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INTRODUCTION

In the last several decades, the countries of the world have become more open and closer to each other politically, economically, and culturally. The phenomenon of a "shrinking world" has intensified the need of a common world language and English has been taking the role of an international language. Therefore, the study of teaching English has been blooming. As a TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) student in the U.S., I have been concerned about English education in Korea. As I studied TESL, I began to realize that the textbooks and teaching method used in my English classes in Korea were very inappropriate for fulfilling what is now seen as the ultimate goal of language learning: developing "communicative competence" in real life. As the focus on language as communication has grown, "communicative competence" is now a household word in language learning/teaching. According to Dubin and Olshtain (1986), communicative competence "entails knowing not only the language code or the form of language, but also what to say to whom and how to say it appropriately in any given situation....[in other words], it includes knowledge of what to say, when, how, where, and to whom" (p. 4). That is, communicative competence involves the ability to use language authentically. Therefore, in my thesis, I have examined some of the English textbooks in Korea to determine the extent to
which they enable students to develop communicative competence.

The role of textbooks is especially important in the Korean education system, where English is a foreign language (EFL), not a second language (ESL). That is, Korean students learn English in the classroom from Korean-speaking teachers and seldom have a chance to speak English in real life. In this situation, where teachers are often uncertain about their abilities in English, they tend to rely heavily on textbooks in their teaching. Accordingly, their teaching method is largely determined by the methods and activities of the textbooks used, and students have little exposure to English from any other source.

Current Status of English Education and Textbooks in Korea

Korean students and teachers recognize communicative competence in real life as the goal of English education, but in reality, they rarely achieve it. Cefola (1989) suggests several reasons for this. First, English teachers in Korea still use the audiolingual method, focusing on discrete skills such as grammar or vocabulary, regardless of the overall purpose of their program. While English is learned and taught as the most important subject for entrance examinations to a higher level of education, entrance examinations contain only
multiple-choice, discrete point questions. These examinations exert a powerful influence on classroom methods, encouraging heavy use of drill type exercises. Second, as noted above, English education in Korea is an EFL situation. Even though students study English 7-10 hours per week at the secondary level, they seldom have a chance to speak English in real life. Students study English only in the classroom to pass the entrance examinations. Third, almost all of the English teachers in Korea are native Koreans, sharing both language and culture with their students. Teachers are not fluent in English, and have limitations in understanding and introducing different cultures. Therefore, they are more comfortable in teaching the grammar of English by means of practice. Finally, because of the high population density and insufficient government funding for education, there are usually 60-70 students in one class at the secondary level. In these circumstances, it is very difficult for teachers to act as facilitators in developing students' speaking or writing skill.

Let us turn now to some background information about the textbooks used in Korean classes, as reviewed in Lee (1988) and Yang (1988). Textbook production in Korea is supervised by the Ministry of Education, even though there are several publishers. Therefore, most textbooks have similar content and format reflecting the policy of the Ministry of Education.
Historically, in Korea, textbook production, including that of English textbooks, has been supervised by the government. Before 1949, some of the schools selected textbooks produced privately, and some of the schools even taught students without textbooks. However, in 1949, the Ministry of Education began to enforce a textbook control system in which every publisher had to submit its new textbooks for government approval. In 1952, the Korean Authorized Textbook Company was established to supervise textbook production and marketing. In 1977, the government formulated a set of regulations governing the publication of textbooks. This was revised in 1978, 1980, 1982, 1983, 1986 and 1988. According to the 1988 version, there were to be two types of textbooks: Type I, those written by the Ministry of Education, and Type II, those produced by private publishers and approved or authorized by the Ministry of Education. Type I textbooks include all elementary textbooks and junior high and senior high textbooks on the Korean language, Korean history and national ethics. Type II textbooks include all other textbooks. The Ministry of Education limited the number of publishers of Type II textbooks for each subject to eight. After the textbooks have been used five years, they must be reviewed and can be approved for two additional years. There can be no revisions until three years after the textbooks are selected by the Ministry of Education. Each school can set up a committee
which can select textbooks for each subject from those Type II textbooks approved by the Ministry of Education. The most popular textbooks tend to be those from the big publishers because they can afford to employ famous authors and market their books in all parts of the country. However, textbooks of different publishers are quite similar because all of them are produced according to the principles of textbook production established by the Ministry of Education.

Statement of Research Questions

The main purpose of this study was to evaluate English textbooks used in Korea to determine whether they are appropriate for fulfilling the ultimate goal of language learning/teaching: developing communicative competence in real life. Theoretical bases for the evaluation were derived from Dubin and Olshtain's (1986) framework for language curriculum/syllabus design which discusses theoretical and philosophical views of curriculum and shows how general curricular goals become syllabus objectives. From two of Dubin and Olshtain's three components of second language curriculum--the nature of language and the nature of language learning--four sets of criteria for evaluating the textbooks, all relating to the development of communicative competence, were derived. These involve the degree to which the texts (a)
develop language skills, (b) introduce students to the target culture, (c) provide opportunities for real communication in English and (d) provide samples of authentic language.

A representative sample of English textbooks used in Korea was selected for evaluation. The main research questions being asked here are as follows:

(a) To what extent do the textbooks provide students with opportunities to develop skills in using written and spoken English?

(b) To what extent do the textbooks introduce students to the culture of English-speaking countries?

(c) What opportunities do the textbooks provide for real communication in English?

(d) Is the English used in the textbooks "authentic"?
LITERATURE REVIEW

To evaluate the textbooks, I started with a framework for language curriculum/syllabus design proposed by Dubin and Olshtain (1986), and then developed principles from that framework to evaluate the English textbooks used in Korea. Dubin and Olshtain distinguish between curriculum and syllabus. A language curriculum provides "a broad description of general goals by indicating an overall educational-cultural philosophy which applies across subjects together with a theoretical orientation to language and language learning with respect to the subject matter at hand. A curriculum is often reflective of national and political trends as well" (pp. 34-35). On the other hand, "a syllabus is a more detailed and operational statement of teaching and learning elements which translates the philosophy of the curriculum into a series of planned steps leading towards more narrowly defined objectives at each level" (p. 35). According to Dubin and Olshtain, "the theoretical and philosophical views which mold the intellectual tone of a curriculum affect how general goals are formed. These general goals, in turn, become the basis for specifying objectives in the three dimensions of a syllabus: language content, processes or means, and product or outcomes" (p. 42). Figure 1 shows how general goals elicited from theoretical and philosophical views of second language
Figure 1. Eliciting general goals from theoretical and philosophical views of L2 curriculum and translating general goals into syllabus objectives (Dubin and Olshtain, 1986, p. 43)
curriculum --the nature of language, the nature of language learning, and educational-cultural philosophy--become the basis for specifying objectives in the three dimensions of a syllabus: language content, process/means, and product/outcomes. To derive the principles for evaluating English textbooks used in Korea, I used two of Dubin and Olshtain's components of curriculum--the nature of language and the nature of language learning. These two components concerning what language is and how the language can best be learned were useful in evaluating textbooks, because they provide the theoretical basis for how textbooks should be. The third curricular principle concerning educational-cultural philosophy was useful in interpreting the findings--why Korean textbooks are written as they are.

The Nature of Language

The nature of language includes discussion of what language is and what aspects of language students must learn.

Many researchers (e.g., Bolinger, 1968; Brown, 1987; Daniels, 1985; Francis, 1975; Hughes, 1970; Lyons, 1981) have tried to define the nature of language by enumerating characteristics of language. My discussion of the nature of language is based on Brown's (1987) definitions of language and the subareas of the study of language. The reason I chose
Brown's description among many others was that his definitions were broad and concise, and he related each characteristic of language to relevant areas of language. Brown begins with eight defining statements about language.

Definitions of language

1. Language is systematic and generative.
2. Language is a set of arbitrary symbols.
3. Those symbols are primarily vocal, but may also be visual.
4. The symbols have conventionalized meanings to which they refer.
5. Language is used for communication.
6. Language operates in a speech community or culture.
7. Language is essentially human, although possibly not limited to humans.
8. Language is acquired by all people in much the same way—language and language learning both have universal characteristics. (pp. 4-5).

