

New Guidelines for College English Materials Development¹⁾

Kyunghwan Kim²⁾

(Kyung Hee University) (Cheju National University of Education)

Mia Kim

(Kyung Hee University)

Kyoung-Sun Hong

Garnet Nimmo

(Kyung Hee University)

Kim, Kyunghwan., Hong, Kyoung-Sun., Kim, Mia., & Nimmo, Garnet. (1998). *New guidelines for college English materials development*. *English Teaching*, 53(3), 217-239.

Kim, Hong, Kim, and Nimmo (1996) reported a student survey results on what types of materials, topics, and exercises for developing the four basic skills Korean university students find useful, interesting, and/or important in learning English. In order to compare the student survey results and what English instructors in Korean universities think appropriate as English coursebooks for Korean university students, a teacher survey was conducted between the end of 1996 and the beginning of 1997. The teacher survey consisted of what the student survey included, in addition to other questions related to some external aspects of textbooks. This paper reports the teacher survey results, and compares and analyzes the results from the two surveys. The final results can be used as a basis for evaluating and developing coursebooks for English language courses in universities in Korea.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently more and more colleges and universities in Korea have been taking

1) This paper was supported by '95 SPECIAL FUND for UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INSTITUTE, Korea Research Foundation.

2) After this research project was completed, Kyunghwan Kim has changed his affiliate from Kyung Hee University to Kyonggi University.

a positive action to improve the quality of English education.³⁾ With such a trend, the qualification and experience of English instructors are getting more important and many instructors seem to have a right to choose their coursebooks. At this point, we are concerned about how to select or develop a good coursebook suitable to our particular teaching situation because many instructors "tend to follow the text's sequence, methodology, pacing, and vocabulary to the letter" (Skierso, 1991, p.432), though no teachers are fully satisfied with their textbooks and supplementary materials. Moreover, a textbook may even be seen as a means of motivating students to pursue language study by offering various situations in its illustrations and readings, as indicated by Ariew (1982).⁴⁾

In order to help instructors select or develop a proper English textbook suitable to Korean college and university students, we wish to provide a guideline to develop better coursebooks tailored to the needs of the college level learners. We understand that textbook criteria are emphatically local as mentioned by Sheldon (1988). Anthony (1995) also asks a relevant question: "How can a published textbook serve my class well when the author clearly has no knowledge about my learners' problems or interests?" (p. 35) To investigate local problems and needs for Korean university students, we conducted a teacher survey at the end of the 1996 fall semester, following the student survey done a semester earlier.⁵⁾

The purpose of this survey was, first, to see what types of materials, topics, and exercises English instructors at colleges and universities in Korea think useful and/or important in learning English. It also provides information about instructors' preferences regarding multi-skill learning in an English course. Second, it is possible to compare the results from the instructors' survey with the students' reported in Kim et al. (1996). The final results obtained from the comparison can be used as a basis for evaluating textbooks and furthermore, as a guideline in developing coursebooks for English language courses in

3) An earlier version of this paper was presented at the KATE (Korea Association of Teachers of English) 1998 Winter International Conference, and we thank the audience at the conference who commented on it. We also would like to sincerely thank the reviewers of *English Teaching*, who provided us with valuable comments.

4) Ariew (1982) is cited in Skierso (1991).

5) A report on the student survey for the same purpose was published in Kim et al. (1996).

universities in Korea. Such textbooks should be communicative rather than traditional in terms of Grant (1987), helping students to use in real life the language they have learned in the classroom.

II. METHODOLOGY

1. Subjects

The survey was conducted between December 1996 and January 1997, and ninety-seven questionnaire forms were collected from twenty-seven universities throughout Korea.⁶⁾ The following is part of the basic information related to the subjects.

