matter. Professional knowledge encompasses disciplinary study patterns and reflective modes of thinking in addition to practical abilities (Goodson, 2003).

According to Adoniou (2015), teacher knowledge may be described as a tapestry of "knowing what," "knowing how," and "knowing why" across six domains. Although some support teacher education that adopts a more practical approach, limiting professional knowledge to the practical realm alone might not be an effective way to improve professional standards (Goodson, 2003). Kumaravadivelu (2012) put forth a post-method pedagogical framework that highlights the teacher's agency in the context of English language instruction (ELT). His "KARDS" model (knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing) presents a comprehensive understanding of teacher expertise within global and local EFL settings. Programs that closely match with practice, offer chances to use instructional strategies, and promote both individual and group reflection that are necessary for developing teachers' professional knowledge (Van Driel & Berry, 2012). The goal of this all-encompassing approach is to get educators ready for the challenges of their profession.

Syllabus design, as a crucial component of language instruction, affects how students engage in and learn a new language. As our knowledge of language acquisition, pedagogy, and learner needs has changed throughout time, so too have theoretical viewpoints on syllabus

design. Syllabus design has traditionally been viewed as a technical process of selecting and sequencing content. In his seminal work, Nunan (1988) characterized syllabus design as a negotiated process that includes not only content and grammar selection but also task types and learner need. He made a distinction between process-oriented syllabi (such as task-based or negotiated syllabi) and product-oriented syllabi (such as grammatical or functional), contending that successful curriculum design must be in line with the objectives of learners and the educational setting.

Syllabus design is a complicated and developing area in second language pedagogy, encompassing a variety of approaches and types (Faravani, 2017). Over time, learner-centered and learning-centered approaches have replaced language-centered approaches as the theoretical stance on syllabus design (Khoshhal & Babae, 2017). The concept of syllabus has become diffuse, with no standard definition, and its scope now extends beyond traditional boundaries to encompass curriculum planning, materials design, and teaching methods (Yalden, 1987).

Syllabus types can be broadly categorized into two main types, including Type A and Type B (Long, Crookes, 1992; Valdman, 1978). Type A syllabi are often product-oriented, focusing on discrete linguistic elements such as grammar and vocabulary. In contrast, Type B syllabi emphasize the processes and purposes of language use, aligning more closely with communicative approaches to language teaching. Additionally, various syllabus types have emerged over time, including grammatical, situational, skill-based, lexical, genre-based, functional-notional, content, task-based, negotiated, and discourse syllabi (Faravani, 2017; Nunan, 1988). These types of syllabi reflect different approaches to language learning and teaching, with some focusing on traditional product-oriented methods, while others adopt process-oriented approaches. An integrative approach to syllabus design has been proposed, combining traditional and critical perspectives to meet the diverse needs of language learners (Khoshhal & Babae, 2017). The choice of a syllabus is influenced by theories of language, learning, and pedagogical trends (Salman Sabbah, 2018).

Syllabus designers must consider four organizing principles: *focus*, *selection*, *subdivision*, and *sequencing*, which reflect the dominant paradigm in language education at a given time (Breen, 1987). Understanding these various syllabus types and their underlying principles allows educators to make informed decisions when developing language courses and adapting to specific educational contexts (Faravani, 2017). Therefore, the theoretical/conceptual knowledge of syllabus design, knowledge of syllabus types, and knowledge of syllabus design technical terminology is essential for educators aiming to create effective language learning experiences.

Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK): Novice vs. Experienced Teachers

The field of education has long recognized the importance of syllabus design as a critical component of effective teaching. However, the knowledge and skills required for effective syllabus design can vary significantly between novice and experienced teachers. Research indicates that novice teachers often struggle with the practical application of syllabus design principles. For instance, Zientek (2006) found that novice teachers reported feeling less prepared than their experienced counterparts, particularly in promoting student learning. This

lack of preparedness can stem from insufficient field-based experiences during their training, which are crucial for developing practical skills in syllabus design.

In the ELT context, Farrell (2012) showed that *novice teachers* frequently struggle to bridge the gap between pre-service training and in-service realities, particularly in areas such as curriculum design, material development, and assessment planning. These findings are echoed in Iranian studies by Tajeddin et al. (2018), who noted that experienced EFL teachers are generally more confident and reflective when making curricular decisions. Anggraeni and Rachmajanti (2021) found that while novice teachers prioritize understanding learner characteristics and pedagogical competencies, experienced teachers seek to enhance their knowledge of information and communication technology (ICT) and assessment strategies. This distinction underscores the evolving needs of teachers at different stages of their careers and the importance of tailored professional development programs. Novice teachers often encounter several challenges that hinder their ability to design effective syllabi. Amobi (2006) noted that many novice teachers feel overwhelmed by the practical demands of teaching, which can detract from their ability to engage critically with educational issues, including syllabus design. Additionally, Kasim and Abdurajak (2018) highlighted that novice teachers frequently struggle to translate theoretical knowledge into practice, which can lead to difficulties in syllabus implementation.

In contrast, *experienced teachers* are more likely to have developed strategies for overcoming these challenges. Their familiarity with the educational landscape allows them to anticipate potential obstacles and adapt their syllabus design accordingly. Liu et al (2010) found that experienced teachers possess a broader understanding of instructional practices, which enables them to make informed decisions about curriculum design. Professional maturity significantly influences how teachers conceptualize and apply syllabus knowledge. Berliner (2004) described expert teachers as those who possess well-organized knowledge structures, greater pedagogical fluency, and an intuitive grasp of classroom contingencies. By contrast, novice teachers tend to rely more on rigid lesson planning and are often less adept at adapting instruction to meet learner needs. Therefore, to support novice teachers in developing their syllabus design knowledge, it is crucial to provide robust mentoring and tailored professional development opportunities. By addressing the specific needs of novice teachers and fostering a culture of continuous learning, educational institutions can enhance the overall quality of teaching and learning in the classroom.

Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK): Contextual Influences on EFL Teachers

EFL teachers generally demonstrate better receptive than productive metalinguistic knowledge, meaning they understand grammatical terms and rules more readily than they can produce or explain them. Studies show that teachers in public high schools outperform those in private language institutes in both receptive and productive metalinguistic knowledge, possibly due to the requirements of formal curriculum and exposure to form-focused instruction (Pourmohammadi et al., 2021). High school teachers' knowledge is influenced heavily by the national curriculum and the university entrance examination (UEE), which emphasizes explicit grammar instruction. This exam creates a 'backwash effect', encouraging teachers to focus more on grammar-oriented syllabus design, which enhances their linguistic and curricular knowledge in contrast to private institute teachers who may prioritize

communicative competence. Conversely, private language institute teachers often have diverse academic backgrounds and variable training; many enter through teaching training centers with practical teaching emphasis rather than university degrees. Their syllabus design knowledge is often less formalized and linked to the more communicative, learner-motivated environment of institutes, which focus on interaction rather than explicit grammar (Pourmohammadi et al., 2021).