These eight simple definitions do not cover all of the sophisticated characteristics of language, so Brown elaborates on each one with a list of subareas in the study of language.

Subareas of the study of language

1. Explicit and formal accounts of the system of language on several possible levels (most commonly syntactic, semantic, and phonological).
2. The symbolic nature of language; the relationship between language and reality; the philosophy of language; the history of language.
3. Phonetics; phonology; writing systems; kinesics, proxemics, and other "paralinguistic" features of language.
4. Semantics; language and cognition; psycholinguistics.
5. Communication systems; speaker-hearer interaction; sentence processing.
6. Dialectology; sociolinguistics; language and culture; bilingualism and second language acquisition.
7. Human language and nonhuman communication; the physiology of language.
8. Language universals; first language acquisition. (p. 5)
Items 1–6 appear to be related to second language learning. Item 1 is related to grammatical aspects of the language on various levels: syntactic, semantic and phonological. Item 3 is related to two modes of language skills, spoken and written, each of which can be productive and receptive. Productive skills are speaking and writing, in which language is created, while receptive skills are listening and reading, in which language is interpreted. Item 6 is related to sociolinguistics and culture. Cultural patterns, customs, and ways of life are expressed in language.

Brown (1987) notes that language and culture are "intricately interwoven such that one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture" (p. 123). Thus, the acquisition of a language is also the acquisition of a culture. Items 2, 4, and 5 are related to language as communication.

From Brown's discussion, it would seem that students studying a foreign language should (a) learn the grammatical system of the language, (b) develop productive and receptive skills in both the spoken and written mode, (c) learn the socio-cultural aspects of language and (d) learn how to use the language to communicate.
The Nature of Language Learning

As discussed in the previous section, language learners need to learn the grammatical system and develop productive and receptive skills as a means of communicating in a given socio-cultural context.

In this century, many language learning/teaching methods have been attempted in America. During the second half of the 19th century and the early decades of the 20th century, the Grammar-Translation method of foreign language teaching was widely used. In this method, students memorized words, translated sentences and drilled items such as irregular verbs. Grammar-Translation was to some extent successful because of the systematic use of grammar rules and the utilization of students' native-language proficiency. Despite these appealing features, its "principal limitations were tedium, inefficiency of instruction, and limited results in terms of communication - notably, limited oral proficiency" (Bowen, Madsen and Hilferty, 1985, p. 20). In the late 1940s and 1950s, the Audiolingual Method (ALM) was prevalent. The ALM was based on structuralism, linguistically, and behaviorism, psychologically. In line with the structuralists' view of language, which involved many patterns of sounds and words in sentences, and the behaviorists' view of learning, which involved the formation of good habits, ALM
teachers believed that intensive drilling could lead to the development of subconscious habits in the new language. Therefore, there was a great deal of dependence on mimicry, memorization and drill type exercises. ALM instructors put much attention on speaking and pronunciation, but seldom got beyond repetitive drill. Consequently, they failed to develop communicative competence, even though they emphasized oral proficiency. In the sixties and seventies, the Cognitive Code approach arose in second language learning/teaching as a reaction against the ALM. The Cognitive Code approach was influenced by transformational-generative theory, linguistically and cognitive theory, psychologically. The key concept in cognitive theory is that learning must be meaningful. The key concept in transformational-generative linguistics is that language competence precedes language performance. Students should learn "the system that makes language production possible" (Chastain, 1976, p. 145) and to create language using the system. Thus, practitioners of the Cognitive Code approach viewed language learning as "consciously acquiring competence in a meaningful manner as a necessary prerequisite in the acquisition of the performance skills" (p. 146). In this approach, students learn new sounds, vocabulary and structures in a meaningful manner, conceptualize these linguistic items and then manipulate the forms. This approach emphasized linguistic competence as well
as language performance. Nevertheless, it failed to account for the communicative function of a language in a discourse. Gradually, in the seventies and eighties, as teachers and researchers (e.g., Breen & Candlin, 1980; Brumfit & Johnson, 1979; Canale & Swain, 1980; Johnson & Morrow, 1981; Littlewood, 1981; Savignon, 1983; Widdowson, 1978) realized the need for communicative, meaningful practice, various communicative movements began in language learning/teaching. In Communicative Language Teaching, the best known approach to developing communicative competence, the emphasis on rules, patterns, definitions and other knowledge "about" language has shifted to emphasis on communicating "genuinely, spontaneously, and meaningfully in the second language" (Brown, 1987, p. 12), though, as will be shown, linguistic knowledge is now generally understood to be a prerequisite for communication. Components of the communicative approach--learning the linguistic system and developing language skills, understanding the culture of the target language and learning to communicate in the target language--are discussed below. It should be noted that these components follow from Brown's (1987) definition of language described in an earlier section.

Learning the linguistic system and developing language skills

The linguistic or grammatical system of a language comprises three components: a syntactic component, a semantic
component, and a phonological component. These three components can be thought of as component skills--grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation--in language learning. The three component skills are subsumed under four performance skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing (Bowen, Madsen and Hilferty, 1985). Thus, to communicate in the language, learners should develop all of these component skills and performance skills.

For some time after the rise of the Communicative Language Teaching approach, the focus on communication made the status of learning linguistic forms uncertain. Therefore, there has been some controversy about the importance of linguistic competence. However, now it is believed that linguistic competence is necessary if it is applied communicatively. Littlewood (1981) claims that "the learner must attain as high a degree as possible of linguistic competence...[but further] the learner must [be able to] distinguish the focus he has mastered as part of his linguistic competence, and the communicative functions which [he] performs" (p. 6). Thus, it is clear that while learning linguistic items is necessary, learners need more than linguistic items--component skills--to communicate. Language learners must know how to integrate the component skills of grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation into macroskills or performance skills--listening, speaking, reading and writing--productively and receptively. These
macroskills are usually woven together in classroom tasks and, if possible, extended to real life. There may be occasions when one is simply listening, speaking, reading or writing to the exclusion of the other skills, but in most language behavior, all the skills conjointly interact with each other (Nunan, 1989). Thus, linguistic competence which is prerequisite to communicative competence must be learned, but it should be learned globally in a communicative way, as well as discretely. In other words, language items must be learned in contexts of use rather than in isolation (Brumfit, 1987).

For example, textbooks can have directions to bring authentic tapes into classroom such as radio/T.V. broadcasts (news, weather forecasting, commercial messages), dialogues in a movie, announcements in a railroad station or airline terminal, telephone talk (making a reservation at a hotel, ordering from a catalog, ordering a pizza, confirming an airline reservation, making an appointment with the doctor), party conversations, lectures, and so on. Teachers can have students listen to these tapes and then do various kinds of exercises, for example, true or false, fill-in-the-blank, finishing a sentence, short answer, role play, and so on. In "fill-in-the-blank" or "finishing a sentence" questions, students' pronunciation, vocabulary or grammar skills can be diagnosed at the discrete level. But global level exercises can follow, e.g., "What is the subject or message?" "What
situation is represented?" "Who are the speakers?" "What is their relationship?" "Is this formal or informal language?" "Is this casual or intimate?" "What are the feelings of the speakers?" "What conversational skills are emphasized?" "What aspects of American culture does this conversation reflect?", and so on (Blum and Carr, 1981).

