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On EFL writing courses where no specific materials exist, the selection and use of a coursebook are important issues. The major aim of this study is to evaluate the coursebook used in two EFL writing courses in a university in Korea, applying a systematic model of material evaluation, and to see how it relates to other writing materials. The results show that the principal role of the coursebook as a whole is to structure the teaching and learning of English, focusing on the paragraph as the basis for writing within the Current-Traditional approach, for those who are encountering writing in English as beginners. Although this is partly consistent with the aims of the two courses, the coursebook is not concerned with the reader, classroom interactions, and a consideration of the real/social context. A comparison of the coursebook with two other writing materials indicates that there is a gradual shift from guiding learners through cognitive aspects to a concern with paragraph and text structure, and to a communicative perspective which focuses on purpose, audience, and the development and organization of thinking for real-world.

I. INTRODUCTION

The coursebook is an important component within the curriculum, and is often the most tangible and visible aspect of pedagogy. According to Nunan (1998), while the syllabus defines the goals and objectives, the linguistic and experiential content, instructional materials can put flesh on the bones of these specifications. According to Wright (1987), instructional materials help define the goals of the syllabus, and the roles of teachers and learners within the instructional process. I therefore consider that the development of evaluation of the coursebook can be largely based on the analysis of the beliefs about writing, and teaching and learning of
writing in English revealed in coursebooks.

Evaluation is a matter of judging the fitness of something for a particular purpose (Hutchinson, 1987). Many of us as teachers find that there is a distinction between teaching situations where, on the one hand, ‘open-market’ materials are chosen by teachers themselves, and where, on the other hand, an educational authority produces or adopts materials which are subsequently passed on to the teacher for classroom use.

There is a wealth of EFL material available. Sheldon (1988, p. 239) mentions figures for the United States alone, where 28 major publishers offer 1,623 ESL coursebooks between them. Brumfit (1980) writes about how there is no ‘Which’ (a British magazine which reviews consumer products) for coursebooks, and that putting a book on the market implies that the book has been cleared of basic faults (McDonough & Shaw, 2000). However, this is not always the case. For some teachers the selection of a good coursebook can be valuable, particularly in contexts where the situation of stimulating, authentic materials can be difficult to organize.

No coursebook or set of materials is likely to be perfect and even though ‘it is clear that coursebook assessment is fundamentally a subjective, rule-of-thumb activity, and that no neat formula, grid or system will ever provide a definite yardstick’ (Sheldon, 1988, p. 245), we nonetheless need some model that will be comprehensive in its coverage of criteria, given that everyone in the field will need to evaluate materials at some time or other. I hope to do this with two major aims in this paper: first, to evaluate the coursebook used in two EFL writing courses in a Korean university by applying a systematic model of material evaluation; second, to compare the coursebook with two other writing materials.

II. FRAMEWORKS FOR THE EVALUATION OF COMMERCIAL MATERIALS

In describing the coursebook on the two writing courses I draw on two theories on materials in use at the starting point: checklists produced by Breen and Candlin (1987) and McDonough and Shaw (2000). These frameworks have the strength that they take into account not only any linguistic analysis which may precede the design of the materials, but also the proposals for classroom methodology and the demands made upon the learner which are implied in the particular task types included. I next elaborate these two models to synthesize a new flexible model in order to evaluate the actual coursebook in the two classrooms rather than teaching materials in a wide range of contexts.
1. Breen and Candlin’s Model

The model proposed by Breen and Candlin (1987, pp. 13-28) divides the evaluation of teaching materials into two sets of considerations: Phase 1 for the initial questions about the purposes and methodology of the evaluation and phase 2 for the final evaluation of the materials, as presented in Figure 1.

In Phase 1, Breen and Candlin consider purposes as a first step; this will include both long-term and short-term aims and methodology which serve as a means towards those purposes. Methodology, however, can be further analyzed in their model, as Littlejohn (1992) argues, in their model in terms of two basic aspects: content, within which one can distinguish data (i.e., samples of the target language) and information (i.e., explanations and rules about the language and language use), and process, which refers to the actual procedures and participant roles involved in working upon the content. In terms of content, the model involves considering first the theory of language which may underlie the material. Next, the implicit and explicit focus of the content of the materials is to be considered. The various ways in which the content is sequenced and subdivided and the manner in which continuity is established are to be considered next. Regarding process, Breen and Candlin’s model involves first identifying the theory of language learning which the materials either implicitly or explicitly reflect. This theory will manifest itself in the types of classroom procedures which the materials propose. These procedures may imply decisions about participation - who does what with whom - and the nature of the roles of the teacher and learners and the contribution each of them is expected to make.

**FIGURE 1**
Outline of Breen and Candlin’s Model for the Analysis and Evaluation of Teaching Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Purposes</th>
<th>Phase 2: Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (means towards purposes)</td>
<td>Methodology (means towards purposes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (means towards purposes)</td>
<td>Methodology (means towards purposes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of language learning</td>
<td>Theory of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom procedures</td>
<td>Focus of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Sequence of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher roles</td>
<td>Continuity in content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Phase 2, they deal with evaluation as the final aspect of materials; this concerns the effectiveness of the methodology and the appropriateness of the original purposes in terms of learners’ needs and interests, learners’ own approaches to language learning, and the classroom
teaching/learning process. The strength of their model lies, as Littlejohn (1992, p. 24) also believes, in the fact that it takes into account not only any linguistic analysis which may precede the design of the materials but also the proposals for classroom methodology and the demands made upon the learner which are implied in the particular task types included.