TABLE 1
Subjects

Sex	Male	45
	Female	47
Age	30 & under	13
	31 ~ 40	40
	41 ~ 50	22
	51 & above	17
Nationality	Korean	39
	American	40
	Australian	1
	British	5
	Canadian	7
	Czech	1
	Philippine	2

6) Since six respondents have not specified the name of their university, the number of universities can be more than twenty-seven. We cordially thank faculty members and instructors who kindly returned their questionnaire forms.

Status	Part-time Lecturer	19
	Full-time Lecturer	41
	Assistant Professor	8
	Associate Professor	4
	Professor	14
	Other	7
Final Degree Obtained	Bachelor's	9
	Master's	43
	Doctoral	37
	Other	3
Field of Degree	TEFL/TESL	27
	Linguistics	23
	English Literature	13
	Education	6
	English Language	4
	Communication	2
	Other	16

Since the numbers of males and females are nearly same, and since the difference between the number of Koreans and the number of foreign instructors participated in the survey is not so great, it is worth going through the statistical results to see if there is any significant differences in terms of sex and nationality. However, since the main purpose of this paper is to analyze the results obtained from college students and English instructors in Korea, a comparison between the different sexes and between Korean instructors and foreign instructors shall be done in a future research.

2. Survey Questions

The survey questionnaire consisted of a hundred and seven questions. Of them, forty-four questions were the same as the ones in the student survey, which dealt with expected skills to be practised in conversation and composition

courses, degree of usefulness in types of materials, degree of usefulness in topic areas, and importance of types of exercises for reading, writing, listening and speaking.

Seventeen questions (plus five open-ended ones) were added to the instructors' questionnaire to find out their opinions with regard to various aspects of materials, such as number of sections in a unit, necessity of a teacher's manual, tapes, accents recorded in tapes, illustrations, price, etc.⁷⁾ Finally, eleven questions were provided to collect background information on the instructors.

3. Data Analysis

To analyze the data collected from the teacher survey, the SAS (Statistical Analysis System) version 6.08 was used, and the frequency of teacher responses was measured. Although only ninety-seven questionnaires were collected and used for the analysis, which can be pointed out as a limitation of the analysis, the statistical analysis is still valid since normal distribution can be obtained when samples are more than thirty. Therefore, it is possible to estimate the means of population of English instructors teaching at Korean universities through the means that we obtained, which function as the statistical estimator of the samples.

In addition to the statistical analysis of the teacher survey, a t-test was performed in order to compare the means obtained through the teacher and the student survey. As a result, there were some items showing significant differences with 95% accuracy between the two groups.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section can be divided into two parts. The first part (subsections 1 through 8) compares the results from the teacher survey and the ones from the

7) Twenty-four more questions were also added to see how important English instructors think some aspects are in conversation (e.g., fluency, cultural awareness) and in composition (e.g., mechanics), and how much they think Korean university students need to improve them, the results from which we did not include in this report.

student survey reported in Kim et al. (1996). The latter part (subsections 9 through 16) includes the results solely obtained from the teacher survey, the purpose of which was to find out instructors' opinions on some external aspects of materials.

1. Multi-skill Learning (Conversation)

Regarding the question of which skills must be practiced in an English conversation course, 30 instructors (30.9%) checked *speaking and listening only*, 16 (16.5%) *listening, speaking, and reading*, and 51 (52.6%) *listening, speaking, reading, and writing* integrated. That is, more than half of the instructors think all four skills should be integrated, whereas about one third of them think two closely related skills such as speaking and listening may be more effectively combined in teaching English rather than three skills (i.e., listening, speaking, and reading). It seems that some instructors do not recognize the potential effect of reading that can motivate students to think and discuss more specifically, which often provides good expressions or ideas if reading materials are well selected.

On the other hand, the results of the student survey reported in Kim et al. (1996) were as the following: 45.7% of the students checked for *speaking and listening only*, 16.2% for *speaking, listening, and reading*, and 38.1% for *speaking, listening, reading, and writing* combined. That is, a higher percentage of instructors, compared to students, think other skills in addition to speaking and listening should also be covered in a conversation class: specifically, more instructors prefer all four skills combined in a conversation class whereas more students prefer *speaking and listening only*.