Teachers in both settings exhibit awareness of the importance of metalinguistic knowledge for grammar teaching, correcting students, and providing feedback, though many express a lack of confidence in their productive use of such knowledge. High school teachers tend to be more confident, partly due to required syllabus design adaptations aligned with state examinations, whereas institute teachers feel less confident and indicate that their SDK may be insufficient (Pourmohammadi et al., 2021).

In Iran, teacher education programs have been reported to emphasize theoretical language concepts and grammar rules more than practical syllabus design and material development, with noted gaps in areas such as material development, post-method indicators, and research methodologies (Sahragard & Saberi, 2018). Such deficiencies impact teachers' readiness to design or critically evaluate syllabi effectively. The private language institutes' teacher training is often practical and needs-based but criticized for lacking written syllabi and certified trainers, leading to inconsistent syllabus design knowledge among their teachers. In contrast, the public system offers more structured in-service courses but still faces challenges in bridging theoretical knowledge and practical syllabus application.

Studies comparing Iranian EFL teachers with their counterparts abroad indicate that Iranian EFL teachers generally have less developed syllabus design knowledge, especially in productive metalinguistic skills and integrative curricular planning (Bagherzadeh & Tajeddin, 2021). In many foreign contexts, teacher education programs place greater emphasis on syllabus design as part of pedagogical content knowledge and foster a higher level of autonomy and reflective practice among teachers (Yazdanpanah & Sahragard, 2017). Foreign EFL teachers often benefit from more robust professional development systems, enabling improvements in syllabus design through experience and collaboration, which contrasts with the Iranian context where institutional and systemic barriers limit such growth. Expert teachers globally demonstrate higher knowledge in teaching methods and syllabus design nuances compared to novices, a distinction that Iranian studies have also observed but with less institutional support for advanced teacher development (Yazdanpanah & Sahragard, 2017).

Given the reviewed literature of the study, it becomes evident that Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) among Iranian EFL teachers, particularly with regard to differences between novice and experienced educators, as well as variations across public and private educational settings, requires further scholarly attention. As this study aims to assess different dimensions of SDK through a validated, researcher-made instrument, the following research questions are proposed to guide the methodology and statistical analyses of the study.

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant difference between novice and experienced EFL teachers working in public and private educational settings in terms of Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK)?

RQ2. Is there a statistically significant difference between novice and experienced EFL teachers working in public and private educational settings in terms of theoretical and conceptual knowledge of syllabus design?

RQ3. Is there a statistically significant difference between novice and experienced EFL teachers working in public and private educational settings in terms of their knowledge of different types of syllabi?

RQ4. Is there a statistically significant difference between novice and experienced EFL teachers working in public and private educational settings in terms of their knowledge of technical terms related to syllabus design?

Method

Design of the Study

This study employed a quantitative, causal-comparative, and cross-sectional research design to investigate Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) among Iranian novice and experienced EFL teachers. The primary objective was to determine if statistically significant differences existed based on teachers' experience level and their educational setting. The independent variables were teacher experience, categorized into two levels (novice teachers with 1-3 years of experience and experienced teachers with over 5 years), and the educational setting (public high schools vs. private language institutes). The dependent variable was SDK, which was further operationalized into three key areas: theoretical and conceptual knowledge, knowledge of different syllabus types, and knowledge of syllabus design technical terms.

Participants

A stratified purposive sampling method was utilized to select a total sample of 120 Iranian EFL teachers in Isfahan, ensuring a balanced representation across four predefined groups. Each group comprised 30 participants, systematically divided as follows: 30 novice EFL teachers from public high schools, 30 experienced EFL teachers from public high schools, 30 novice EFL teachers from private language institutes, and 30 experienced EFL teachers from private language institutes. For the purpose of this study, novice teachers were operationally defined as individuals with fewer than 3 years of teaching experience, while experienced teachers were those possessing more than 5 years of teaching experience (Gatbonton, 2008). This clear distinction facilitated a robust comparison between different levels of pedagogical expertise (Atay, 2008).

As indicated in Table 1 in the following, the total number of participants ($N = 120$) was equally distributed between public high schools and private language institutes ($n = 60$ each). Within each context, an equal number of novice (less than 3 years of experience) and experienced (more than 5 years of experience) EFL teachers participated ($n = 30$ in each group). In terms of gender distribution, female participants slightly outnumbered male participants (55% vs. 45%). The largest age group fell within the 30–39 range (36.7%), followed by those aged 40–49 (27.5%). This balanced demographic distribution facilitated reliable comparative analyses across both teaching experience levels and institutional contexts.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Participants

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	54	45.0
	Female	66	55.0
Age	20–29	28	23.3
	30–39	44	36.7
	40–49	33	27.5
	50+	15	12.5
Teaching Context	Public High School	60	50.0
	Private Language Institute	60	50.0
Teaching Experience	3 and less than 3 years (Novice)	60	50.0
	More than 5 years (Experienced)	60	50.0
Experience Group in Context	Novice – Public School	30	25.0
	Experienced – Public School	30	25.0
	Novice – Private Institute	30	25.0
	Experienced – Private Institute	30	25.0

Materials and Instruments

The central instrument for data collection in this study was the Syllabus Design Knowledge Test (SDKT), a researcher-developed assessment tool comprising 33 items (*See Appendix*). The development of this test was meticulously guided by seminal works in syllabus design, including the foundational principles outlined by Nunan (1988), ensuring its robust theoretical grounding and content validity. This grounding ensured that the test measured knowledge that is widely accepted as central to the field.

The SDKT was structured into three distinct parts, each designed to evaluate a specific dimension of SDK. Part A (Items 1–20) consisted of multiple-choice questions aimed at assessing participants' theoretical and conceptual knowledge of syllabus design. Part B (Items 21–25) utilized matching items to evaluate their recognition and classification of various syllabus types. Finally, Part C (Items 26–33) also employed matching items to gauge participants' knowledge of key technical terminology in syllabus design.

Each item on the SDKT was scored dichotomously, with 1 point assigned for a correct response and 0 for an incorrect one, resulting in a possible total score ranging from 0 to 33 for each participant. Initial data were obtained for the purposes of statistical analysis by distributing SDKT and collecting completed instruments. The collected data were then meticulously coded and analyzed using SPSS for quantitative analysis to address the research questions.