Understanding the culture of the target language

As discussed earlier, language and culture are not separable. To communicate in the target language effectively and appropriately in real life, cultural aspects of the target language should be addressed. According to Valdes (1986), if the similarities and differences between students' native culture and the target culture are identified and understood, they can be a useful tool for target language learning. To deal with the similarities and differences between native culture and target culture, it is important to recognize the students' own cultural base of attitudes and behavior as well as the target cultural base of attitudes and behavior. After recognizing and understanding values and behavior patterns of other cultures, language learners can use cultural clues to learn the target language. Most second/foreign language teachers realize the importance of studying culture in second/foreign language learning. However, in many cases, only the cultural "facts" are presented to students, so
students see only the "surface culture" at a tourist level or stereotype the target culture rather than acknowledging the "deep culture" or developing cross-cultural adaptation skills (Kramsch, 1983). If the textbook, a main resource of language learning in many classrooms, describes only the superficial facts of the target culture, teachers must try to probe beneath the superficiality to explore the underlying attitudes, beliefs and values of a society (Heusinkveld, 1985). Learners should also learn "the many dimensions of nonverbal communication" (p. 64) or other culture-bound behavior. Nonverbal aspects of communication such as posture and movement, facial expression, gaze and eye movement, gestures, proxemics or kinesics can be critical factors in understanding the target language (Brown, 1987; Morrain, 1978). These aspects cannot be acquired through textbooks. In a foreign language situation, such as learning English in Korea, students learn "a non-native language in [their] own culture with few immediate and widespread opportunities to use the language within the environment of [their] own culture" (Valdes, 1986, p. 34). Students in this situation seldom to meet foreigners who speak the target language. However, even in the foreign language situation, there are ways to let students have contacts with the target culture, such as "structured visits to class by members of other cultures" (Sadow, 1987, p. 27), viewing films related to the target
culture, listening to lectures by a native speaker of the target language, or having free discussions with native speakers of the target language.

**Learning to communicate in a foreign language**

Classrooms and learning activities which will enable students to utilize the linguistic system as part of a communicative system are quite different from those associated with the Grammar-Translation method, the ALM or the Cognitive Code approach. In the Communicative Language Teaching approach, teachers stress "the importance of self-esteem, of students cooperatively learning together, of developing individual strategies for success, and above all of focusing on the communicative process in language learning" (Brown, 1987, p. 12). In communicative activities, teachers act as facilitators rather than implementers to encourage students' participation in a supportive environment tolerating students' errors as a natural part of the process of language acquisition (Brown, 1987; Brumfit, 1987). To use the language, learners should know "the strategies for making sense of something and for negotiating meaning" (Nattinger, 1984, p. 391)—aspects of language learning that were completely ignored in the Grammar-Translation method, ALM and Cognitive Code approach. Therefore, in recent years, teachers have tried to develop activities which would enable learners
to use language in real life situations. The literature now provides a variety of communicative activities which can be utilized in classrooms to foster fluency, such as simulations, role plays, language games, information-gap tasks, problem-solving tasks, theater plays, pantomimes, and so on. All these communicative activities have their own merits, so they can be used depending on the classroom environment or pedagogic purposes.

For example, if there are too many students in one class, as in the Korean educational environment, it is difficult to try a role play, which has the "disadvantage that only a few students have an opportunity to talk at any one time" (Horwitz, 1985, p. 206). However, other activities can be used, e.g., an information-gap task. In an information-gap task, "participants must share information in order to complete a task or solve a problem" (Nunan, 1988, p. 84). For example, one uses the target language to explain information provided by the teacher, and the other listens and writes. In this task, students have to speak to deliver and negotiate the meaning, listen to comprehend the meaning, and write what they comprehend. Students have the opportunity to use the language and check their language performance by seeing what their partners produce. All the students can participate at one time and teachers do not need to check every student. Or, if a role play is assigned in a big class, teachers can use
various strategies to let the audience participate. For example, after the role play is finished, the teacher can give listening comprehension exercises in which the audience must recall in the target language everything they remember from the conversations that took place, or in the middle of the role play, the teacher can stop the role play at a strategic point and assign new students to take over the parts (Horwitz, 1985).

An important consideration in developing communicative skills is the authenticity of the language used. In foreign language settings as in Korea, it is necessary to bring authentic language data into the classrooms. According to Melvin and Stout (1987), authentic materials are needed for language learning since "authentic texts give students direct access to the culture and help them use the new language authentically themselves to communicate meaning in a meaningful situation rather than for demonstrating knowledge of a grammar point or a lexical item" (p. 44). In recent years as the focus on communicative competence in language learning has increased, the need for authentic materials has also increased. Since the aim of language learning is "to enable learners to produce and process actual language use" (Widdowson, 1979, p. 164), learners should be exposed to authentic language data. As the focus of language learning has shifted to communication, there has been a strong reaction
against "the kind of contrived language data which is a feature of many textbooks and which is simply cited to demonstrate how the rules of the language system can be manifested in sentences" (Widdowson, 1979, p. 164). And many language learners/teachers have noted that "simulated excerpts may serve to mislead students about the nature of everyday interactions" (Cathcart, 1989, p. 105). However, despite the strong belief that authentic texts should be used in the textbooks and other classroom materials, teachers and researchers have yet to agree on an exact definition of authenticity.

There have been a number of ways to define authenticity and to render the notion of authenticity. Geddes (1982) takes a very strong position claiming that students need to learn to "understand spontaneous speech with all its 'ums' and 'ers,' its ungrammatical features, incomplete sentences and mid-utterance changes of direction" (p. 79). In contrast, others believe that authentic texts may be edited and changed for language learners. Mollica (1979) maintains that "authors should make sure that dialogues are constructed around an experience compatible with the age and interest of the students; the language, therefore, should not be pedantic or unreal" (p. 162). Kruger (1985) notes that "'authentic' does not necessarily mean documentary. A text can or must be prepared and made teachable for pedagogical purposes" (p. 25).
Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) focus on content-oriented texts: "when the focus is on the content of the communication, the language environment is natural" (p. 14). On the other hand, Weijenberg (1980) focuses on the situation in which the language is produced. He maintains that language is purely authentic "when it is generated by a situation in which native speakers are conversing with native speakers for the purposes of accomplishing a task requiring verbal communication" (p. 30). As we see from the above, "authenticity" is a difficult term to define, although many researchers agree that authentic texts should be provided to language learners.

Since it is hard to define "authenticity", it is hard for language teachers to know what constitutes authentic language data in the classroom. However, Widdowson warns of the danger in the belief that authenticity can be achieved simply by exposing learners to genuine instances of discourse. He noted that "we do not begin with authenticity; authenticity is what the learners should ultimately achieve; it represents their terminal behavior" (Widdowson, 1979, p. 166). Thus classroom language learning is a kind of bridge from textbooks to real life for language learners. If teachers are concerned too much with authentic language itself, they might lose sight of the issue of effective pedagogy. It is important that we set up adequate ends, but it is also important that we set up adequate means for achieving them. In that sense, authentic
texts need "'doctoring'..., the pedagogic tampering with data..., in order to bring learners to the point at which they can realize the authenticity of the language by appropriate response" (p. 168). Thus, textbooks should be designed to lead both teachers and students to a condition whereby authenticity can ultimately be achieved, considering the purpose and situation of language learning.

Summary

As discussed above, it appears that to develop communicative competence, (a) Learners need to develop all of the component skills and performance skills. These language skills should be learned globally as well as discretely. (b) Learners need to learn socio-cultural aspects of the target language. The cultural aspects of the target language should be learned deeply rather than superficially. (c) Learners need to be involved with actual communicating in meaningful activities. To learn how language is used in real life, learners should be provided with authentic texts. Textbooks should provide opportunities for students to meet these needs.

Educational-cultural Philosophy

In the previous two sections, a description of how
textbooks should be was derived from the notions of the nature of language and the nature of language learning. However, considering the fact that the purpose of this study is to evaluate Korean textbooks and suggest ways to improve them, the setting for their use should also be considered. Therefore, this section reviews the Korean educational-cultural philosophy and shows how it affects the teaching of English.