2. Multi-skill Learning (Composition)

Regarding the question of which skills must be practiced in an English composition course, only 5 instructors (5.2%) checked *writing only*, 48 (50.0%) *writing and reading* combined, 43 (44.8%) all four skills. The numbers suggest that the majority (94.8%) of instructors agree that reading practice must accompany writing practice, and that writing practice alone cannot comprise an effective composition course.

We should notice here that more instructors want to combine the two skills only than all four in a composition class, although the difference is only about 5%. We can at least infer from this finding that the four-skill learning is less favored by the instructors in a composition class compared to a conversation class, in which more instructors prefer to integrate all four skills. In the case of students' response reported in Kim et al. (1996), 34.8% preferred *writing and reading* combined, and 37.8% four skills combined in a composition class.

With regard to multi-skill learning, still many English teachers in Korea may not be well oriented to the currently recognized communicative, interactive framework. Brown (1994) noted that the most effective English language teaching integrates the four skills rather than assuming that one skill can be broken down, isolated, and studied for long stretches of time, and that the integration of the four skills is the only plausible approach to take within a communicative, interactive framework. With all our history of treating the four skills in separate segments of a curriculum, there is nevertheless a more recent trend toward skill integration. That is, rather than designing a curriculum to teach the many aspects of one skill, say, reading, curriculum designers are taking more of a whole language approach whereby reading is treated as one of two or more interrelated skills. We should also note that content-based teaching, task-based, theme-based or topic-based teaching helps the novice teacher to become confident in directing interactive, student-centered, cooperative classrooms (Brown, 1994).

However, since the survey results from instructors and students regarding multi-skill learning reflect how important they think integration of different skills in a course is, and moreover since the results apparently show that the number of respondents (both students and instructors) who think all four skills must be integrated is far from consisting the vast majority, one cannot simply adopt Brown's argument. Furthermore, for Korean college students who have instrumental motivation of learning English, a short-term isolated skill learning can be helpful to achieve their specific goals.

3. Types of Materials

Five text types were presented and instructors were asked how useful each material type is. The result below shows the mean for each type of materials

listed in order, with the maximum of 5 as very useful and the minimum of 1 as not useful at all. The numbers in square brackets indicate the rank followed by the mean of each item drawn from the result of the student survey reported in Kim et al. (1996).⁸⁾

TABLE 2
Types of Materials

Types of Materials	Usefulness	Students' Response
1. Conversations/dialogues/interviews	4.146	[1. 4.350]
2. Newspaper/magazine articles	4.021	[2. 4.014]
3. Short stories/narratives	3.448	[4. 3.289]
4. Letters/application forms	3.226	[3. 3.529**]
5. Graphics/charts/statistics	2.646	[5. 2.918**]

**P < 0.05

The instructors tend to think *conversations/dialogues/interviews* and *newspaper/magazine articles* are more useful than the other types, which was also observed among the students. The only difference between the instructors and the students in terms of ranking among material types is that the students considered *letters/application forms* more useful than *short stories/narratives*. This may imply that the students are more concerned about practicality or applicability of materials while the instructors want to provide more content-based materials for their students.

4. Topic Areas

Sixteen types of topics were chosen and instructors were asked how useful each topic is in learning English.

8) Below the table, $P < 0.05$ indicates that statistically there is a possibility with 95% certainty that the means for the instructors and the students show a significant difference.