2. McDonough and Shaw’s Model

McDonough and Shaw (2000) examine, as Breen and Candlin do, criteria for evaluation in two stages, as shown in Figure 2: an external (macro) evaluation which offers a brief ‘overview’ of the materials from the outside (cover, introduction, table of contents), which is then followed by a closer and more detailed internal (micro) evaluation.

FIGURE 2
McDonough and Shaw’s Model for the Analysis and Evaluation of Teaching Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-evaluation (External)</th>
<th>inappropriate/potentially appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-evaluation (Internal)</td>
<td>inappropriate/appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adopt/select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the external evaluation the model basically examines the organization of the materials as stated explicitly by the author/publisher by looking at (i) the ‘blurb’, or the claims made on the cover of the teacher’s/students’ book and (ii) the introduction and table of contents, which should enable the evaluator to access what Cunningsworth (1984, p. 2) has termed ‘what the books say about themselves’. That is, the external evaluation reveals the aspects with respect to: the intended audience, the proficiency level, the context and presentation of language items, whether the materials are to be core or supplementary, the role and availability of a teacher’s book, the inclusion of a vocabulary list/index, the table of contents, the use of visuals and presentation, the cultural specificity of the materials, the provision of audio/video material and the inclusion of tests. The next stage of this model continues the evaluation procedure by performing an in-depth investigation into the materials. It suggests teachers as evaluators to examine the following criteria: the treatment and presentation of the skills, the sequencing and grading of the materials, the types of reading, listening, speaking and writing materials, appropriacy of tests and exercises, self-study provision and teacher-learner ‘balance’ in use of the materials.

The model proposed by McDonough and Shaw outlines and comments upon the essential
criteria, both external and internal, necessary to make pertinent judgements in order to make a preliminary selection of ELT materials. This materials evaluation is flexible enough to be used in ELT contexts worldwide, as it avoids long checklists of data and can be used according to the evaluator’s primary purpose.

3. A New Model

I now propose a new model in order to identify and evaluate the characteristics of the coursebook used in the two classrooms, and to map it onto the pedagogic practices of the two teachers. I do this by elaborating the two models introduced in the two previous sections. My intention is thus not to argue for a greater degree of objectivity but rather for a more comprehensive description and interpretation. I suggest that the inferences involved in describing the coursebook in the two writing courses need to be made explicit; the model which I envisage for the process of constructing a description involves 3 levels. In doing this, I have used, with a little adaptation, Littlejohn’s (1992) schedule for describing coursebooks. My model mainly adopts the content and process in Breen and Candlin’s model, and both the external and internal evaluation in McDough and Shaw’s model, forming a step-by-step procedure, because they expand the scope of material evaluation to the wider aspects, combining two levels, i.e. content and process; external and internal.

The model guides the analysis through 3 phases: firstly through its physical characteristics, ‘what it says’; secondly through its tasks embodying teaching and learning processes, ‘what it does’; and thirdly, based on phase 1 and 2, through its underlying aims and principles concerning teachers, learners and the teaching/learning process, ‘what it implies’. Figure 3 summarizes these phases and their components and explains how the model draws on Breen and Candlin and McDough and Shaw. The arrows indicate how the specific criteria in the two models of Breen and Candlin and McDough and Shaw are reorganized to make a more flexible design for the evaluation and analysis of the coursebook in this study.

The Phase 1 of the model describes the ‘explicit nature’ of the coursebook. I begin first with the descriptive statements about the coursebook itself. These statements cover, for example, the publication data, the intended audience, the type of the book (i.e., ‘general’ or ‘specific purpose’, ‘supplementary’ or ‘main course’), and the general manner in which the material is to be used (i.e., for self-study or for class use). Beyond this, I may then consider the physical aspects of the book such as the number of pages, use of color or visuals, the various components in a complete set (e.g., a students’ book, a teacher’s book), and the various means of access into the coursebook (e.g., an appendix or index).

The next level as internal analysis at Phase 2 involves stepping inside the coursebook to
discover the basis of subdivision. This might set out the number of instructional units provided, the length these units typically have and any form of patterning which is evident both across units and within units. This pattern is often identifiable through section headings or rubrics to learners which indicate the type of activity involved. The essential issue at the last stage, Phase 3, is to analyze and interpret the implication of the aforementioned factors in Phase 1 and 2, ‘what it says’ and ‘what it does’, in terms of the beliefs underpinning the coursebook.

**FIGURE 3**

The Process of Making a New Model for the Description and Analysis of the Coursebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breen and Candlin’s model</th>
<th>Synthesizing a model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (means towards purposes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theory of language</td>
<td>• Theory of language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus of content</td>
<td>• Classroom procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sequence of content</td>
<td>• Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuity in content</td>
<td>• Teacher roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learner roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Phase 2: Evaluation      |                      |
|---------------------------|                      |
| McDoug and Shaw’s model  | Synthesizing a model |
| Macro-evaluation (External) | Phase 1: ‘What it says’ |
|   --> inappropriate/potentially appropriate | • The descriptive perspectives |
| Micro-evaluation (Internal) | Phase 2: ‘What it does’ |
|   --> inappropriate/appropriate | • The subdivision into constituent activities |
|                           | • An analysis of activities |