Throughout history, Koreans have had "an unquenchable thirst for education which was initially motivated by the old Confucian school of learning" (Adams, 1976). The emphasis on education derived from Confucianism is still alive in Korean society. Korean educational philosophy is captured in the Korean phrase "Hongikingan Jungsin". The principles of Hongikingan Jungsin originate from the ideologies of Tangun the Great, the founder of the Korean people. The ideologies of Tangun the Great stem from "benevolence, pride of the chosen, and fraternity (oneness)" (Suh et al., 1983, p. 173). These ideologies became the philosophy of education in Korea. In 1949, the Education Law was promulgated to set forth the high ideals of education: "all nations must contribute to the common prosperity of mankind through the development of democracy and by nurturing the integrity of individuals equipped with the ability to lead independent lives and become qualified citizens with altruistic ideals of 'Hongikingan'"
(KOIS, 1979, pp. 656-657).

However, the Korean educational philosophy as shown above has not appeared to have a direct influence on English education, since English education started in Korea for very practical reasons. The Korean government saw the necessity for political, economic, cultural and technological contact with other countries in the world after Korea opened itself to Western countries in the middle of the 1940s, and English, the international language, was selected as the first foreign language in Korea. The highest priority in English education is communication through English with foreigners to get information about politics, economics, science and culture from other countries. The lowest priority is on reading English literature for self-refinement (Munkyobu, 1988).

However, as noted earlier, the goal of teaching Koreans to communicate in English has not been achieved. Only a small percentage of Korean students have mastered English in terms of developing a high level of proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing, although English has been taught in the school intensively and extensively for several decades (Cefola, 1989). The main reason for this failure is the method that has been used. When English first began to be taught in Korea, the ALM was in vogue in the U.S., and it was adopted in Korea through army personnel in the Korean War. In addition, the main characteristics of the ALM--rote memory,
repetition and drill type practice—are quite compatible with the Korean education style. In Confucianism, which continues to have a great deal of influence on Korean education, textbook memorization and rote learning are heavily used to pass objective tests through which "scholarly attainment ... [can] be achieved" (Adams, 1976, p. 33). Thus, the ALM easily and smoothly took root in Korea. Nowadays, Korean English teachers and textbook writers realize the problems in English education and advocate the Communicative Language Teaching approach to foster communication through English. However, the English educational environment in Korea, as has been stated earlier, with its excessive focus on entrance examinations, lack of native-speaker teachers, large number of students per class and the learning/teaching method derived from Confucianism still causes Korean English teachers to cling to the ALM.

While these facts about the environment in which English is taught in Korea do not affect the goals that should be reached or the methods that should be used to attain them, as set out in previous section of this review, they do limit what can be attained in actual practice. I will return to these limiting factors after my examination of textbooks in current use in Korea.
PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATING TEXTBOOKS

This section discusses four sets of criteria which effective English textbooks in Korea should meet based on the theoretical review in the previous section. These criteria grow out of the discussion of language and language learning, which suggested that textbooks should provide students with opportunities to (a) develop component and performance skills globally as well as discretely, (b) learn about cultural aspects of the target language at a deep rather than superficial level, (c) communicate with the language and (d) use authentic language texts. (Items (c) and (d) both derive from the discussion of learning to communicate in a foreign language.)

Language Skills

As discussed in the literature review, component skills as well as performance skills should be learned/taught as prerequisites to communication. In addition, they should be learned/taught globally as well as discretely.

The following principles were used in determining whether the English textbooks used in Korea provide students with opportunities to develop component skills and performance skills, and whether these skills are treated globally as well
Language skills are divided into two main categories: performance skills and component skills. Performance skills include listening, speaking, reading and writing. Traditionally, component skills have included grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary (see e.g., Bowen, Madsen and Hilferty, 1985). Here, I have added translation as a component skill, because, in Korean English textbooks, there are many translation exercises. While translation might be considered a writing skill, it is different from even the discrete level of writing described below and therefore was considered separately.

To determine whether a section treats a language skill at the discrete or global level, we have to consider the characteristics of each language skill individually. Translation is, by its nature, a relatively discrete activity. However, the other skills can be developed at the discrete level or the global level. If a grammar activity focuses on a grammar structure in isolation, it is at the discrete level. However, if a grammar point is embedded and utilized within a reading text, it is globally presented. If vocabulary items are presented individually, for example, under the "profession" category, with "doctor", "lawyer", "professor", "architect", and so on., being introduced, they are discretely treated. But new vocabulary words used in a context within a
reading passage are globally presented. If pronunciation items deal with sounds or stress in individual words or intonations of short sentences, they are discretely treated. But if intonation in a discourse or modified sounds in connected speech are presented, they are at the global level. In listening, if discrimination of sounds in words or sentences or recognition of individual pieces of information are dealt with, they are at the discrete level. However, if comprehension of listening material or recognition of a whole situation is dealt with, the skill is globally treated. In speaking, pattern practice is discrete, but speaking practice in a more or less free situation which simulates communicative situations in the real world is global. For example, if students produce "excuses" or "apology" statements, they are practicing a discrete skill. But if they produce these statements in either a formal or informal situation, or, apply "polite rejecting" statements in a real social interactive situation, the activity is global. In reading, recognition of visual symbols, words or grammar structures in sentences or short paragraphs is at the discrete level. In contrast, comprehension of a discourse is at the global level. In writing, if short compositions focusing on correct language forms without meaningful context are practiced, the exercise is at the discrete level. But if the exercise requires consideration of organization, expression, purpose or audience
as well as mechanics such as grammar or punctuation, it is global.

From this discussion, I derived the following questions to use in coding Korean English textbooks with respect to language skills.

Q.1 What language skills are dealt with in each unit of the randomly selected chapters? (The categories of language skills are pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, translation, listening, speaking, reading, and writing.)

Q.2. Is the treatment discrete or global?

Culture

As discussed in the literature review, cultural aspects of the foreign language should be learned/taught. These should go beyond mere presentation of cultural facts to develop awareness of cross-cultural differences. The following principles were used in evaluating the extent to which the English textbooks used in Korea introduce students to the culture of English-speaking countries.

Cultural content can be classified into three types. In the first, presentation, the reading text merely presents the cultural facts. In the second, comparison, the reading text not only presents the cultural facts but also compares similarities or differences between two cultures. In the
third, discussion, the reading text presents cultural facts, perhaps compares facts in the target culture with these in the students' culture and provides background information about them or discusses how students can further develop their sensitivity to culture. For example, if a textbook states that "eating at McDonald's" is typical in the United States society because it is convenient, less expensive and time-saving, students may conclude that Americans prefer fast food and that fast food is the most common eating style in America. In this case, teachers should note the fact that many Americans still keep the custom of having dinner at home with all of their family much of the time, but at the same time they often go out to eat fast food for convenience. Or, suppose there is a story about the attitude toward older people in the United States society. This story could be a good example of comparing two cultures since older people in Korea usually live with their family, while older people in America live apart from their family, sometimes in nursing homes. It is easy for Korean students to see the nursing home as a place to get rid of the older people. If Korean students fail to understand the American values which lie behind the superficial facts, they can never understand that nursing homes are usually a "last resort or a place where proper care with love and respect is provided" (Valdes, 1986, p. 50) to the elderly. In understanding and accepting different
behavioral patterns or values, students should not have a simplistic concept of black/white, good/bad or right/wrong. The important thing is to let students develop cultural sensitivity or awareness of cross-cultural differences.

As noted earlier, possible suggestions for making contact with the target culture in the EFL Korean classroom situation are inviting members of other cultures to class (Sadow, 1987), viewing films related to the target culture, listening to lectures by a native speaker of the target language, having free discussions with native speakers of the target language, and so on.

From this discussion, I derived the following questions to use in coding Korean English textbooks with respect to culture.

Q.1. How many chapters in each textbook have cultural content?
Q.2. Do chapters with cultural content (a) merely present cultural facts, (b) compare the native and the target cultures and/or (c) discuss cultural facts?
Q.3. Do the textbooks suggest ways for students to have contact with the target culture?

Communicative Activities

As discussed in the literature review, students should be involved with communicative activities to develop skill in
real communication. The following considerations were taken into account in determining whether the English textbooks used in Korea provide opportunities for such activities in English.