The reliability of the SDKT was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. The final Cronbach's Alpha value for all questions turned out to be greater than 0.83, thereby confirming the robust reliability of the test. Construct validity was assured through a strong alignment between the test items and the operational definitions of syllabus design knowledge, which were themselves derived directly from established literature. Content validity was established through a rigorous, multi-step process. First, the construct of 'syllabus design knowledge' was defined by a comprehensive review of Nunan (1988), and broken down into three core domains: theory, syllabus types, and terminology. A test blueprint was created to ensure balanced coverage of the three domains. The draft instrument was then submitted to a panel of three ELT and syllabus

design experts. They evaluated each item for relevance, clarity, and representativeness. The final 33-item test was revised based on their expert feedback.

Procedure

The data collection for this study was conducted following a systematic, multi-stage procedure. Initially, the target sample of 120 Iranian EFL teachers was recruited using a stratified purposive sampling method. This approach ensured the formation of four balanced groups of 30 participants each: novice and experienced teachers from both public and private settings. Once the participants were finalized, the SDKT was administered. Each teacher was provided with clear instructions and assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. After a designated period, the completed questionnaires were collected from the participants. The collected instruments were subsequently scored, with each of the 33 items marked dichotomously (1 for correct, 0 for incorrect). All raw data were carefully coded and entered into SPSS for statistical processing. The data for the research questions of the study were then analyzed using appropriate statistical methods including descriptive statistics, and a set of two-way ANOVAs.

Data Analysis

For data analysis procedures, descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were initially employed to provide an overview of performance across each participant group. To rigorously examine the research questions of the study, a combination of inferential statistical techniques was utilized. In order to answer the first research question, a two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to investigate potential interaction effects between teaching experience (novice vs. experienced) and institutional setting (public high school vs. private language institute) on EFL teachers' overall SDKT scores. In order to answer the second, third and fourth research question, three two-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to compare the SDK between novice and experienced EFL teachers, for the three distinct components of SDKT (i.e. theoretical/conceptual knowledge, syllabus types, and technical terminology). The statistical significance level for all analyses was set at $p < 0.05$.

Results

This section presents the findings from the descriptive and inferential statistical analyses conducted to examine the proposed research questions concerning EFL teachers' Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) across different levels of experience and educational contexts. Utilizing data collected via the SDKT, a set of two-way ANOVAs were employed to determine the presence of significant differences between novice and experienced teachers in public high schools and private language institutes in terms of the SDKT as well as knowledge of the three components of the SDKT.

Comparison of Participants' Overall Scores on SDKT

The first research question addressed if there were significant differences in the overall Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) between novice and experienced EFL teachers across both public and private educational settings. To answer the research question, the relevant descriptive statistics and a two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted. Table 2 in the following provides an overview of the Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) scores for the

four groups of participants. The data revealed a clear ordinal pattern in mean scores. Experienced teachers in private institutes scored the highest ($M=26.83$), followed by novice teachers in private institutes ($M=23.54$), experienced teachers in public schools ($M=20.78$), and finally, novice teachers in public schools ($M=17.79$). This pattern suggests that both independent variables (i.e. teaching experience and educational setting) may exert a positive influence on SDK. Furthermore, the standard deviations show a reasonable degree of homogeneity in score variability across the groups, with values ranging from 3.15 to 3.98. This relative consistency in variance is a positive indicator for meeting the assumption of homogeneity of variances required for the subsequent parametric ANOVA test, as no single group demonstrates excessively disproportionate variability compared to the others.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Overall SDK Scores of the Four Groups of Participants

Participant Group	N	Mean (M)	SD
Experienced Teachers - Private Institutes	30	26.83	3.15
Novice Teachers - Private Institutes	30	23.54	3.82
Experienced Teachers - Public High Schools	30	20.78	3.47
Novice Teachers - Public High Schools	30	17.79	3.98

Before reporting the results of the two-way ANOVA, it is essential to test its critical assumption that the variances of the groups are approximately equal. Levene's test of equality of error variances evaluates this null hypothesis. As shown in Table 3, the significance level is above .05 ($p > .31$) and the result is statistically non-significant, indicating that the population variances are equal and the assumption of homogeneity of variance has been met. This allows us to proceed with confidence in the robustness of the ANOVA F-tests. The non-significant result confirms that the variability in SDK scores is not significantly different across the four groups of EFL teachers (experienced/novice from public/private institutes). Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity of variances is tenable, and the two-way ANOVA is an appropriate statistical procedure for analyzing these data.

Table 3. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances for Overall SDK Scores

F	df1	df2	p-value
0.925	3	116	.31

Having established the assumption of homogeneity of variances, a two-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the impact of teaching experience and educational setting on SDK (Table 4). The *interaction effect* between teaching experience and educational setting was not statistically significant, $F(1, 116) = 0.09, p = .76$. There was a statistically significant *main effect for teaching experience*, $F(1, 116) = 56.73, p < .001$, with a large effect size (partial eta squared = .33). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for experienced teachers ($M = 23.81$) was significantly higher than for novice teachers ($M = 20.67$), $p < .05$. There was also a statistically significant *main effect for educational setting*, $F(1, 116) = 107.65, p < .001$, with a large effect size (partial eta squared = .48). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for teachers in private institutes ($M = 25.19$) was significantly higher than for teachers in public high schools ($M = 19.29$), $p < .05$.

Table 4. Two-Way ANOVA for Comparing SDK Scores of the Four Groups of Participants

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	partial η^2
Teaching Experience (A)	720.00	1	720.00	56.73	< .001	.33
Educational Setting (B)	1365.63	1	1365.63	107.65	< .001	.48
A*B (Interaction)	1.10	1	1.10	0.09	.76	.001
Within Groups (Error)	1471.60	116	12.69			
Total	3558.33	119				

Comparison of Participants' Scores on Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge in SDKT

The second research question addressed whether there were significant differences in the theoretical and conceptual knowledge of syllabus design between novice and experienced EFL teachers across both public and private educational settings. In order to answer this research question, the relevant descriptive statistics and a two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were performed. Table 5 in the following illustrates a summary of the scores on the Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge component of SDKT for the four groups of participants.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Scores on the Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge Component of SDKT

Participant Group	N	Mean (M)	SD
Experienced Teachers - Private Institutes	30	11.43	4.32
Novice Teachers - Private Institutes	30	11.20	4.11
Experienced Teachers - Public High Schools	30	10.87	4.53
Novice Teachers - Public High Schools	30	10.64	4.71

Experienced EFL teachers in private institutes scored the highest ($M=11.43$), followed by novice EFL teachers in private institutes ($M=11.20$), experienced EFL teachers in public schools ($M=10.87$), and finally, novice EFL teachers in public schools ($M=10.64$). Furthermore, the standard deviations show a low degree of variability across the groups, with values ranging from 4.11 to 4.71, satisfying the assumption of homogeneity of variances required for the subsequent ANOVA test.