TABLE 3
Topic Areas

Topic Areas	Usefulness	Students' Response
1. Jobs/work	4.305	[4, 4.118]
2. School life/education	4.301	[10, 3.738**]
3. Greetings/meeting people	4.295	[1, 4.278]
4. Customs/cultures in other countries	4.245	[3, 4.150]
5. Family relationship/family life	4.158	[11, 3.678**]
6. Traveling/transportation	4.095	[2, 4.196]
7. Emotions	4.074	[5, 4.034]
8. Dating/friendship	4.074	[7, 3.931]
9. Sports/hobbies/entertainment	4.065	[6, 4.015]
10. Food/dining out	3.809	[9, 3.789]
11. Physical appearance	3.688	[12, 3.605]
12. Shopping	3.641	[8, 3.813]
13. Time/weather	3.581	[14, 3.568]
14. Housing/accommodation	3.500	[15, 3.523]
15. Neighborhood	3.226	[13, 3.598**]
16. Animals/plants/nature	3.043	[16, 3.391**]

**P < 0.05

The means of the top ten topic areas are higher than 3.75, which means that the instructors think them worthy to deal with in class and useful topics motivating their students.⁹⁾

Some significant differences are found between the instructors and the students. For example, while the instructors consider *school life/education* and *family relationship/family life* fairly useful topics, that is not the case for the students. They are considerably ranked lower with lower means in the student survey. On the other hand, both groups consider *time/weather*, *housing/accommodation*, *neighborhood*, *animals/plants/nature* as least useful topics.

When we select topic areas for the coursebooks, the result of the student survey can be considered more useful and important if learner-based curriculum

9) We would like thank one of the audience at the KATE 1998 Winter International Conference, who suggested that 3.75 should be set as a critical point.

is emphasized. But when there is a significant difference between the two groups, it is recommended to look for a way to include in the coursebooks what the instructors think useful since the evaluation and the experience of the instructors cannot be ignored. Why are students comparatively not so much interested in those topics (e.g., *school life/education* and *family relationship/family life*) that the instructors consider useful? For such topic areas, we should design materials, and develop teaching methods and activities to make students get involved in the target topics.

5. Exercise Types for Reading

We asked the instructors to indicate how important the following reading exercises are in a coursebook.

TABLE 4
Exercise Types for Reading

Exercise Types	Importance	Students' Response
1. Summary exercise about the main idea/ information in a text	4.427	[4. 3.939**]
2. Exercise for making inferences	4.052	[2. 4.192]
3. Questioning about specific pieces of information in a text	4.021	[5. 3.558**]
4. Exercise for guessing unknown words from context	3.969	[3. 3.970]
5. Speed reading exercise for gist	3.771	[1. 4.193**]

**P < 0.05

According to the above result, English instructors focus on training for the overall comprehension and more content-oriented drill rather than vocabulary or speed reading drill.

The mean for *exercise for guessing unknown words from context* is almost

identical to the one in the student survey. However, it is striking to see the difference between the instructors and the students with regard to *summary exercise about the main idea/information in a text* and *speed reading exercise for gist*. Also, *questioning about specific pieces of information in a text* is considered more important by the instructors than by the students.

We agree with the instructors regarding the importance of summarizing the main idea of a text when reading. However, students may find *summary exercise about the main idea/information* difficult or time-consuming, and therefore they may want to avoid it. In such a case, we need to find out better methods or techniques to design such exercises in a more interesting way to motivate students.

6. Exercise Types for Writing

TABLE 5
Exercise Types for Writing

Exercise Types	Importance	Students' Response
1. Presentation and practice for organizing and developing an essay (writing a thesis statement, topic sentences, supporting sentences, conclusion, etc.)	4.573	[1. 3.913**]
2. Presentation and practice for process of writing (brainstorming, pre-writing, writing drafts, revising, etc.)	4.365	[2. 3.851**]
3. Presentation and practice for styles in writing (formal/informal essay, narrative, description, letters, etc.)	3.865	[3. 3.705]
4. Presentation and practice for mechanics (paragraph format, punctuation, quotation, reference, etc.)	3.854	[4. 3.498**]
5. Presentation and practice for a variety of grammar	3.313	[5. 3.492]

**P < 0.05

According to the result above, organizing ideas and building up logic are considered by the instructors to be more important in writing than grammar, mechanics or style.