As discussed earlier, there are many valuable communicative activities and many ways to adjust them to a particular classroom situation. However, in the Korean educational environment, teachers have little training in setting up communicative activities, so they must rely on textbooks for guidance. A useful scheme for classifying textbook activities according to their degree of "communicativeness" is the one used by Paulston (1976), which views activities on a continuum from mechanical through meaningful to communicative.

Paulston defines mechanical, meaningful, and communicative activities in terms of "control of response." Mechanical activities are defined as the ones "where there is complete control of the response, where there is only one correct way of responding" (p. 4). These activities enable students to memorize the structure of target language in manipulative ways such as repetition or simple substitution drills.

Ex) Repetition

T: It is hot, isn't it?
T: It is slow, ______?
S: It is slow, isn't it?

Ex) Substitution
T: I go to school every day.
T: (every week)
S: I go to school every week.

Meaningful activities are defined as the ones "where there is still control of the response..., there is a right answer," but students are "supplied with the information necessary for responding, either by the teacher, the classroom situation, or the assigned reading" (Paulston, 1976, p. 7). These activities usually have meaningfully related facts which provide the basis for student responses, such as restatement, charts or pictures.

Ex) Restatement

T: Abdul, ask Juan what he did yesterday.
A: What did you do yesterday, Juan?
J: I went to the library.

Ex) Charts/Pictures

Meaningful Drill

Teacher draws the stick figures on the blackboard and labels them with name, age, and weight.
Who is taller, David or John? John is. (John is taller than David.)

T: older -- Susie -- David  S1: Who is older, Susie or David?
    S2: David is. (David is older than Susie.)

shorter -- Susie -- Mary  S3: Who is shorter, Susie or Mary?
    S4: Susie is. (Susie is shorter than Mary.)

younger -- David -- John  etc.

heavier -- David -- Mary  (Robinett, 1978, p. 208)

Communicative activities are defined as the ones which "[solicit] opinions rather than factual answers from reading passages" (Paulston, 1976, p. 9). In mechanical and meaningful activities, "automatic use of language manipulation" is seen, but in communicative activities, "free transfer of learned language patterns to appropriate situations" (p. 9) is expected. These activities enable students to practice the target language in directed but open-ended situations such as group work, pair work, simulation, role play, language games, information-gap tasks, problem-solving tasks, two-way tasks, theater plays, pantomimes, and so on.

From this discussion, I derived the following questions to use in coding Korean English textbooks with respect to
communicative activities.
Q.1 How many mechanical activities are there in the exercise section of the randomly selected chapters?
Q.2 How many meaningful activities are in these section?
Q.3 How many communicative activities are in these section?

Authentication

As discussed in the literature review, authentic texts should be provided to students. The following principles were used in evaluating whether the English in textbooks used in Korea is authentic or not.

In examining the authenticity of Korean English textbooks, I decided not to require that the source of language be authentic. Instead, I focused on three other aspects of authenticity. First was the appropriateness of language use for the given situation from the viewpoint of native speakers of English. For example, could the language of the textbook be used in a real English-speaking situation? Second was the lack of awkward/unnatural expressions for the given situation as judged by native speakers of English. An example of such an expression can be seen in chapter 5 of the 11th grade textbook. The passage is a dialogue of an old lady in a play. The old lady describes that the world around old people is undergoing changes. "I say something and everyone stoops low
to listen with a strange look, an indifferent look. Then they respond with a shout of something I never understand. What's the yell for when you don't get it? I always try to ask to find out, but whiff they're gone! Boy, they move fast! I feel a strong wind when each person goes by. I take good care not to touch any of them, but when I do they turn me like a big top. Each time this happens I keep standing a good long minute with all my eyes shut to clear off the daze." Finally I looked at the appropriateness of language use for the given situation from the viewpoint of the learner as judged by Korean TESL students. An example of such inappropriate language use would be a philosophical reading text with lots of jargon in a 7th grade students. This would be unauthentic because it would likely be far removed from the students' interests. Likewise, a reading illustrating modal auxiliaries that is appropriate and authentic for 12th graders might be inappropriate and unauthentic for 7th graders, because the proficiency level is different.

From this discussion, I derived the following questions to use in coding Korean English textbooks with respect to authenticity.

Q.1. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the given situation in the conversation/dialogue and reading sections of the randomly selected chapters? (The level of appropriateness was evaluated on a 4-point scale: very
appropriate, somewhat appropriate, somewhat inappropriate, very inappropriate, by three experienced native-speaker ESL instructors.)

Q.2. How many expressions which are awkward/unnatural for the situation occur in each of these units? (Expressions were identified by the same three experienced native-speaker ESL instructors as in question 1.)

Q.3. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the students' age, proficiency level and interest in these units? (The level of appropriateness was evaluated on the same 4-point scale as in question 1 by two Korean TESL students.)
METHODS

The first part of this section provides a rationale for selecting textbooks to evaluate. The second part discusses the steps taken in coding the various features of the textbook and principles for the coding for each criterion.

Rationale for Selecting Textbooks

For this study, I decided to examine English textbooks used in Korea at the junior and senior high level, since the government prescribes the syllabi and textbooks for these grades. (In contrast, universities can have their own syllabi and are not bound by the government textbook policies, so there is a wide variety of books used. Results from a study of university textbooks would thus not be generalizable.)

Five publishers produce English textbooks at the junior high level: Dong-A, Kyo-Hak (2), Ji-Hak and Tae-Rim. Eight publishers produce English textbooks at the senior high level: Dong-A (2), Kyo-Hak, Ji-Hak, Hyung-Sul, Ha-Na and Ung-Jin (2). I decided to use English textbooks from Dong-A because they are used by a large number of students. However, Dong-A textbooks are quite similar to those from other publishers with respect to the format of textbooks and the principles of textbook writing provided by the Ministry of Education.
To examine language skills, communicative activities and authenticity, I used random number tables to select two chapters, excluding the first and the last (which might not be typical of the rest of the text) for each level of Dong-A English textbooks from 7th grade to 12th grade. The chapters chosen were Chapters 9 and 12 for 7th grade, Chapters 2 and 6 for 8th grade, Chapters 2 and 6 for 9th grade, Chapters 6 and 12 for 10th grade, Chapters 5 and 11 for 11th grade and Chapters 3 and 12 for 12th grade. To examine the cultural aspects, I looked at the entire text at each level for chapters which have cultural content.

In Dong-A English textbooks, each chapter has a main body and a series of exercises. The main body consists of several sections which have different lesson points related to different language skills. In the junior high textbooks, the sections are labeled as Preview, Dialogue, Reading Text, Comprehension, Sounds, Utter/Respond and Patterns. In the senior high textbooks, the sections are labeled as Points of Lesson, Conversation, Reading, Comprehension, Further Practice and Sounds. In both junior and senior high textbooks, each exercise consists of several questions, all on a single point and presented in a single format. In my coding, each exercise was considered as one activity. In addition, senior high textbooks have exercises consisting of composition practice. Each composition practice was considered as one activity.
Coding

The following steps were taken in coding the various features of the textbook for language skills, culture and communicative activities.

1. I wrote a preliminary description of each coding category incorporating information presented in the previous chapter.
2. My major professor and I, working independently, used the descriptions to code the activities in one chapter or, in the case of culture, one textbook. We then compared our results and discussed items on which we disagreed.
3. I rewrote the category descriptions to clarify points on which we had disagreed. Steps 2 and 3 were repeated until we reached agreement on all items.

I then coded the remaining chapters alone. The final coding principles for each criterion are described below.

**Language Skills**

The units for evaluating language skills were the main body and exercise sections for the selected chapters. The questions used in the evaluation were as follows:

(1) What language skills are dealt with in each unit of the randomly selected chapters?
(2) Is the treatment discrete or global?

While each of the exercises was clearly related to a
single skill, the sections of the main body could be used to develop several skills. The decision about how to code a particular section was made on the basis of what appeared to be the primary skills being taught and not the secondary skills that might be involved. For example, the vocabulary skill seems to be covered in all sections. However, in all Dong-A English textbooks, certain sections present new vocabulary words and certain sections do not. Therefore, the criterion used for identifying vocabulary learning as a primary skill in a section was whether new words were introduced or not.