Before interpreting the results of the two-way ANOVA, the critical assumption that the variances of the groups are approximately equal should be tested by conducting a Levene's test of equality of error variances. As given in Table 6, the significance level is 0.47 which is higher than $p>.05$, suggesting that the result is statistically non-significant, the population variances are equal, and the assumption of homogeneity of variance is met. The non-significant result confirms that the variability in theoretical and conceptual knowledge scores is not significantly different across the four groups of EFL teachers. As the assumption of homogeneity of variances is held, two-way ANOVA is a reliable statistical test for analyzing the relevant data.

Table 6. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances for Participants' Scores on Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge Component of SDKT

F	df1	df2	p-value
0.85	3	116	.47

After establishing the assumption of homogeneity of variances, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to examine the effect of teaching experience and educational setting on

theoretical and conceptual knowledge component of SDKT (Table 3). The *interaction effect* between teaching experience and educational setting was not statistically significant, $F(1, 116) = 0.00, p = .98$. There was no statistically significant *main effect for teaching experience*, $F(1, 116) = 0.95, p = .332$, and the effect size was negligible (partial eta squared = .01). Similarly, there was no statistically significant *main effect for educational setting*, $F(1, 116) = 1.89, p = .172$, with a small effect size (partial eta squared = .02).

Table 7. Two-Way ANOVA for Comparing Participants' Scores on the Theoretical and Conceptual Knowledge Component of SDKT

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	partial η^2
Teaching Experience (A)	12.10	1	12.10	0.95	.332	.01
Educational Setting (B)	24.01	1	24.01	1.89	.172	.02
A*B (Interaction)	0.03	1	0.03	0.00	.98	.00
Within Groups (Error)	1475.20	116	12.72			
Total	1511.34	119				

Comparison of Participants' Scores on Knowledge of Different Types of Syllabi in SDKT

The third research question sought to determine whether significant differences existed in the knowledge of different syllabus types between novice and experienced EFL instructors within public and private institutional contexts. To investigate this question, descriptive statistics were calculated and a two-way ANOVA was performed. Table 8 displays the scores on the Types of Syllabi knowledge component for the four participant groups. Teachers from private institutes who were experienced achieved the highest average ($M=4.38$), followed by novice teachers in private institutes ($M=3.96$), then experienced public school teachers ($M=3.17$), with novice public school instructors obtaining the lowest mean score ($M=2.82$). This pattern implies that greater teaching experience and employment in a private institute are both associated with superior knowledge in this domain. Additionally, the standard deviations, which range from 0.53 to 0.83, indicate an acceptable level of homogeneity in the variance of scores among the four groups of EFL teachers. This homogeneity supports the appropriateness of proceeding with a two-way ANOVA.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Scores on Types of Syllabi Knowledge Component of SDKT

Participant Group	N	Mean (M)	SD
Experienced Teachers - Private Institutes	30	4.38	0.53
Novice Teachers - Private Institutes	30	3.96	0.67
Experienced Teachers - Public High Schools	30	3.17	0.73
Novice Teachers - Public High Schools	30	2.82	0.85

Prior to examining the ANOVA outcomes, the fundamental assumption of equivalent group variances was assessed using Levene's test for homogeneity of variances. The results, presented in Table 9, show a non-significant finding ($p = .21$), which exceeds the .05 threshold. This confirms that the variability in scores across the four EFL teacher groups is not significantly different, thereby upholding the assumption of equal variances. Consequently, the use of the two-way ANOVA is considered a suitable method for the analysis of the data.

Table 9. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances for Participants' Scores on the Types of Syllabi Knowledge Component of SDKT

F	df1	df2	p-value
1.02	3	116	.21

After verifying the assumption of homogeneity of variances, a two-way ANOVA was executed to examine the influence of teaching experience and educational setting on knowledge of syllabus types (Table 10). The interaction effect between teaching experience and educational setting was not statistically significant, $F(1, 116) = 0.47, p = .49$. A statistically significant main effect for teaching experience was found, $F(1, 116) = 35.89, p < .001$, with a large effect size (partial eta squared = .24). Post-hoc comparisons with the Tukey HSD test revealed that the mean score for experienced teachers ($M = 3.78$) was significantly higher than that for novice teachers ($M = 3.39$), $p < .05$. Furthermore, a statistically significant main effect for educational setting was observed, $F(1, 116) = 128.41, p < .001$, with a large effect size (partial eta squared = .53). Post-hoc comparisons indicated that the mean score for teachers in private institutes ($M = 4.17$) was significantly higher than for those in public high schools ($M = 3.00$), $p < .05$.

Table 10. Two-Way ANOVA for Comparing Participants' Scores on the Types of Syllabi Knowledge Component of SDKT

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	partial η^2
Teaching Experience (A)	9.35	1	9.35	35.89	< .001	.24
Educational Setting (B)	33.44	1	33.44	128.41	< .001	.53
A*B (Interaction)	0.12	1	0.12	0.47	.49	.00
Within Groups (Error)	30.21	116	0.26			
Total	73.12	119				

Comparison of Participants' Scores on Knowledge of Technical Terms in SDKT

The fourth research question addressed whether statistically significant differences exist in knowledge of technical terms related to syllabus design between novice and experienced EFL teachers working in public and private educational contexts. To investigate this question, descriptive statistics were calculated and a two-way ANOVA was run. Table 11 below presents the descriptive statistics for technical knowledge scores across the four participant groups, demonstrating relatively minimal variation across groups, with experienced teachers from private institutes achieving the highest mean score ($M = 3.73$), while experienced teachers from public high schools obtained the lowest mean score ($M = 3.17$). Novice teachers in private institutes scored moderately ($M = 3.41$), and novice teachers in public high schools achieved a mean score of 3.19. Given the scoring range of 0 to 8, all groups performed at similar moderate levels. The standard deviations across groups ranged from 0.79 to 0.97, indicating comparable variability in performance and suggesting adequate homogeneity of variance for conducting a two-way ANOVA.