**III. THE STUDY**

The evaluation of the coursebook in this study is based on the theoretical framework in my own model explained in the previous section. My discussion about the coursebook evaluation relates to classroom observations of two different EFL writing courses at a university in Korea, in which the same coursebook was used (Lee, 2002; 2003). It is worth, therefore, giving a brief overview of the context of the institution and the selection of the coursebook for the two writing classrooms.
1. The Selection of an Institution and Two Writing Courses

In order to investigate what sorts of materials are used on EFL writing courses in Korea, I obtained a list of universities in the city of Daejeon where I intended to carry out my research during September and October 2001. I particularly focused on the institutions where writing in English was taught as an optional module for students in general, rather than for those who were in the English department. In fact, this was very simple as there were only two, a national and a private one, since, as Lee (2003) described in her study on EFL writing pedagogy in Korea, there were not many institutions where writing in English was taught to students in general. I chose the national one, Chungnam University, since it had a higher catchment population of around 20,000 from a number of neighboring areas (http://www.cnu.ac.kr:888/sub01/sub01_01_04_01.jsp & http://www.cnu.ac.kr:888/sub03/sub03_main.jsp). The policy on English writing courses of Chungnam University is unusual for a Korean university because matters of teaching writing in English are mainly the responsibility of the department of English. I next contacted two teachers of eight who were teaching writing in English there with the help of my colleagues and had their permission to sit in their classrooms.

2. The Selection of the Coursebook for the Two Writing Courses

The coursebook used in the two writing courses was chosen by the institution; the two teachers in fact would get a very limited choice or perhaps no choice at all. This context will more than likely involve them in an understanding of why the material has been chosen and how they can make effective use of it in the classrooms. The two teachers might be having to work with materials which they found very limiting, and would need to resort to adapting the material as best they could to suit the needs of their particular context. The aims of the two courses were to teach basic level of writing and free writing in English to students who came from a variety of disciplines and English proficiency levels. Even though they would not have to evaluate to adapt materials, they might well be interested in an evaluation as a useful process in its own right, giving insight into the organizational principles of the material and helping them to keep up with development in the field.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In applying the synthesized model for the description of the coursebook, I now present the coursebook in two ways. The first, ‘what it says’, is the criterion which will provide a
comprehensive, external overview of how the coursebook has been organized, exploring the physical aspects of the coursebook, i.e., the overall map, aims, and contents. The other, ‘what it does’, is to identify features within each area of the coursebook. These two phases of description will form the basis for making the overall evaluation of the coursebook, ‘what it implies’ in Phase 3.

1. Phase 1: ‘What it says’

The procedure for recording the explicit nature of the coursebook consists of three physical aspects: (i) the map of the coursebook as a whole, (ii) the aims of the coursebook, and (iii) the whole outline of the contents within the coursebook, which set out the main sequence of activities.

1) The Map of the Coursebook

At the beginning of Phase 1, ‘what it says’, my aim is basically to examine the organization of the coursebook as stated explicitly by the author by looking at (i) the ‘blurb’ or the claims made on the cover of the book and (ii) the introduction and table of contents. Table 1 represents the whole description as a map which covers the explicit nature of the coursebook. It allows us to draw out some general observations about the coursebook used in the two writing courses.

The coursebook was recently produced, in 1996, (area 1) to aid in the teaching and learning of ‘academic’ writing in a multilingual context, principally in institutions of higher education (area 2), throughout the world (area 3) without mentioning whether it was main core material or supplementary (area 4). The coursebook offers no color printing (area 5), and provides the teacher and students with a single book without explicit comments for either of them (area 6a). There also appears to be no definite information about the duration of the complete course (area 6b). In terms of materials in area 7a, five appendixes are included as a significant element at the back of the book: (i) correction symbols, (ii) conjunctions, (iii) transition signals, (iv) word division, and (v) parts of speech. There are, however, no specific comments about some components of materials such as ‘guidance on use of the book’, ‘tests’, and ‘answer keys’. The area 7b covers 5 types of access to the coursebook, i.e. content list, content name, page number, appendix, and index. The subdivision of the coursebook (area 8) is facilitated solely by the contents list which contains a total of 6 units.
TABLE 1
The Map of the Coursebook as a Whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year of publication</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Title of the book</td>
<td>First Steps in Academic Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Intended audience</td>
<td>High-beginning writing students of English as a second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Type</td>
<td>• Academic writing;  • No mentioned of main ‘core’ course or supplementary  • Multilingual class use for ESL writing course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Design and layout</td>
<td>No colors, A4 size, 212 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Extent</td>
<td>(a) Components  • One book for students and the teacher (No teacher’s book)  (b) Total estimated time Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Distribution</td>
<td>(a) Materials  • Visual materials (pictures &amp; photographs) Yes  • Guidance on use of the book No  • Tests No  • Answer keys No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Access  • Content list  • Content name  • Page number  • Appendix  • Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Subdivision</td>
<td>6 units with 4 parts in each unit:  part 1 (organization) -&gt; part 2 (grammar &amp; mechanics) -&gt; part 3 (sentence structure) -&gt; part 4 (writing process)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) The Aims of the Coursebook

It is worth stating first the overall aims of the coursebook, since these can be directly related to the process and product of ESL/EFL writing materials. The aims of materials are normally made clear in the introduction to teaching materials, which can be very revealing. To illustrate what the author of the coursebook means, here are two extracts taken from the introduction. These examples reflect clearly the author’s ideology, and echo Breen and Candlin’s framework which includes process and product. In particular, the author emphasizes that a paragraph is both a product and process of writing in English, focusing on the need to practise sentence structure and develop linguistic knowledge about text:

Extract 1: Introduction from the coursebook

First Steps in Academic Writing takes beginning writers from understanding the concept of a paragraph (Unit 1) to writing three basic types of paragraphs: chronological process (Unit 2), spatial description (Unit 3), and listing (Unit 4). Unit 5 shows students how to use examples, and Unit 6 shows how to express and support their opinions…
Extract 2: Introduction from the coursebook

Woven into every chapter are the four aims of the text:
• To offer a structured approach to writing
• To acquaint students with the process of writing
• To provide practice in basic sentence structure
• To develop grammar and mechanical skills

From the above two extracts, I suggest that the coursebook is aiming at beginners in writing in English who do not have a very good ‘usage’ background and need a course which will reinforce the basics.

3) The Whole Map of Contents

The table of contents may be seen as a ‘bridge’ between the external (Phase 1) and internal stages (Phase 2) of the evaluation and can reveal useful information about the organization of the materials, giving information about the learning of writing, skills to be covered, functions and so on, possibly with some indication as to how much class time the author thinks should be devoted to a particular unit. The contents list gives the names of units and page numbers which specify a route through the book, along with the accompanying 4 parts in each unit: organization, grammar and mechanics, sentence structure, and the writing process. Unit page lengths are normally consistent throughout the book, which means that the pattern of activities in terms of the 4 parts are repeated in every 6 units even though the order of the parts occasionally varies.

2. Phase 2: ‘What it does’

I now continue to the next stage of my evaluation procedure by performing an in-depth investigation which aims to analyze the explicit nature of the units in the coursebook. The coursebook is divided into 6 units, normally including 4 parts in each unit: (i) organization, (ii) grammar and mechanics, (iii) sentence structure, and (iv) writing process, to provide sufficient classroom work or activities for different aspects of writing practice. In this section, two units out of six (33.33%) in the book are described in order to deal with three issues: the subdivision of units, the pattern of the activities in units, and the distribution and rank order of activities in units. In order to perform an effective internal inspection of materials, we need, as McDonough and Shaw (2000) argue, to examine at least two units of a piece or set of materials. This also enables us to find out any characteristic relationships between chapters or units in the coursebook. For this, ‘Unit 2: Writing instructions’ and ‘Unit 3: Describing’ are extracted as samples because the functions of ‘instructing’ and ‘describing’ are very common modes of
writing in English, and are typically included in other ESL or EFL writing materials.

1) Subdivision of Units in the Coursebook

It is probably a feature common to most teaching materials that they are subdivided into ‘units’ or ‘lessons’, each normally covering a standardized number of pages. The coursebook in this study is also subdivided into units, sections, and activities. A closer inspection of the sequence of activities in Units 2 and 3 shows that the units begin with an introduction which explains the unit objectives and definitions of a new mode of writing that will be dealt with through either students’ own-reading or the teacher’s presentation (because of the non-existence of explicit comments on the roles of the teacher and students). This is followed by what I call ‘4 types of input’, i.e., organization, grammar and mechanics, sentence structure, and the writing process, in order to enable students to complete a piece of writing as product independently or cooperatively in accordance with the 5 steps of the writing process suggested by the author.

Each unit has usually at least three writing exercises for paragraphs between part 1 and part 4 so that students can practise the same mode of writing several times with paragraph checklists. The first writing activity is based on the unit’s opening task on which students work individually, in pairs or teams to develop their paragraphs for the later writing activities. The second and third writing activities deal with the same mode of writing using different topics. All these writing activities aim to help students learn to develop paragraphs, using specific descriptive details, reasons, examples and exercises through a single paragraph. The units end with several suggestions for additional writing activities, which may be assigned for extending writing such as paragraphs or a full piece of writing.

In each unit, activities basically require some degree of learner independence, i.e. individual, pair or group work, with a repeated cycle of activities from phrase exercise to sentence exercise, and a paragraph with checklists. It can, therefore, be assumed that the selection and grading of exercises are basically the same and systematic in every unit of the book, mainly grammatical and textual in nature, following the established sequence of activities. The approach to the learning of writing in all units is essentially inductive in that the book provides ample contextualized examples of structures and from these examples students are expected to hypothesize about the underlying rules.

2) The Pattern of the Activities in Units

The whole map of Units 2 and 3 can be explained in terms of the sequence of the activities throughout a unit. This will enable us to find out the sequence and grading of activities, and then
identify significant features of the pattern of activities in each unit, since each unit has the same structured approach as mentioned earlier. There is a movement from introduction or presentation, through sentence and paragraph-focused exercises on organization, grammar and mechanics, and sentence structure, to a writing exercise which allows students to learn how to plan, draft and revise a paragraph using the process approach recommended by the author. The sentence combining or paragraph exercises are placed both before and after the ‘text input’ and ‘text + task’, i.e., explanation or exercise of linguistic aspects.

It is thus clear that the grading and sequencing of a unit show a slow movement from simple to complex in a way that beginning students are likely to be comfortable with. It is interesting to observe that all of the writing exercises are based on a single paragraph in which students can manipulate the structure they have been learning in a controlled, contextualized environment. These methodological and content aspect of writing exercises can identify the book as what I term ‘a course package for an English paragraph’, in which most of the necessary decisions regarding the what and how of teaching and learning of writing have been made.