Culture

The units for evaluating cultural aspects were chapters in the selected textbook. For this criterion, all chapters of a given textbook were considered. For the second question, the conversation/dialogue, reading and comprehension sections in the main body of the chapters which have cultural content were examined. The questions used in the evaluation were as follows:

(1) How many chapters in each textbook have cultural content?

(2) If some chapters have cultural content, do they (a) merely present cultural facts, (b) compare the native and target cultures and/or (c) discuss cultural facts?

(3) Do the textbooks suggest ways for students to have contact
with the target culture?

Chapters of the textbooks were regarded as dealing with culture if the content dealt with an aspect of the target culture which is unfamiliar to Korean culture, or if the content dealt with a contrast between the target culture and Korean culture. Therefore, (1) if the content of a dialogue or reading text deals with aspects of American life style, but presents them as being what one finds in Korea, I did not label the section as dealing with culture. (2) If language form rather than cultural aspects were being contrasted (e.g., introduction style, dialogue in a doctor's office), I did not label the section as dealing with culture. (3) If the content of a dialogue or reading text deals with Korean culture only, I did not label the section as dealing with culture. (4) Sections that dealt with fables and wise sayings were not regarded as cultural, even when the source was not Korea.

Communicative Activities

The units for evaluating communicative activities were exercise sections for the selected chapters. The questions used in evaluation were as follows:
(1) How many mechanical activities are there in the exercise section of the randomly selected chapters?
(2) How many meaningful activities are in these sections?
(3) How many communicative activities are in these sections?
Each exercise was categorized as a mechanical activity, a meaningful activity, or a communicative activity.

**Determination of Authenticity**

The units for evaluating authenticity were conversation/dialogue and reading sections in the main body for the selected chapters. The questions used in the evaluation were as follows:

1. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the given situation in the conversation/dialogue and reading sections of the randomly selected chapters? (response on a 4-point scale)
2. How many expressions which are awkward/unnatural for the situation occur in each of these units?
3. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the students' age, proficiency level and interest in these units?

For questions 1 and 2, I obtained judgements from three native-speaker ESL teachers in the Intensive English and Orientation Program (IEOP) at Iowa State University. After explaining the definition of authenticity adopted in this study, I asked them to judge the level of appropriateness of the language use in each selected chapter, using a 4-point scale, and to identify expressions which seemed awkward or unnatural for the context. For question 3, which involved direct knowledge of the Korean situation, I used myself and another Korean TESL student at ISU. Again using a 4-point
scale, we evaluated the conversation/dialogue and reading sections in the main body of the selected chapters.
RESULTS

This section provides the results of the codings with respect to the four sets of criteria discussed earlier.

Language Skills

The questions used for language skills were as follows:
(1) What language skills are dealt with in each unit of the randomly selected chapters?
(2) Is the treatment discrete or global?

The codings of language skills and the level at which they are presented—discrete or global—for the chapters evaluated in each textbook for the junior and senior high levels are shown in Appendix A.

These codings are summarized in Tables 1-3. Table 1 shows the findings in the main body for junior and senior high level and the findings in the exercises for junior and senior high level. The findings were quite similar for the two sets of textbooks with respect to the overall distribution percentage of component skills and performance skills (although the breakdown within categories was somewhat different for the two groups). Thus, for the next comparisons between main body and exercise sections, the two groups were combined.

Table 2 combines the findings for the main body of all
chapters at both levels—junior and senior high—showing the total number of component skills and performance skills, overall and broken down according to treatment at the discrete level and global level. Table 3 combines the findings for the exercises of all chapters at all levels by the same means as in Table 2. These tables show that the ratio of component and performance skills for the main body and the exercises were quite different. In the main body, 61% of the total skills were component skills, while in the exercises, this percentage jumps to 92%. Even more striking is the percentage of global skills in the two sections. While 61% of the total skills were globally treated in the main body, only 2.95% of the total skills were treated globally in the exercises. In the main body, vocabulary, grammar, and reading skills were dealt with most frequently, while translation, listening and writing skills were not dealt with at all. While pronunciation and speaking skills were only discretely treated, the majority of grammar, vocabulary and reading skills were treated globally. In the exercises, grammar, vocabulary and translation skills were most frequently dealt with, while listening was not dealt with at all. Most (97%) of the exercises were at the discrete level and over half of these involved grammar.
Table 1. Breakdown of language skills in junior high and senior high textbooks (2 chapters/textbook)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main body (Junior-high level)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Exercises (Junior-high level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrete global</td>
<td></td>
<td>discrete global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>component skills</td>
<td>gr 24 (30.8%) 6 (7.7%) 18 (23.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>gr 17 (51.5%) 17 (51.5%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vo 18 (23.1%) 0 18 (23.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>vo 7 (21.2%) 7 (21.2%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pr 6 (7.7%) 6 (7.7%) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>pr 1 (3.0%) 1 (3.0%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tr 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>tr 6 (18.2%) 6 (18.2%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance skills ls 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>performance skills ls 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sp 6 (7.7%) 6 (7.7%) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>sp 1 (3.0%) 1 (3.0%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rd 24 (30.8%) 12 (15.4%) 12 (15.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>rd 1 (3.0%) 1 (3.0%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wr 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>wr 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total 78 (100%) 30 (38.5%) 48 (61.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>total 33 (100%) 33 (100%) 0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main body (Senior-high level)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Exercises (Senior-high level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrete global</td>
<td></td>
<td>discrete global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>component skills</td>
<td>gr 13 (14.3%) 0 13 (14.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>gr 41 (60.3%) 41 (60.3%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vo 36 (39.6%) 6 (6.6%) 30 (33.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>vo 14 (20.6%) 14 (20.6%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pr 6 (6.6%) 6 (6.6%) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>pr 1 (1.5%) 1 (1.5%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tr 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>tr 6 (8.8%) 6 (8.8%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance skills ls 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>performance skills ls 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sp 16 (17.6%) 16 (17.6%) 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>sp 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rd 20 (22.0%) 8 (8.8%) 12 (13.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>rd 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wr 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>wr 6 (8.8%) 3 (4.4%) 3 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total 91 (100%) 36 (39.6%) 55 (60.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>total 68 (100%) 65 (95.6%) 3 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Breakdown of language skills in main body (2 chapters/textbook, junior & senior-high levels combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Skills</th>
<th>Discrete</th>
<th>Global</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gr</td>
<td>vo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrete</td>
<td>37 (21.9%)</td>
<td>54 (32.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global</td>
<td>6 (3.55%)</td>
<td>6 (3.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169 (100%)</td>
<td>66 (39%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Breakdown of language skills in exercises (2 chapters/textbook, junior & senior-high levels combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Skills</th>
<th>Discrete</th>
<th>Global</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gr = grammar</td>
<td>58 (57.4%)</td>
<td>58 (57.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vo = vocabulary</td>
<td>21 (20.8%)</td>
<td>21 (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr = pronunciation</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr = translation</td>
<td>12 (11.9%)</td>
<td>12 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is = listening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp = speaking</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd = reading</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wr = writing</td>
<td>6 (5.9%)</td>
<td>3 (2.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101 (100%)</td>
<td>98 (97.05%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:
gr = grammar
ls = listening
pr = pronunciation
rd = reading
sp = speaking
tr = translation
vo = vocabulary
wr = writing
The questions used for culture were as follows:

1. How many chapters in each textbook have cultural content?
2. Do chapters with cultural content (a) merely present cultural facts, (b) compare the native and the target cultures and/or (c) discuss cultural facts?
3. Do the textbooks suggest ways for students to have contact with the target culture?

The codings of cultural content are shown in Appendix B. Table 4 summarizes these findings.

Table 4. Summary of codings for cultural content *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of chapters with cultural content</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of chapters dealing with culture at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. presentation level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. comparison level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. discussion level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of chapters suggesting contact with target cultures</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a total of 80 chapters were examined.