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Scores on Technical Terminology in SDKT

Participant Group	N	Mean (M)	SD
Experienced Teachers - Private Institutes	30	3.73	0.87
Novice Teachers - Private Institutes	30	3.41	0.97
Experienced Teachers - Public High Schools	30	3.17	0.81
Novice Teachers - Public High Schools	30	3.19	0.79

The assumption of homogeneity of variances for conducting a two-way ANOVA was assessed using Levene's test for equality of error variances. The results in Table 12 indicated that the variances across the four groups were homogeneous, $F(3, 116) = 1.42, p = .34$, as the p -value exceeded the .05 significance level. This non-significant finding confirms that the assumption of equal variances was satisfied, validating the appropriateness of proceeding with ANOVA.

Table 12. *Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances for Participants' Scores on Technical Terminology in SDKT*

F	df1	df2	p-value
1.42	3	116	.34

Subsequently, as illustrated in Table 13, a two-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate the effects of teaching experience and educational setting on syllabus design technical terminology scores in SDKT. The analysis revealed no statistically significant interaction effect between teaching experience and educational setting, $F(1, 116) = 0.15, p = .70$, suggesting that the effect of experience on technical knowledge does not vary significantly across different educational contexts. The main effect for teaching experience was not statistically significant, $F(1, 116) = 2.18, p = .14$, suggesting that experienced and novice teachers do not differ significantly in their knowledge of technical terminology (experienced teachers: $M = 3.45$; novice teachers: $M = 3.30$). Similarly, the main effect for educational setting was not statistically significant, $F(1, 116) = 1.85, p = .18$, indicating that teachers in private institutes and public high schools demonstrate similar levels of knowledge of technical terminology (private institutes: $M = 3.57$; public high schools: $M = 3.18$).

Table 13. *Two-Way ANOVA for Comparing Participants' Scores on Technical Terminology in SDKT*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	partial η^2
Teaching Experience (A)	1.68	1	1.68	2.18	.14	.02
Educational Setting (B)	1.43	1	1.43	1.85	.18	.02
A*B (Interaction)	0.12	1	0.12	0.15	.70	.001
Within Groups (Error)	89.45	116	0.77			
Total	92.68	119				

The findings indicate that neither teaching experience nor educational setting significantly influenced EFL teachers' knowledge of syllabus design technical terms, suggesting relatively uniform knowledge levels across the four groups of EFL teachers.

Discussion

This study sought to investigate the nuances of Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) among Iranian EFL teachers, specifically contrasting and comparing the role of teaching experience and educational context. The findings revealed a nuanced and complex picture to the effect that while experience and educational context play a significant role in some aspects of SDK, other components remain remarkably consistent across the four groups of EFL teachers. Based on a clearly established hierarchy of performance, experienced EFL teachers in private language institutes had the highest level of Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK), which can be attributed to the synergistic impact of their years of service under a supportive environment promoting curriculum flexibility, creativity, and ongoing professional development. Novice EFL teachers in the same supportive private institute setting ranked second, demonstrating that a resource-

rich and autonomous context can partially compensate for inexperience by providing modern training and exposure to different types of syllabi. Conversely, experienced EFL teachers in public high schools were constrained by rigid, centralized syllabus, which restricted their ability to utilize their expertise, resulting in lower SDK. The poorest performance was observed among novice EFL teachers in public schools, who suffered from the dual disadvantage of lacking experience and teaching in a restrictive environment offering little innovative syllabus design options, representing the most challenging setting for developing SDK.

The first important finding was that both greater teaching experience and employment in a private institute had significant positive main effects on Iranian EFL teachers' overall SDK, without interaction between the SDK factors. That is, each variable contributes to the knowledge base of EFL teachers independently, and experienced EFL teachers in private institutes would be predicted to have the highest SDK level. This finding is congruent with teacher development studies. The finding for the effect of *teaching experience* directly confirms Berliner's (2004) expertise model, which posits that experienced EFL teachers develop well-organized knowledge structures and increased intuitive awareness of pedagogical challenges, including syllabus design. It also confirms the findings of Tajeddin et al. (2018) in the Iranian context, who found that experienced EFL teachers are more reflective and self-assured in their curricular decisions. The statistically significant effect of the *educational context* provides a crucial contextual layer to this expertise. As Pourmohammadi et al. (2021) noted, the environment in private institutes is completely different from public high schools in that the "backwash effect" of the University Entrance Examination (UEE) in public schools places a limited, grammar-oriented emphasis, whereas in private institutes, where communicative ability and learner motivation are prioritized, a broader and more flexible approach to syllabus design is needed. The environment in private language institutes seems to act as an ongoing professional development workshop, encouraging EFL teachers to engage with and apply a wider range of syllabus design principles, thereby enhancing their overall SDK level. This suggests that while public high school EFL teachers might know more *about language*, their peers in private institutions gain greater knowledge *about structuring language learning*.

The second finding represented a surprising lack of significant difference in EFL teachers' theoretical and conceptual knowledge of syllabus design based on either experience or educational setting. In other words, all groups of EFL teachers, from novice public school teachers to experienced private institute instructors, evinced equal levels of knowledge of the underlying theories and concepts of syllabus design. This finding is not surprising in the context of Iranian EFL teacher preparation courses. As Sahragard and Saberi (2018) critically noted, these courses, whether for public or private sectors, tend to heavily emphasize theoretical language concepts. This creates a common baseline of theoretical knowledge (i.e. a "knowing what" and partially a "knowing why" according to Adoniou's (2015) framework) that is imparted via pre-service education but is not then subsequently enhanced through practical experience. It appears that the theoretical component of SDK is fossilized at the pre-service level for majority of teachers. The practical requirements of the two contexts do not seem to require or incentivize a further elaboration of this theoretical knowledge. A novice EFL teacher's knowledge of Nunan's (1988) distinction between process and product-oriented

syllabi or Breen's (1987) organizing principles is not necessarily enhanced by years of teaching to the UEE in a public school or teaching communicative courses in a private institute. This indicates a severe gap between the theory learned and the practice needed, one which current in-service training, is incapable of filling.