Unlike exercise types for reading, the rank for each type of writing exercises in the teacher survey exactly matches the one in the student survey, which means both the instructors and the students agree what types of exercises are more important in writing. Such a result can provide us with a clear guide to what a writing coursebook (or part of a coursebook relevant to writing) should emphasize in order to be considered effective by both instructors and students in Korean universities.

However, another noticeable finding is that although the ranks are similar, the means in the instructors survey is generally higher than those in the student survey. The t-test results show that for the three writing exercise types, the differences are clearly significant. This could indicate the difference between the instructors and the students in terms of how seriously writing is considered in learning English.

7. Exercise Types for Listening

The result below shows that the means for four types of exercises are higher than 4, which means most instructors think such exercises are important for their students, while practice for intonations is considered less important.

TABLE 6
Exercise Types for Listening

Exercise Types	Importance	Students' Response
1. Exercise for listening for gist and/or specific pieces of information	4.242	[4. 4.088]
2. Exercise for understanding verbal description/narrative/instructions	4.146	[2. 4.182]
3. Exercise for making inferences through listening	4.124	[3. 4.159]
4. Exercise for understanding informal conversations	4.073	[1. 4.588**]
5. Presentation and practice for intonations	3.361	[5. 3.751**]

**P < 0.05

One obvious difference between the instructors and the students is that *exercise for understanding informal conversations* is not only the first choice but its mean is comparatively higher in the student survey than in the teacher survey result. This shows students' greater preference for practice of English related to conversation, which is consistent with the student survey result on types of materials (cf. Table 2). On the other hand, we can see that the instructors consider *exercise for listening for gist and/or specific pieces of information*, *exercise for understanding verbal description/narrative/instructions*, and *exercise for making inferences through listening* as important as, or more important than, *exercise for understanding informal conversations*. Such a difference is understandable when we consider the fact that the first three types of listening exercises are supposed to be more difficult, but important to improve listening ability in general.

Another interesting result is that although practice for intonations is considered relatively less important than the other types of listening exercises in both surveys, students seem to be a bit more conscious about their intonation.

8. Exercise Types for Speaking

As was the case for the exercise types for listening, the students consider practice related to conversation and practice for intonation (and pronunciation) more important in speaking than the instructors do. Nevertheless, both groups agree that *presentation and practice for expressing or explaining your opinions in discussions* and *presentation and practice for asking and answering questions in a conversation* are more important than the other types of exercise in speaking.

TABLE 7
Exercise Types for Speaking

Exercise Types	Importance	Students' Response
1. Presentation and practice for expressing or explaining your opinions in discussions	4.526	[2. 4.461]
2. Presentation and practice for asking and answering questions in a conversation	4.309	[1. 4.514**]
3. Presentation and practice for giving summarized oral reports or short talks	4.113	[5. 3.875**]

4. Presentation and practice for information gathering (interview, information gap exercise)	4.072	[6. 3.760**]
5. Presentation and practice of appropriate style and expressions in speaking	3.804	[3. 4.007**]
6. Presentation and practice of correct pronunciation and intonation	3.500	[4. 3.885**]

**P < 0,05

Note that *practice for expressing or explaining opinions in discussions, practice for giving summarized oral reports or short talks, and practice for information gathering (interview, information gap exercise)*, each of which is considered more important by the instructors than the students, require more skilled proficiency. Such difference between the instructors and the students shows the instructors are more aware of the fact that students should acquire English not just as a tool to perform simple conversations, but also as a language used in various situations that may demand much more effort.