3) Distribution and Rank Order of Activities in a Unit

The distribution of main activities and the rank order of their frequency are here analyzed to give a more detailed picture of how the activities are actually organized to match up with the grading for a writing course. This is done by a careful examination of Unit 3 in the coursebook. Table 2 reports the distribution, definitions of the terms, and rank order of the 37 general activities identified in Unit 3 and the percentage each type of activity contributes.

The predominance of ‘text + task (24.32%)’, ‘text input (21.62%)’, and ‘writing exercises (18.92%)’; which together account for 64.86% of all the activities, is evident in the breakdown. Taken together, these three activity-types account for around two-thirds of all the activities identified. On the other hand, the relatively low incidence of ‘discussion (2.70%)’ and ‘additional writing (2.70%)’ is notable.

4) Writing Assignments

Writing assignments are found ‘bunched’ at the end of a unit, which is quite common in general coursebooks (McDonough & Shaw, 2000, p.179), either as supplementary work in class or set for homework and returned to the teacher for later correction. It is interesting to observe the extent of detail about the roles of the teacher and students in the guidance for writing assignments, since, unlike other aspects in the coursebook, the author suggests explicit stages, places, content, and the type of participation, as shown in her comments:
Students should work in pairs or groups on the prewriting stage, by themselves on the writing stage, and in pairs again in the editing stage. Armed with the results of prewriting, the students can write their paragraphs on their own either in class or at home. The next step is editing… First, students check their own work both for meaning and for mechanics (grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure). Then they bring their writing to class and ask a classmate to check it. Each writing assignment is accompanied by a ‘paragraph checklist’. Writing the final draft is to be done individually. The teacher may encourage students to rewrite the paragraph after the final drafts are processed. The students must receive a passing mark on the no-rewrite assignments in order to pass the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity-type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text + task</td>
<td>Written direction for specific activity (i.e. identifying adjectives,</td>
<td>/ / //</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prepositional phrases, periods,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text input</td>
<td>Explanation or information on the grammatical aspects</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing exercises</td>
<td>Exercises for 3 types of writing:</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phrases, sentences, and paragraphs-focused</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading of model paragraphs</td>
<td>//</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Statements presented at the beginning of the unit and each part,</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which can be presented by the teacher or read by students for themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Oral work carried out by pair or group</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional writing</td>
<td>Extended writing which may be assigned at the end of the unit</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exercises. This also reflects the social relations and relationships of power and authority between the teacher and students. I shall look at these issues further in the following sections by mapping them onto the implications of the coursebook.

3. Phase 3: ‘What it Implies’

At this final level of evaluation, I will attempt to draw together the various aspects of the coursebook as have been noted at Phases 1 and 2, and I will suggest the underlying aims and beliefs about writing and the implications the coursebook as a whole may have for the roles of the teacher and students. Table 3 represents the issues in this section, Phase 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of inference</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: ‘What it implies’</td>
<td>Aims</td>
<td>Phases 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs about writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approaches to teaching/learning of writing</td>
<td>The roles of the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles of the coursebook as a whole</td>
<td>The roles of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deduction from Phases 1, 2, and 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Aims

From the analyses set out in Phases 1 and 2, it is clear that the main and probably exclusive aim of the coursebook is the development of the students’ paragraphs in English, focusing on text with an approach of combining the process and product of writing. The aim of the coursebook is presented in the introduction: ‘to reinforce the notion of writing as discourse’. The author, however, does not provide an explicit meaning of ‘discourse’. I interpret it as the development of different types of paragraphs as texts and knowledge about a paragraph in English. The development of paragraphs is, however, primarily viewed in terms of learning English generally, since the content of a unit contains lots of activities which require grammar, reading, and oral work. This is more clearly shown in Table 2 earlier where ‘text + task (24.32%)’, ‘text input (21.62%)’, and ‘reading (16.22%)’ together account for around two-thirds (62.16%) of all the activities.

In other words, the coursebook is not concerned with one’s reader, the links between students and the teacher, and the links between classrooms and the real/social context in which it can be used. The reader, classroom interactions, and a consideration of the real/social context are, as Ivunic (2003) argues, important elements in the successful completion of the tasks of writing.
particularly in an EFL writing programme.

2) Beliefs about Writing

The author’s beliefs about writing may be presented in the content of the book, and may influence the methodology in it. As we have already seen in Phases 1 and 2, the methodology of the analyzed content is characterized by a basic standardized pattern. Tasks are sequenced in order to provide a flow of activities which moves from an introduction, through ‘text + task’ and ‘text input’, towards writing exercises for a paragraph as text. The author would appear to have clear beliefs about writing in English, since the main purpose of the content is to act as a carrier for the development of a paragraph with linguistic competence. The paragraph writing element also shows an underlying belief about writing in terms of organization, surface structure, and syntactic patterns. On this evidence, the coursebook appears to be based on ‘Current-Traditional’ (Johns, 1997, p. 7) approaches to writing, which are extensions of factual, scientific views of literacy, often called ‘Traditional’, since the emphasis of the book is on formal ‘factual’ text organization. Texts in the book are categorized into ‘rhetorical modes’, identified ways of organizing content at a paragraph or text level. Mode categories include ‘instructing, describing, listing, stating reasons, and explaining’. Although the Current-Traditional approaches of the coursebook are somewhat different from ‘Traditional’, the book has the same basic interest: surface-level, formal descriptions of what are considered to be standard language or discourse patterns, and the ‘facts’ of language. That is, writing is form; all other linguistic, psychological, and social factors are secondary or in some cases ignored.