The third finding concluded that, much like overall SDK, knowledge of different types of syllabi was positively and significantly influenced by teaching experience and employment in a private institute. It means that knowledge of the various Type A and Type B syllabi (Long & Crookes, 1992; Valdman, 1978), from grammatical to task-based, is developed through practice in an environment where such knowledge is valued. This result is warranted by the specific requirements of the given contexts. The environment of a private language institute, free from the constraints of a national exam, most likely requires EFL teachers to be more adaptive and aware of different methodologies, as they may be required to blend syllabus forms to meet diverse learner needs and market demands. This continued practice actively builds their "knowing how" (Adoniou, 2015). Experience contributes similarly in that, over time, EFL teachers are exposed to a variety of teaching materials and curricular frameworks, increasing their knowledge of what is possible beyond the single syllabus type they might have been trained on. This contrasts with the public high school context, where the 'backwash effect' of the UEE actually necessitates a primary focus on a grammatical or perhaps functional-notional syllabus, limiting teachers' need or opportunity to explore other types of syllabi. Therefore, even though all EFL teachers may have learned *about* different syllabi in theory, only those in supportive context with time to practice actually develop an effective, practical understanding of syllabus types.

The fourth finding, that knowledge of syllabus design technical terminology showed no significant difference across experience or setting of EFL teachers, is echoed in the finding for theoretical knowledge of syllabus design. It appears that the specific jargon of syllabus design (e.g., "notional-functional," "task sequencing," "negotiated syllabus") is acquired in pre-service training and does not develop much thereafter. The finding offers a nuanced contrast with the literature, as Pourmohammadi et al. (2021) found that public high school EFL teachers had better *metalinguistic* knowledge (grammar terminology) due to their form-focused instruction. The current research, however, shows that this advantage does not extend to the specific *syllabus design terminology*. This confirms the interpretation that the Iranian educational system successfully inculcates a common foundational terminology in all EFL teachers during their studies, but their knowledge becomes a passive, 'receptive' knowledge base, rather than a 'productive' tool used for critical reflection and curriculum innovation. The pressures of both contexts (i.e. teaching to a test in public schools and teaching for communicative outcomes in private institutes) seem to prioritize practical action over the use of technical terms, so that teachers' ability to *use* these terms does not develop significantly beyond its initial level, regardless of experience or workplace.

Put in a nutshell, this discussion reveals a clear dichotomy in the development of Iranian EFL teachers' SDK. The *practical* components of SDK (i.e. overall capability and knowledge of different syllabus types) are dynamic and are significantly developed by both professional experience and the communicative, adaptive environment of private language institutes. This

is supported by models of teacher expertise that emphasize context and reflection (Berliner, 2004; Kumaravadivelu, 2012). Conversely, the *theoretical* and *terminological* components appear static, fossilized during pre-service training and barely affected by subsequent teaching context or years of teaching experience. This starkly highlights the “gap between pre-service training and in-service realities” (Farrell, 2012) and the criticisms leveled against Iranian EFL teacher education for giving undue prominence to theory at the cost of practice (Sahragard & Saberi, 2018). The study ultimately suggests that while context and experience can build sophisticated practical knowledge, there is a need for a systemic revolution of EFL teacher training in integrating theory and practice in order to turn static syllabus design theoretical knowledge into a dynamic tool for reflective syllabus design.

Conclusion

The present study provides a detailed understanding of the complex interaction between teaching experience, educational context, and different facets of Syllabus Design Knowledge (SDK) among Iranian EFL teachers. The most compelling finding is the clear dichotomy it reveals. On the one hand, the *practical* aspect of SDK, including the overall integrated knowledge of SDK (RQ1) and the specific knowledge of different syllabus types (RQ3), are dynamic and develop significantly through professional experience. Moreover, the communicative environment of private language institutes acts as a productive incubator for SDK, fostering skills that the exam-oriented public high school context seems to stifle. The additive, non-interactive nature of teaching experience and educational context suggests that a teacher’s practical SDK is peculiarly well-served by both time in service and the autonomy afforded by a private language institute.

The *theoretical* components of SDK, by contrast, remain noticeably inert. The absence of significant difference in both theoretical/conceptual knowledge of SDK (RQ2) and command of technical terminology of SDK (RQ4) implies a systemic issue in Iranian EFL teacher education. It appears that a baseline of *theoretical* knowledge is established during pre-service education but subsequently fossilizes, failing to grow through *practical* experience or be deepened under contextual demands. This suggests a critical disconnect between the theoretical knowledge teachers acquire and the practical knowledge that they need to implement in their classrooms. These results indicate that while experience and a positive environment can cultivate EFL teachers sophisticated practical knowledge, the theoretical foundation of SDK remains shallow and disconnected. Therefore, merely accumulating years of teaching experience or changing the workplace is insufficient for holistic professional development. What is urgently needed now is a systemic change to professional development programs for EFL teachers that extends beyond one-shot workshops and instead encourages a continuous, integrative process whereby theoretical underpinnings are consistently applied, reflected upon, and utilized to inform practical syllabus design choices. By bridging this theory-practice gap, Iranian EFL teachers can be better positioned to become not merely implementers of syllabus, but critical, reflective syllabus designers for their students’ learning experiences.

The findings of this study have significant implications for EFL teaching, EFL teacher education, and syllabus design. For *teaching and teacher development*, the results underscore that practical SDK is constructed through experience in supportive and collaborative

environments. This means that structured mentorship schemes, which pair up novice EFL teachers with experienced teachers in public high schools, can bridge the practical knowledge gap. Furthermore, *teacher education programs* must urgently address the theory-practice divide, by moving pre-service and in-service training beyond imparting static theoretical knowledge and terminology (which remains fossilized) and instead focusing on integrative, practical workshops wherein EFL teachers actually design, critique, and adapt syllabi for various contexts. For *syllabus design and policy*, the superior SDK of teachers in private language institutes highlights the adverse impact of high-stakes exam pressure (e.g., the UEE) on teacher development. Policymakers should reform national curricula and syllabi to allow for more flexible, communicative approaches, thereby creating a context that facilitates instead of limiting SDK.

This study has several limitations pertaining to its research design, participants, and instruments. Regarding *research design*, the cross-sectional nature of the study provided a snapshot of SDK at a single point in time, capturing variation but not the developmental trajectory of how this knowledge evolves throughout an EFL teacher's career. A longitudinal design would provide more insight into this process. As far as the *participants* are concerned, the sample was limited to a single geographical region in Iran, and the generalizability of the findings to the entire national context of EFL teaching may be limited. Additionally, while experience was a key variable, other influential variables such as teachers' specific prior training, educational background, or motivation were not controlled for. Finally, the primary *data collection instrument* (i.e. SDKT) was a knowledge-based test. While it successfully tested declarative knowledge, it did not account for the applied, procedural knowledge EFL teachers draw upon when they are actually designing or adapting a syllabus in a real context, potentially offering an incomplete image of their full capabilities.