At this point, we may raise the following question: Does the current English teaching/learning environment in Korean universities provide opportunities to the students to acquire higher proficiency? We assume that it does not, and we agree that Korean students need to improve their ability to hold a discussion in English. For this, simply providing good English textbooks is not sufficient, and what we need is experienced and professional instructors who can lead and motivate their students to work on improving their English proficiency beyond simple conversations, which must be supported by a systematic curriculum that allows the students to continue studying English to higher levels.

Another finding, based on the two survey results, that we would like to note is the difference between the students and the instructors in terms of which skills—among listening, speaking, reading and writing—are considered more important. McDonough and Shaw (1993) stated that "in the early years of communicative language teaching, 'communicative' was interpreted by and large as oral production with other three skills lagging somewhat behind. However, in recent years there has been a tendency to redress the balance" (pp.152-153). Their statement is applicable to the difference between the two groups. That is, if we look at the overall range of means for the four skills from the results of

the student survey, the means for the listening and the speaking exercises are relatively higher than those for the reading and the writing exercises, which clearly reflects their strong preference for oral communication. On the other hand, we can infer that the instructors are more concerned about balanced development of the four skills.

What follows is the results obtained from additional seventeen questions about external aspects of materials, such as number of sections in a unit, necessity of a teacher's manual, accents recorded in tapes, illustrations, etc.

9. Conversation Sections

English instructors were asked how many sections (activities) would be appropriate to be included in each unit of a conversation coursebook. The range was set between three and seven(+). The mean for this question was 4.627 (sections).

TABLE 8
Conversation Sections in a Unit

Number of Sections	Percentage of Instructors
3	20.5%
4	24.1%
5	34.9%
6	13.3%
7+	7.2%

Quite a high number of instructors feel that having four or five sections would be appropriate for each unit of a conversation coursebook.

10. Composition Sections

Instructors were asked the same question as above in reference to a composition coursebook. The range, again, was set between three and seven(+). The mean for this question was 4.349 (sections).

The result below shows a relatively discursive distribution. Nonetheless, the majority consider three to five sections for each unit as appropriate in a composition coursebook.

TABLE 9
Composition Sections in a Unit

Number of Sections	Percentage of Instructors
3	31.3%
4	22.9%
5	31.3%
6	8.4%
7+	6.0%

11. Supplementary Materials for Listening and Speaking

Four supplementary materials were given and instructors were asked how important each supplementary material is for a listening/speaking coursebook. The following is the mean for each supplementary material listed in order, with the maximum of 5 as very important and the minimum of 1 as not important at all.

TABLE 10
Supplementary Materials for L/S

Materials	Importance
Listening Tape	4.021
Teacher's Guide	3.823
Video Tape	3.811
Workbook	3.417

Note that the first three are thought to be fairly important supplementary materials in a listening/speaking coursebook. Also, listening tapes are still a bit

more preferred than video tapes by the instructors. However, demand for video tapes is rapidly increasing, but the reality is that audio-visual equipments, especially VCRs, are not available for every general English class in many universities. If universities can supply sufficient, and also efficient, equipment, we assume that more coursebooks with video tapes would be used.

12. Supplementary Materials for Reading and Writing

The same four supplementary materials were given and instructors were asked how important each supplementary material is for a reading/writing coursebook. The following is the mean for each supplementary material listed in order, with the maximum of 5 as very important and the minimum of 1 as not important at all.

TABLE 11
Supplementary Materials for R/W

Materials	Importance
Workbook	3.979
Teacher's Guide	3.821
Listening Tape	2.596
Video Tape	2.548

Obviously, listening or video tapes are considered less important in a reading/writing coursebook than in a listening/speaking coursebook. On the other hand, a workbook in a reading/writing coursebook is considered more important by many instructors than in a listening/speaking coursebook, which reflects the necessity and also the potentiality of self-study in a reading/writing course. Note that a teacher's guide is consistently considered important in both courses.

13. Accents

Instructors were asked which accents should be recorded in listening materials. The following is the breakdown of the responses.