The coursebook proposes a writing process which consists of 5 or 6 steps in order to help students develop a set of strategies for planning, revising, and editing. The process approach tries to provide useful support for student writers in gaining greater control over the cognitive strategies involved in composing. One could argue, however, that setting aside the time needed for the revision of several drafts is unrealistic, particularly within the constraints of school systems, and particularly where classes are large. The author does not suggest any explicit ideas on this which suggests that the teacher can adapt his/her practices to encourage more extensive writing both inside and outside class.

3) The Roles of the Teacher

In the description of the coursebook at Phases 1 and 2, I noted no existence of a teacher’s book as a component and no total estimated time for the activities in it. Guidance on use of the coursebook, tests, and answer keys were not provided. This could mean that these elements
exclusively depend on the teacher as a manager. The net effect of this will be an unequal distribution of power within the classroom, and students will be placed in a dependent position in relation to the teacher. Given the high incidence of ‘text + task’ and ‘text input’, the teacher’s controlling role is even further strengthened. From the perspective of Phase 2 of the description, therefore, we can say that the teacher is placed in an advantaged position in relation to classroom power, having more control over and responsibility for their own teaching of writing.

4) The Roles of Students

Whereas the teacher is given the role of manager of a classroom event, it is students who are placed in the role of ‘managed’ in the coursebook. This is clearly the case from the high incidence of tasks or activities (‘text + task’, using checklists, writing exercises, etc) which often require simple repetition or reproduction where there are clear patterns of text. Closer examination of the activities proposed for pair or group shows, however, that here also the main requirement is repetition of some kind. It is true that the activities do call upon students for personal information or opinion, but this is only as carrier content for tasks rather than relating to decisions about classroom procedure.

The ‘managed’ role for students also gives some indication of their role in relation to the learning of writing in English. It is evident from the emphasis on tasks which focus on practice at an item level (i.e., phrase, sentence, paragraph-focused exercise) that writing is conceived of as the gradual accumulation and synthesis of components of syntactic knowledge, such as the rules and patterns of sentence formation or individual items of grammar and tenses. This grading and synthesis is to be accomplished primarily by repetition or reproduction (via ‘text + task’ and ‘text input’) of texts.

In this section I have discussed students’ roles in terms of reflection on approaches in the coursebook. In this effort, I must acknowledge a debt to the study of writing and writing processes described in Johns (1997) and Ivanic (2003). At the same time, I suggest that writing classes, particularly EFL writing programs, need to go beyond students’ problem solving and processes to the context, linking ‘process’ with ‘how writing works in the world’ (Giroux, 1983). In this way, students can develop an understanding that task planning and processes depend not only on themselves but also on many current social influences.

5) Roles of the Coursebook as a Whole

As we have seen, the principal role of the coursebook as a whole is to structure the teaching and
learning of English, focusing on the paragraph as the basis for writing, for those who are encountering writing in English as beginners. The interaction between the teacher and students, however, is not clear except in the issue of writing assignments, because there is no teacher’s guide on the use of the book, timing, audience (reader), and the setting of socio-cultural contexts, which may be essential in designing materials for a writing program in academic contexts. Thus, the coursebook as a whole can be identified as an informant who provides the teacher and students with general guidelines to lead to an English paragraph, focusing on mainly the linguistic aspects.

V. SUMMARY OF PHASES 1, 2, AND 3

To make the process of description explicit in evaluating the coursebook, I divided the analysis into 3 phases. Table 4 summarizes the findings in relation to the three phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 ‘What it says’</td>
<td>Year of publication</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Academic writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intended audience</td>
<td>High-beginning ESL writing students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and layout</td>
<td>No colors, A4 size, 212 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual materials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinds of access</td>
<td>Content list, unit name, page number, appendix, index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
<td>6 units with 4 parts: (i) organization, (ii) sentence structure, (iii) grammar &amp; mechanics, and (iv) process or writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 ‘What it does’</td>
<td>Extract length</td>
<td>2 units (Units 2 &amp; 3: 33% of the coursebook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequencing of activity</td>
<td>Unit 2: Introduction -&gt; reading -&gt; text input -&gt; writing exercise 1 (paragraph) -&gt; text+task -&gt; writing exercise 2 (sentence) -&gt; text+task -&gt; writing exercise 3 (paragraph) -&gt; text+task -&gt; writing exercise 4 (paragraph) -&gt; additional writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 3: Introduction -&gt; reading -&gt; text input -&gt; writing exercise 1 (paragraph) -&gt; text+task -&gt; writing exercise 2 (paragraph) -&gt; text+task -&gt; writing exercise 3 (sentences) -&gt; writing exercise 4 (paragraph) -&gt; additional writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 ‘What it implies’</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Paragraph writing in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs about writing</td>
<td>Text (a paragraph) through linguistic competence: Current-Traditional approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of the teacher</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of students</td>
<td>A ‘managed’ position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of coursebook as a whole</td>
<td>‘A course package for an English paragraph’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1 examined ‘what it says’ in the coursebook and enabled me to describe the coursebook in terms of an external overview of how the coursebook has been organized. Phase 2 considered ‘what it does’ as an internal evaluation of the coursebook, and permitted me to determine the
nature of the coursebook in terms of its subject matter, and the types and distribution of
teaching/learning activities provided. Phase 3 dealt with ‘what it implies’ which combined the
nature of the coursebook at both Phases 1 and 2.