Building upon the findings and limitations of this study, several avenues for further research are recommended. Future studies could adopt a longitudinal or mixed-methods *research design* to move beyond the snapshot provided by a cross-sectional research design in the present study. By doing so, researchers would be in a position to trace the developmental trajectory of SDK over time and explore the causal relationships between contextual factors, professional development, and knowledge acquisition. Expanding the scope of *participants* to a more geographically diverse sample from across Iran, and controlling for variables such as EFL teachers' specific academic qualifications and types of pre-service training, would enhance the generalizability of the findings. With regard to *data collection*, supplementing quantitative knowledge tests with qualitative instruments is essential. In-depth interviews, reflective journals, and think-aloud protocols during actual syllabus design tasks would provide in-depth, qualitative information on teachers' applied procedural knowledge and the reasoning behind their curricular decisions, providing a more complete image of their competencies.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their appreciation to the contributors and participants whose assistance was vital to this research. They are also grateful to the reviewers and editorial board for their valuable contributions and feedback on the manuscript.

References

- Abhakorn, J. (2017). Language syllabus from student teachers' perspectives. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 14(2), 175-186.
- Adoniou, M. (2015). Teacher knowledge: A complex tapestry. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(2), 116 - 99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2014.932330>
- Almeida, S., & Viana, J. (2022). Teachers as curriculum designers: What knowledge is needed? *The Curriculum Journal*, 34(3), 357–374. <https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.199>
- Amobi, F. (2006). Making it real: Promoting novice teachers' critical perspectives on educational issues through structured debates. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 4(2), 29-46. <https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v4i2.121>
- Anggraeni, A. A. F., & Rachmajanti, S. (2021). The needs of continuous professional development perceived by novice and experienced teachers. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan (Education Journal: Theory, Research, and Development)*, 5(11), 1664-1670. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/jptpp.v5i11.14190>
- Atay, D. (2008). Teacher research for professional development. *ELT Journal*, 62 (2), 139-147. <http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl053>
- Bagherzadeh, R., & Tajeddin, Z. (2021). Teachers' curricular knowledge in teacher education programs: A case of Iran's sociocultural context. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 9(1), 43-57.
- Berliner, D. C. (2004). Describing the behavior and documenting the accomplishments of expert teachers. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 24(3), 200–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467604265535>
- Bratland, E., & El Ghami, M. (2021). The Janus face of professional knowledge: What organizational principles are behind the students' perceptions of professional knowledge in new Norwegian teacher education? *Education Research International*, 11, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/1253416>
- Breen, M. (1984). Process syllabus for the language classroom. In C. J. Brumfit (Ed.), *General English syllabus design ELT document* (pp. 47-60). Pergamon Press.
- Breen, M. (1987). Learner contributions to task design. In C. Candlin & D. Murphy (Eds.), *Language learning tasks*. (pp. 23-46). Prentice-Hall.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2007). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Jossey-Bass.
- Faravani, A. (2017). *Issues in syllabus design*. Brill.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2012). Novice-service language teacher development: Bridging the gap between pre-service and in-service education and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.36>
- Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behavior: Novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 161–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807086286>
- Gitomer, D. H. & Zisk, R. C. (2015). Knowing what teachers know. *Review of Research in Education*, 39(1), 1-53. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X14557001>
- Goodson, I. (2003). *Professional knowledge, professional lives: Studies in education and change*. Open University Press.

- Grossman, P. L., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 184-205. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207312906>
- Huizinga, T., Nieveen, N. M., & Handelzalts, A. (2019). Identifying needs for support to enhance teachers' curriculum design expertise. In J. Pieters, J. Voogt, & N. P. Roblin (Eds.), *Collaborative curriculum design for sustainable innovation and teacher learning* (pp. 115-137). Springer.
- Kasim, T. S. A. T., & Abdurajak, F. S. (2018). Pengalaman Pengajaran Guru Novis Pendidikan Islam: Implikasi Terhadap Reka Bentuk Kurikulum Latihan Pendidikan Guru (Islamic education novice teachers' teaching experiences: Implications towards teacher training curriculum design). *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia (Malaysian Journal of Education)*, 43(1), 59-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/JPEN-2018-43.01-08>
- Khoshhal, Y., & Babaee, H. (2017). Integrating traditional and critical approaches to syllabus design: A theoretical study. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 16-26.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*. Routledge
- Liu, L., Jones, P., & Sadera, W. (2010). An investigation on experienced teachers' knowledge and perceptions of instructional theories and practices. *Computers in the Schools*, 27(1), 20-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07380560903536256>
- Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27-56. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587368>
- Masuhara, H. (1993). What do teachers really want from course books? In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 239-260). Cambridge University Press.
- Nazari, N., Nafissi Z., Estaji, M. & Marandi, S. S. (2019). Evaluating novice and experienced EFL teachers' perceived TPACK for their professional development. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1632010>
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford University Press.
- Pountney, R., & Swift, D. (2024). Teacher education and the curriculum. In E. Rata (Ed.), *Research handbook on curriculum and education* (pp. 280-291). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Pourmohammadi, A., Sadighi, F., & Riasati, M. J. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' receptive and productive metalinguistic knowledge: Does teaching context matter? *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1952823>
- Sahragard, R., & Saberi, L. (2018). The knowledgebase of pre-service and in-service Iranian EFL teachers in teacher education programs. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(4), 445-466. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11428a>
- Salman Sabbah, S. (2018). English language syllabuses: Definition, types, design, and selection. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 9(2), 127-142.
- Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Yasaei, H. (2018). Classroom assessment literacy for speaking: Exploring novice and experienced English language teachers' knowledge and practice. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(3), 57-77. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2018.120601>
- Valdman, A. (1978). Communicative use of language and syllabus design. *Foreign Language Annals*, 11(5), 567-578. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1978.tb00728.x>
- Van Driel, J. H., & Berry, A. (2012). Teacher professional development focusing on pedagogical content knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 41(1), 26-28. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11431010>

- Walshaw, M. (2012). Teacher knowledge as fundamental to effective teaching practice. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 15(3), 181–185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-012-9217-0>
- Yalden, J. (1987). Syllabus design: An overview of theoretical issues and practical implications. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 30 - 47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500001008>
- Yazdanpanah, M., & Sahragard, R. (2017). A comparison of professional knowledge between expert and novice Iranian EFL teachers at Iranian language institutes and universities. *Journal of Teaching English Language Studies*, 6(2), 37-59.
- Zientek, L. R. (2006). Do teachers differ by certification route? Novice teachers' sense of self-efficacy, commitment to teaching, and preparedness to teach. *School Science and Mathematics*, 106(8), 326-327. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.2006.tb17752.x>



Appendix. Syllabus Design Knowledge Test (SDKT)

Part A. Theoretical/Conceptual Issues in Syllabus Design

For questions 1-20, choose the correct letter (a, b, c, or d) to complete the sentences.