As shown in Table 4, very few chapters contained cultural content—only seven (8.75 %) out of the 80 examined. The 9th
The questions used for communicative activities were as follows:
(1) How many mechanical activities are there in the exercise sections of the randomly selected chapters?
(2) How many meaningful activities are in these sections?
(3) How many communicative activities are in these sections?

The codings of communicative activities are shown in Appendix C. Table 5 summarizes these findings.

Table 5. Summary of codings for communicative activities *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activities</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical activities</td>
<td>93 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful activities</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative activities</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total activities</td>
<td>101 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* exercise sections in two chapters/textbook were examined.

As shown in Table 5, the vast majority of the activities (92%) were mechanical. Most of these were fill-in-the-blank or substitution exercises related to grammar or vocabulary. Of the five meaningful activities, one had a chart and the others were related to understanding the reading text in that chapter. The three communicative activities involved the writing skill only and all had the same format; students were asked to answer questions about a certain topic in full sentences and then to form a good paragraph about the topic.
Authenticity

The questions used for authenticity were as follows:

(1) Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the given situation in the conversation/dialogue and reading sections of the randomly selected chapters?

(2) How many expressions which are awkward/unnatural for the situation occur in each of these units?

Table 6. Summary of authenticity ratings *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness of language use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
<td>45 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat appropriate</td>
<td>23 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat inappropriate</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very inappropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of awkward/unnatural expressions found by 3 ESL teachers: 93
Number of different awkward/unnatural expressions found by 3 ESL teachers: 77

Appropriateness of language use (2 Korean TESL student ratings/section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness of language use</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
<td>23 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat appropriate</td>
<td>18 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat inappropriate</td>
<td>7 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very inappropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* conversation/dialogue and reading sections in two chapters/textbook were examined.
(3) Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the students' age, proficiency level, and interest in these units? The codings for authenticity are shown in Appendix D. Table 6 summarizes these findings.

For the first question, the large majority of the ratings were "Very appropriate" or "Somewhat appropriate", with only 5.5% "Somewhat inappropriate" and none "Very inappropriate". Two raters (A and C) agreed fairly closely, while the third (Rater B) frequently gave lower ratings. The three raters agreed on 10 sections out of 24.

For the second question, the raters differed considerably in identifying the awkward/unnatural expressions. A total of 77 awkward/unnatural expressions were found by the three raters. Out of these, only two awkward/unnatural expressions were identified by all three raters and only twelve were identified by two raters. All the rest (63) were identified by only one rater. The lack of agreement appeared to be related to the different standards applied by the three raters. For example, while Rater A focused on expression, Rater B focused on grammatical aspects such as sentences which could have been combined or verb usage and Rater C focused on inappropriate vocabulary.

For the third question, again the majority of the ratings were "Very appropriate" and "Somewhat appropriate", with only 14.5% "Somewhat inappropriate" and none "Very inappropriate".
Rater D tended to rate higher than Rater E. The two raters agreed on ratings for 6 out of 24 sections.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As discussed earlier, there are four sets of criteria which effective English textbooks in Korea should meet. These are related to language skills, culture, communicative activities and authenticity. This section discusses the extent to which the books examined met these criteria and suggests some ways for improving them to reach the ultimate goal of communicative competence in language learning/teaching.

Language Skills

As discussed in the literature review, learners should develop all of the component skills and performance skills in order to communicate in real life situations. Except for translation, these skills should be learned globally as well as discretely.

The questions used for language skills were as follows:
(1) What language skills are dealt with in each unit of the chapters under consideration?
(2) Is the treatment discrete or global?
As shown in the results, there were small differences between junior-high and senior-high textbooks with respect to language skills dealt with, but some differences between the main body
and exercises. Thus the textbooks examined had a similar structure for all levels and a typical structure for the main body and the exercises. In the main body, grammar, vocabulary and reading skills were most frequently dealt with. In the exercises, grammar, vocabulary and translation skills were dealt with most frequently. In both sections, component skills were dealt with more frequently than performance skills. However, in the main body, both component and performance skills were dealt with and most of them were treated globally as well as discretely, except for pronunciation and speaking skills. But in the exercises, the component skills were almost exclusively dealt with and almost all of them were treated discretely, including the ones which were treated globally in the main body, such as grammar, vocabulary and reading. Thus, overall, component skills were emphasized more than performance skills. Further, only some of the performance skills were treated. For example, many opportunities were given to develop skill in reading, while the listening skill was not treated at all. In addition, most of the language skills were presented discretely rather than globally, especially in the exercises.

I would suggest that the exercise section is a very good place to develop performance skills on a global level. The textbooks examined had only fill-in-the-blank, substitution or short answer types of questions no matter what language skills
they dealt with, except for writing and translation skills. For example, the textbooks examined had pronunciation exercises which asked students to distinguish words of similar pronunciation either visually or from memory. However, it would be possible to develop global level exercises for this skill. The teacher might be instructed to bring a tape of a dialogue composed of words of similar pronunciation and ask questions which make students distinguish between words of similar pronunciation. In this way, students can distinguish between similar pronunciations in a dialogue, not in a word. Students can distinguish these aurally to develop listening skill and orally to develop speaking skill. Again, the textbooks examined had reading comprehension exercises which asked students whether they understood the facts in the previous reading. In these exercises, students were asked simple yes-no type questions about their understanding of the previous reading. These discrete point exercises could also be replaced with global ones, for example, a pair work activity which leads students to talk or write about their feeling or opinions concerning the previous reading using modal auxiliaries. Thus, students would have an opportunity to understand the reading to develop global reading skill and express their feeling or opinions to develop global speaking or writing skill. Additionally, students would use a certain structure to develop grammar skill. As shown above, there are
many ways which develop language skills in contexts of use rather than in isolation.

Culture

As discussed in the literature review, language and culture are not separable. Thus, cultural aspects of the target language should be addressed so that students can learn to communicate in the target language effectively and appropriately. In addition, cultural aspects should be learned/taught to develop awareness of cross cultural differences rather than merely presenting cultural facts. In EFL situations, such as learning English in Korea, students should have opportunities to have contact with the target culture.

The questions used for culture were as follows:
(1) How many chapters in each textbook have cultural content?
(2) Do chapters with cultural content (a) merely present cultural facts, (b) compare the native and the target cultures and/or (c) discuss cultural facts?
(3) Do the textbooks suggest ways for students to have contact with the target culture?
As shown in the results, there were only 7 chapters with cultural content among 80 chapters from 7th grade to 12th grade and these dealt with their topic in a somewhat
superficial level, merely presenting the cultural facts. Three chapters were at the presentation level and four chapters were at the comparison level. There were no chapters at the discussion level. There were no opportunities suggested for contact with the target cultures. In general, the textbooks examined did not deal with culture sufficiently or deeply enough. On the other hand, there were frequent presentations of cultural items in which American and Korean views are similar, though these were not covered in the above.

However, in Dong-A English textbooks, each chapter has a "comprehension" section after the dialogue or reading text which is a very good place to discuss the content of a dialogue or reading text. The deeper level of understanding of cultural aspects could be reached in the comprehension section. But all of the chapters containing cultural content had superficial and sentential level questions in the comprehension section. Even the chapters with cultural content at the comparison level had only simple questions about the understanding of a dialogue or reading text at the sentential level. This means that even in the cultural chapters which compared different cultures, the questions of the comprehension section blocked students from developing sensitivity to cultural differences. Presenting good questions in the comprehension section would be a good way to make students elevate their sensitivity to culture. For
example, the 12th chapter of the 10th grade textbook introduced the letter writing custom in American culture, which is different from that in Korea. Even though the topic was treated at the presentation level in the reading text, questions could be asked in the comprehension section such as "Do we write letters on the same occasions as the Americans?" "If not, why not?" "What else do we do instead of writing letters on those occasions?" "Which custom do you think is better or more appropriate to our way of life?" "Would you adopt that custom?" "Where?", "When?", "How?". Students would then think about the differences and develop their own opinions about the values in different cultures. The textbooks examined here provided no opportunities for contact with different cultures. But if the textbook provides suggestions for students to have contact with the target culture, it can be a starting point for teachers and students to follow. For example, if a textbook indicates an activity such as "Invite an American who has lived in Korea 3-5 years to class and discuss the topic dealt with in this chapter," teachers can find an appropriate American and invite him/her to class. Through this kind of activity, students can have fun and increase their interest in learning English without stress.
Communicative Activities

As discussed in the literature review, students should be involved with communicative activities to develop skill in real communication.