The aim of the coursebook is the development of paragraph writing by building up linguistic
competence in English. This is partly consistent with the aims of the two courses, to develop
basic writing and free writing in English. However, we can assume that beliefs about writing in
English, the roles of the teacher and students, and use of the coursebook as a whole can probably
be different in terms of the beliefs about the learning and teaching of EFL writing of the two
teachers in the two writing courses.

VI. A COMPARISON OF THE COURSEBOOK WITH TWO OTHER WRITING MATERIALS

In this section, I compare the coursebook discussed so far with two other writing materials
designed for EFL/ESL contexts. We as teachers need to focus on realistic ways of adapting the
materials for a particular group of learners. We also need to review other materials published for
EFL/ESL writing contexts and compare them in order to evaluate; this is a useful process in its
own right, giving insight into the organizational principles of the materials. I therefore selected
two books, Book A and Book B, produced by Hamp-Lyons and Heasley (1987) and Miller and
Cohen (2001), using the same criteria for external evaluation offered for Phase 1, ‘what it says’,
since a standard procedure and a common set of criteria can be applied, as Cunningsworth (1995)
argues, to different materials for comparative evaluation.

1. Explicit Nature of the Two Coursebooks

The criteria for external evaluation also will be of great help in making the process more
objective, leading to more reliable results, by enabling me to examine a brief ‘overview’ of the
materials from the outside (cover, introduction, table of contents). Table 5 reports the results of
the findings from the examination of the two books, and the second column in the table
reproduces results from the coursebook in this study for an easier comparison. I focus here on
the perspectives expressed in Book A and Book B, looking at the approaches to teaching writing,
in order to compare the three books.

Book A consists of guidance on the use of time in a specific length of course and detailed
teacher’s guidance on how to use the book, and/or on the teaching of writing in general. It
essentially emphasizes, as shown in the teacher’s guide, writing as a form of problem-solving in
which the writer faces two main tasks: (i) generating ideas in language, and (ii) from these ideas composing a written structure adapted to the needs of the reader and the goals of the writer. This is why students are asked to think about different kinds of information and different ways of organizing writing. The book is also based on a belief that writing and reading are closely associated, and that a developing writer can learn a great deal from the study of sample texts from the writer’s point of view.

*Book A* pays rather less attention to grammar, discussing only selected topics which experience suggests cause particular problems, since it emphasizes the cognitive and discoursal aspects; this means that error-free writing is less important than writing which addresses the topic clearly, develops it in a rational and relevant way, and takes account of the needs of the reader. The approaches to teaching writing shown in *Book A* reflect, as Lea and Stierer (2000) argue, a climate where writing courses in higher education tend to offer not only ‘study skills’ and ‘learning support’ in order to help non-traditional students to cope with the demands of academic contexts, but also new-style writing and assessment practices. In this sense, the title of *Book A* approximately conveys what it wishes to imply about learning and teaching writing.

*Book B*, on the other hand, although it reflects a similar trend to the coursebook in this study in terms of its physical overview such as type, extent, and subdivision, the author’s beliefs about writing are significantly different. That is, the book suggests, as noted in its introduction, that writing is a social endeavor, a way of communicating with others: informing them, persuading them, and debating with them. In its attempt to provide guidelines, strategies, and practice in writing in higher education, it involves discussion, interaction with teachers, group and pair work, and peer evaluation; students have a voice, and what they write will elicit a reaction from others. The book explains that through these collaborative experiences students come to recognize that they have unique strengths and at the same time cultivate their critical-thinking skills and become more effective writers. Content-based themes are adopted as the key to achieve this goal.