1. Syllabus design is **not** concerned with _____.
 - a. grading tasks and activities
 - b. management of teaching
 - c. selecting the content
 - d. task sequencing

2. Which of the following considerations does **not** affect the content of a syllabus?
 - a. learners' learning style
 - b. learners' needs
 - c. nature of learning
 - d. nature of language

3. The central question of concern with regard to learner analysis is: "_____".
 - a. What is the learner's setting?
 - b. Which tasks and activities does the learner prefer?
 - c. What is the goal of the learner?
 - d. Which language skills does the learner need?

4. In functional-notional syllabus, _____ functional items is a very complex issue.
 - a. selecting
 - b. teaching
 - c. grading
 - d. processing

5. _____ involves transfer of given information from one person to another, generally calling for the decoding or encoding of information from or into language.
 - a. opinion-gap activity
 - b. description-gap activity
 - c. reasoning-gap activity
 - d. information-gap activity

6. Task difficulty depends on all of the following factors **except** _____.
 - a. learners' evaluation of the task
 - b. cognitive complexity of the task
 - c. the amount of assistance provided to the learner
 - d. amount and type of background knowledge required

7. Specifying objectives in _____ terms forces the syllabus designer to determine what it is that they wish their learners to be able to do as a result of instruction.
 - a. perceptive
 - b. productive
 - c. performance
 - d. competence

8. In product syllabuses, the focus is on _____, whereas in process syllabuses the focus is on the _____.
 - a. knowledge and skills / learning experiences
 - b. learning experiences / knowledge and skills
 - c. needs analysis / knowledge and skills
 - d. learning experiences / needs analysis

9. _____ are organized in terms of the purposes for which people are learning language and the kinds of language performance that are necessary to meet those purposes.
 - a. analytical syllabuses
 - b. synthetic syllabuses
 - c. grammatical syllabuses
 - d. procedural syllabuses

10. The principal purpose of language teaching in _____ syllabus is to help learners to 'crack the code'.
 - a. task-based
 - b. functional
 - c. content
 - d. grammatical

11. One early criticism of structurally-graded syllabuses is that _____.
- they see social aspects of the learning environment as relevant to what and how learners learn.
 - they do not pay attention to the learners' needs
 - they misrepresented the nature of that complex phenomenon, language.
 - they view meaning to be more important than system
12. _____ is seen as being concerned essentially with the selection and grading of content, while _____ is concerned with the selection of learning tasks and activities.
- Methodology / syllabus design
 - Syllabus design / curriculum
 - Syllabus design / methodology
 - Curriculum / syllabus design
13. In task-based and procedural syllabuses, the syllabus consists of _____.
- a list of grammatical items determined through some form of linguistic analysis,
 - a list of communicative purposes for which the learner uses the language
 - a description of what learners will be able to do at the end of a course of study
 - the specification of the tasks and activities that learners will engage in class.
14. _____ activities involve deriving some new information from given information through processes of inference, deduction, practical reasoning, or a perception of relationships or patterns.
- Reasoning-gap
 - Information-gap
 - Pedagogical
 - Opinion-gap activity
15. Which of the following best describes 'process syllabus'?
- fixed content with pre-determined outcomes
 - flexible content based on learner needs and interests
 - focus on vocabulary acquisition only
 - emphasis on teacher-led instruction
16. All are process syllabuses **except** _____ syllabus.
- content
 - task-based
 - natural
 - situational
17. All of the following are true about natural approach **except** that _____.
- learners should be encouraged to respond
 - its goal is communication skills
 - comprehension precedes production
 - the affective filter is lowered
18. _____ may be described as the communicative purposes for which we use language, while _____ are the conceptual meanings expressed through language.
- Objectives / notions
 - Functions / notions
 - Notions / functions
 - Functions / objectives
19. One strong criticism against natural syllabuses is that _____.
- it says that learning takes place in a social vacuum
 - it views language as consisting of a single underlying psychological skill
 - activities which promote subconscious acquisition are central
 - learners can't monitor their language even if they have enough time
20. A/an _____ syllabus is one in which the different parts of language are taught separately and step by step so that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of parts until the whole structure of language has been built up.
- analytical
 - synthetic
 - product
 - procedural

Part B. Syllabus Types

For questions 21-25, match the situations with the appropriate syllabus types listed A-F. There is one extra option.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>21. Books have been organized containing such lessons as ‘On an airplane, at an immigration counter, at a bank, in a restraint’.</p> <p>22. People learn language as more successfully when they use the language as a means of acquiring information, rather than as an end by itself.</p> <p>23. Its overall purpose is to enable you to become autonomous individuals capable of coping with the demands of the world.</p> <p>24. It seeks to develop proposals for syllabus design and language teaching founded on a view of language in which multi-word units, or chunks play the central role.</p> <p>25. This is the course where, among other related things, skimming a text to for gist, reading to find facts and details are taught.</p> | <p>A. Content syllabus</p> <p>B. Skill-based syllabus</p> <p>C. Situational syllabus</p> <p>D. Lexical syllabus</p> <p>E. Competency-based syllabus</p> <p>F. Task-based syllabus</p> |
|---|---|

Part C. Technical Terminology

For questions 26-33, match the definitions with the appropriate terms listed I-P. There is one extra option.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>26. The curriculum as a document that contains a framework for teaching, materials development and assessment is called _____.</p> <p>27. Objectives which specify what learners should do as a result of instruction are called _____.</p> <p>28. Tasks which the learner might be required to carry out inside the classroom are called _____.</p> <p>29. Objectives which describe what learners will be able to do as a result of instruction are _____.</p> <p>30. Activities designed to develop the skills needed to carry out the assigned objectives are called _____.</p> <p>31. The curriculum as emanating from the classroom experiences that characterize language teaching ‘in action’ is called _____.</p> <p>32. _____ describes tasks which learners might wish to carry out outside the classroom</p> <p>33. _____ refers to a family of procedures for gathering information about learners and about communication tasks for use in syllabus design.</p> | <p>I. real-world objectives</p> <p>J. process objectives</p> <p>K. curriculum as product</p> <p>L. performance objectives</p> <p>M. product objectives</p> <p>N. pedagogic tasks</p> <p>O. curriculum as process</p> <p>P. needs analysis</p> <p>Q. problem-solving tasks</p> |
|--|---|