TABLE 12
Accents Recorded in Listening Materials

Accents	Percentage
American only	18.2%
British only	0.0%
American and British mixed	36.4%
Native speakers' and non-native speakers' mixed	45.5%

The result clearly shows that very few instructors consider it desirable for students to become familiar with just one type of (standard) accent. In addition, if instructors checked for *native speakers' and non-native speakers' mixed*, they were also asked to give the percentage of non-native speakers' participation in recording listening materials. The result was that they consider about 27.5% of the listening materials could consist of accents of non-native speakers of English.

14. Layout

Three aspects of layout were given and instructors were asked how important each aspect is in English coursebooks for university students, with 5 as very important and 1 as not important at all.

TABLE 13
Layout

Layout	Importance
Photos	3,927
Drawings	3,670
Color	3,564

The result shows that many instructors feel all three aspects of layout are somewhat important when considering English coursebooks.

15. Price

We asked instructors what would be the most appropriate price range of English coursebooks.

TABLE 14
Price of Coursebooks

Price Range	Percentage of Instructors
under 10,000 won	53.3%
10,000 ~ under 15,000 won	43.5%
15,000 ~ under 20,000 won	3.3%
20,000 won and over	0.0%

As shown in the above table, a little over half the instructors consider college English coursebooks should be sold under 10,000 won, although many English coursebooks imported cost around 15,000 won. If the publishers and their distributors can maintain the prices under 15,000 won, many instructors would still consider them appropriate.

16. Computer Softwares

We asked instructors if they had ever used computer softwares as course materials. Only fourteen out of ninety-seven instructors (14.4%) responded 'YES.' We further asked how effective they thought computer softwares were, and the mean for effectiveness was 3.476, with 5 as very effective and 1 as not effective at all.

Sixty-eight instructors (70.1%) out of ninety-seven responded that they had never used computer softwares. When they were asked how much they would like to try using computer softwares in English courses in the future, the following response was obtained. Its mean was 3.153.

TABLE 15
Willingness to Use Computer Softwares in the Future

Degree of Willingness	Percentage of Instructors
1	11.1%
2	19.4%
3	33.3%
4	15.3%
5	20.8%

Not only the number of instructors was small, who had ever used computer softwares as course materials, but even among those who had never used them, not many seem to be very eager to try using computer software in their class. Although we did not ask them why they do not prefer to use computer softwares, many seem to agree that instructors are not yet familiar with using computers in classrooms, partly because some just don't like machines, and partly because they are too much accustomed to the conventional teaching methods and materials.

Whether computer-assisted language learning can be more effective than conventional language learning is questionable, but to name some merits of computer-assisted language learning, it is readily accessible compared to human instructors, and students can choose appropriate software suitable to their own level of proficiency. There are various interactive multimedia materials available from the Internet, CALL, video-on-demand and satellite TV system. Those interested in these materials can refer to Cho, Moon, and Lee (1997) and Kim (1997).

IV. CONCLUSION

Considering the results of the surveys, we may point out the following for those who wish to develop an English coursebook for Korean college students.

First, four skills integrated, but two skills focused, materials may be appropriate for Korean students with instrumental motivation. Such coursebooks should be organized in a way that instructors can have some flexibility on how to use the materials depending on their students' needs.

Second, the topic areas with 3.75 or higher in both teacher and student surveys are highly recommended. However, we also think that the topic area with 3.75 or higher only in the teacher survey result should be included but designed in a way to motivate students.

Third, respecting both instructors' and students' opinions for the types of materials and exercise types, sufficient amount of content-based materials should be provided but practical ones also should be included.

Fourth, the price of a coursebook should be under 15,000 won, and four or five sections would be recommendable in a unit.

Fifth, supplementary materials such as a teacher's manual and audio-visual materials are essential for a conversation course. It is considered desirable to include some non-native speakers' accents (25%~30% of the entire recording) in recorded materials. For a composition course, carefully designed workbooks and a teacher's manual should be provided. With regard to computer softwares, they may not be yet useful for, or at least not popular to, the instructors in the classroom.