From these findings from *Book B*, we can deduce a shift in the approaches to the teaching of writing; some attention to ‘real-world’ (McDonough & Shaw, 2000, p. 177) language or ‘social practice’ (Gee, 1996; Lankshear, 1997; Street, 1984, 1993) is regarded as increasingly important in *Book B*. At the same time, there is the necessity for higher education to adapt their provision to make it possible for students who come from a wide range of educational, cultural and linguistic backgrounds to study in a number of diverse learning contexts.
### TABLE 5
Nature of the Three Writing Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book as a whole</th>
<th>The coursebook in this study</th>
<th>Book A</th>
<th>Book B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Year of publication</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Title of the book</td>
<td><em>First Steps in Academic Writing</em></td>
<td><em>Study writing: A course in written English for academic and professional purposes</em></td>
<td><em>Reason to write: Strategies for success in academic writing</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intended audience</td>
<td>High-beginning writing students of ESL</td>
<td>ESL/EFL students at post-intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency in English (Age: from 17 to 50)</td>
<td>Low intermediate ESL/EFL students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Type | • Academic writing  
  • No mentioned of main ‘core’ course or supplementary  
  • Multilingual class use for ESL writing course | • Academic writing  
  • Core course  
  • ESL/EFL writing course | • Academic writing  
  • No mentioned of main ‘core’ course or supplementary  
  • ESL/EFL writing course |
| 5. Design and layout | No color, A4 size, 212 pages | No color, B4 size, 168 pages | Color, A4 size, 178 pages |
| 6. Extent (a) Components | Same book for students and the teacher  
  - No teacher’s book/sections | Same book for students and the teacher  
  - Different sections to the teacher & the students  
  - Partial teacher’s guide | Same book for students and the teacher  
  - A section for the teacher |
| 6. Extent (b) Total estimated time | Not mentioned | 40-60 hours of class work | Not mentioned |
| 7. Distribution (a) Materials | • Visual materials (pictures & photos)  
  • Guidance on use of the book (No)  
  • Tests (No)  
  • Answer keys (No) | • Visual materials (pictures & photos)  
  • Guidance on use of the book (Yes)  
  • Tests (Yes)  
  • Answer keys (Yes) | • Visual materials (pictures & photos)  
  • Guidance on use of the book (Yes)  
  • Tests (No)  
  • Answer keys (Yes) |
| 7. Distribution (b) Access | • An overview of unit contents | Content list  
  • Content name  
  • Page number  
  • Appendix  
  • Index | Content list  
  • Content name  
  • Page number  
  • Appendix  
  • Index | Content list  
  • Content name  
  • Content objective  
  • Page number |
| 8. Subdivision | 6 units each with 4 parts in each unit:  
  - part 1 (organization)  
  - part 2 (writing)  
  - part 3 (sentence structure)  
  - part 4 (writing process) | 12 units with Part I, Units 1-9  
  & Part II, Units 10-12  
  - Part I: About writing  
  - Using grammar in writing  
  - Consolidation  
  - Part II: Structure of whole texts | 10 units each with 5 main sections:  
  - I. Fluency practice: freewriting  
  - II. Reading for writing  
  - III. Pre-writing activities  
  - IV. Structured writing focus  
  - V. Additional writing opportunities |
| 9. Aims | Paragraph writing  
  • Discursive and cognitive-based writing | Writing for active communicative/social purposes | Writing for active communicative/social purposes |
2. Changes in Writing Materials

It is interesting to observe the changes of focus in materials and methods for teaching EFL/ESL writing, and to see how different approaches have gained prominence at different times, i.e., 1987, 1996, and 2001. The attention of the earliest one, Book A (1987), was focused on discoursal and cognitive aspects of writing which describe writing; writing is described as a discursive process of generating, organizing, and translating ideas into text (Hayes & Flower, 1983). The coursebook (1996) in this study, is mainly concerned with the writing process (Cumming, 1998; Krapel, 1990; Silva, 1993), setting alongside it the grammatical, discoursal, and lexical elements writers need to go about the performance of the task itself. Lastly, the most recent one, Book B (2001), begins to show the significant impact of recent theory on the design of materials and attitudes to teaching writing. The perspective in Book B is consistent with that of literacy studies (Barton, 1991, 1994; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic, 2000; Baynham, 1995; Clark & Ivanic, 1997; Street, 1995) in which writing is best described as social practice rather than as skills, since ‘reason to write’ encourages students to develop ways of thinking about writing on a wide variety of themes that reflect the academic curriculum.

Although it is much too simplistic to suggest that the date of publication can be directly linked to a particular approach, it is probably true to say that there is a gradual shift from guiding learners through cognitive aspects to a concern with paragraph and text structure, and to a communicative perspective. The titles also reflect ways in which we think about the activity of writing – ‘First Steps in Academic Writing’, ‘Study writing’, and ‘Reason to write’. Materials for the teaching of writing, then, do not neglect the basic skills, but are increasingly likely to see writing in terms of purpose, audience, and the development and organization of thinking, for real-world, learning and educational purposes.

VII. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF WRITING MATERIALS

In this study, I evaluated the coursebook used in the two EFL writing courses, proceeding from physical description through to interpretation of the book. The coursebook is designed as a package for practice in writing an English paragraph, and reveals the belief that text as a paragraph is associated with linguistic competence, within the Current-Traditional approach. Coursebook analysis and evaluation are useful in teacher development and help teachers to gain good and useful insights into the nature of the material.

There is clearly a need as a basic principle to select teaching materials in terms of students’
purposes and interests in EFL writing pedagogy, and also to have opportunities for talk between teachers, students, and institutions around appropriate criteria for the selection of teaching materials which take into account EFL learners’ writing experiences. In terms of purposes for writing in English, students in the Korean EFL context probably have intrinsic purposes for writing in English, dependent not on the writing itself but on its power to help them to achieve success in their society. In Korea, English is an important subject at all levels of educational practice and plays a crucial role in people’s lives. For instance, I suggest that a good level of English will help considerably: to enter and graduate from the university; to obtain better jobs, and to study abroad. However, traditional English classrooms, which have paid less attention to writing, have not been adequate for Korean students in fulfilling their needs and preparing them for their workplace or academic contexts. This is a very significant issue, since it enables to conceptualize frameworks for evaluating writing materials while maintaining the fact that the writing purposes influencing EFL writing pedagogy are very real. Listening to students enables us to learn about students’ situations, needs, views, and beliefs about writing in English.

In this paper, it has also served to provide one element in the complex investigation of the teaching of writing. Coursebook evaluation is one part of a complex process, and coursebooks that have been once selected can only be judged after classroom implementation and feedback with real learners in real classrooms. Thus the present study suggests the need for a further study on the two teachers’ pedagogic practices with the use of the coursebook in-depth.
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