In this paper, we examined what Korean university instructors and students who participated in the survey consider more important and useful to be included in English coursebooks. The results from the teacher survey and the ones from the student survey fairly match with regard to material types and writing exercises. However, some significant differences were found in topic areas, reading exercises and listening exercises. As for multi-skill learning and speaking exercises, both similarities and differences were observed. Even though many are advocating a learner-based approach recently, we emphasized that instructors' opinions and experiences cannot be ignored in designing coursebooks even though they may not accord with the students'. What we could notice, for example, was that while the students preferred conversation related exercises for listening and speaking, the instructors think that exercises that require higher proficiency than simple conversation must be integrated in coursebooks.

Universities in Korea mostly use English textbooks that are published either in the U.S. or England, which is similar in Taiwan, and domestic college English textbooks are rarely published. In the case of Japan, however, although American and British coursebooks are still popular, the number of college English textbooks published in Japan is comparatively greater than in Korea. Some English textbooks published in Japan (e.g., Knudsen & Oda, 1991) emphasize that students must understand the culture and customs of English speaking countries in order to carry out a successful communication in accordance with situational context. In our teacher survey, we also asked the teachers how important cultural awareness is when students are learning English, and the mean was fairly high (3.916). What this means is that an English textbook which can introduce some Western cultures is more beneficial for students than the ones that only deal with the language itself.

Another interesting aspect of some Japanese English textbooks is that *hatsinkei eigo* (發信型 英語) is pursued (e.g. Deaux, Suzuki & Shimozaki, 1989:

Horiuchi, Forsythe, Itoh & Uesugi, 1996). That is, they emphasize that students must be able to organize their thoughts and adequately present them in English both orally and in a written form. In order to do so, students must acquire proficiency higher than the one needed for simple daily conversations, which eventually leads to a level in which students can participate in presentation, discussion and debate.

In their middle and high school days, Korean students spend a lot of time in learning accurate grammar to get good grades in written tests. However, for the college-level English, according to our survey, the instructors prefer to focus on organizing ideas and on fluency rather than improving students' accuracy of English. That is, they are more concerned about how to communicate in English. To achieve such a goal, we also need to set our goals high enough to match the intelligence level of college students, and the materials chosen in the coursebooks should be both informative and interesting to make Korean students keep and satisfy their curiosity. Such materials can motivate the students not only to express themselves orally and in writing, but also to discuss and debate with their classmates.

REFERENCES

- Anthony, L. E. (1995). Evaluating textbooks for the EFL classroom. *The Okayama Review of Language and Literature*, 1, 35-42.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cho, S.-K., Moon, S.-C., & Lee, K.-H. (1997). Tayhak yenge-ui kyoywuk hwankyeng-kwa ceyto kaysen pangan [A study of English teaching: Facilities and curriculum development]. *English Teaching*, 52(4), 303-330.
- Deaux, G. R., Suzuki, Y., & Shimozaki, M. (1989). *Activating college English: Introductory course*. Tokyo: Ikubundo.
- Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook*. London: Longman.
- Horiuchi, K., Forsythe, K., Itoh, N., & Uesugi, A. (1996). *Think and communicate*. Tokyo: Sanshusha.
- Kim, I.-S. (1997). A study on the CALL systems (Instavox, Montevideo).

- ALLP) and their pedagogical implications to teaching English in the Korean university. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea*, 13(2), 23-59.
- Kim, K., Hong, K.-S., Kim, M., & Nimmo, G. (1996). A survey report on English materials development for Korean university students. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea*, 12, 65-97.
- Knudsen, J., & Oda, T. (1991). *Writing America—Current English Composition*. Tokyo: Nan'un-do.
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 42(4), 237-246.
- Skierso, A. (1991). Textbook selection and evaluation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 432-453). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.