The questions used for communicative activities were as follows:
(1) How many mechanical activities are there in the chapters under consideration?
(2) How many meaningful activities are there?
(3) How many communicative activities are there?

However, as shown in the results, very few communicative activities were found at any level and the majority of the activities were mechanical. Thus, the textbooks provided students with very few opportunities for real life use of English. The three communicative activities which the textbooks had through all levels involved the writing skill only.

However, there are many ways to develop communicative activities using both oral and written skills. For example, one can set up pair work, group discussions, role plays, and so on to develop speaking or listening skill. Or, one can set up a writing practice dealing with students' feelings or opinions about a reading text. The number of meaningful activities can also be increased. For example, with a map
which has many streets and buildings, students can have writing or speaking practice about directions. Or, with a picture showing sequential events, students can obtain writing or speaking practice about tenses.

**Authenticity**

As discussed in the literature review, authentic texts should be provided to students.

The questions used for authenticity were as follows:

1. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the given situation in the chapters under consideration?
2. How many expressions which are awkward/unnatural for the situation occur in each of these units?
3. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the students' age, proficiency level and interest in these units?

As shown in the results, ESL teachers judged the large majority of the sections to be appropriate for the situation. From the viewpoint of Korean learners, the judgement of the raters was again that the majority of sections were appropriate, although more sections were found to be somewhat inappropriate than in the first criterion. On the other hand, there were a number of awkward/unnatural expressions (77), even though the raters differed considerably in identifying them. In general, the appropriateness of language use in the
textbooks examined was not too bad, but the textbooks examined had a fairly large number of awkward/unnatural expressions. Some of the chapters were quite good, while others contained a fairly large number of questionable expressions.

It is desirable to have textbooks checked by qualified native speakers before publication for authentic/appropriate language, though, as noted earlier, even language experts can disagree on such matters. It is also desirable to have textbooks checked by a committee composed of qualified members considering Korean students' educational background.

In general, Korean English textbooks have many problems. Briefly speaking, the problems I found from the four sets of criteria were:

(1) Language skills were not dealt with equally.
(2) Many of the language skills were treated discretely.
(3) Cultural aspects were not dealt with sufficiently.
(4) Cultural aspects were not dealt with deeply enough.
(5) Students did not have opportunities for contact with the target culture.
(6) There were almost no communicative activities in Korean English textbooks.
(7) The reading passages contained some awkward/unnatural expressions.

Here, I would like to return to the issue of the Korean
educational-cultural philosophy and environment. As discussed earlier, there are many factors which hinder communicative language learning which cannot be changed or improved within a short period of time. Among these factors, the entrenched use of the audiolingual method, the excessive focus on entrance examinations, the large number of students per class and the lack of native speaker teachers are the most important. The combination of these factors make it difficult for change to occur. In Korea, students seldom have a chance to speak in English. It is not easy for students to practice English communicatively in the classroom. It is not easy for teachers to lead students in a communicative way. Students study English mainly to pass the entrance examinations. In other words, English has been learned and taught in the Korean way to satisfy the immediate requirements of the current situation regardless of the stated purpose of developing communicative competence. For example, there are many students who believe they are good at English even though they are not proficient in communication, simply because they receive good grades on multiple choice tests focusing on grammar, vocabulary or reading. This phenomenon has been observed ever since English was introduced as the first foreign language in Korea. As a result, the current English education system falls far short of reaching its ultimate goal of developing communicative competence and Korean English textbooks have played a large
role in bringing this about by reflecting unofficial policy concerning the teaching of English.

However, it is certain that Korean teachers, textbook writers and students must pursue this ultimate goal, despite the fact that the Korean English education environment is not optimal for reaching it. Even though problematic factors cannot be easily changed, there are ways to help students develop communicative competence, as I have suggested in this research. The role of textbook writers is crucial in bringing this about. Since English textbooks determine the content and direction of English instruction in Korea and provide the most important exposure Korean students have to English, textbook writers have an obligation to make their textbooks authentic and to give students opportunities to communicate in English.
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## APPENDIX A. CODING OF LANGUAGE SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Section/Activity</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ch.9</td>
<td>ch.12</td>
<td>ch.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What language skills are dealt with in each unit of the randomly selected chapters?</td>
<td>preview</td>
<td>dialogue</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rd(d)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(d)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(d)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(d)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the treatment discrete or global?</td>
<td>activity 1</td>
<td>gr(d)</td>
<td>gr(d)</td>
<td>gr(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity 2</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
<td>gr(d)</td>
<td>gr(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity 3</td>
<td>tr(d)</td>
<td>gr(d)</td>
<td>tr(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity 4</td>
<td>sp(d)</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity 5</td>
<td>rd(d)</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
<td>gr(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity 6</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
<td>gr(d)</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity 7</td>
<td>pr(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questions Section/Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Section/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What language skills are dealt with in each unit of the randomly selected chapters?</td>
<td>(Main body)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the treatment discrete or global?</td>
<td>(Exercises)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 10th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ch.6</th>
<th>ch.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language skills (d/g)</td>
<td>language skills (d/g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(d)</td>
<td>rd(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vo(d)</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr(d)</td>
<td>pr(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 11th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ch.5</th>
<th>ch.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language skills (d/g)</td>
<td>language skills (d/g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(d)</td>
<td>rd(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vo(d)</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr(d)</td>
<td>pr(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 12th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ch.3</th>
<th>ch.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language skills (d/g)</td>
<td>language skills (d/g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
<td>rd(g)vo(g)gr(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd(d)</td>
<td>rd(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
<td>sp(d)vo(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vo(d)</td>
<td>vo(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr(d)</td>
<td>pr(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ABBREVIATIONS

- language skills
  - gr = grammar
  - ls = listening
  - pr = pronunciation
  - rd = reading
  - sp = speaking
  - tr = translation
  - vo = vocabulary
  - wr = writing

- level of treatment
  - d = discrete
  - g = global

### NOTES

- There are two types of vocabulary exercises, one involving the use of function words and the other, the use of content words. Function words are related to grammar, but they are considered as vocabulary in this table, because they are treated as parts of idiomatic phrases in the textbooks used in this evaluation.

- Senior-high level textbooks have a "points of lesson" section at the beginning of each lesson introducing the various sections which follow. This is omitted in this table, because in itself it does not teach language skills.
APPENDIX B. CODING OF CULTURAL CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many chapters have cultural content?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If some chapters have cultural content, do they (a) merely present cultural facts, (b) compare the native and target cultures and/or (c) discuss cultural facts?</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ch.9</td>
<td>ch.10</td>
<td>ch.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ch.12</td>
<td>ch.14</td>
<td>ch.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do the textbooks suggest ways for students to have contact with the target culture?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C. CODING OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTIVITIES IN EXERCISES SECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>ch.9</th>
<th>ch.12</th>
<th>ch.2</th>
<th>ch.6</th>
<th>ch.12</th>
<th>ch.5</th>
<th>ch.11</th>
<th>ch.3</th>
<th>ch.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many mechanical activities are there?</td>
<td>Mechanical activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many meaningful activities are there?</td>
<td>Meaningful activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many communicative activities are there?</td>
<td>Communicative activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


APPENDIX D. CODING OF AUTHENTICITY IN CONVERSATION/DIALOGUE AND READING SECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>7th ch.9</th>
<th>8th ch.12</th>
<th>9th ch.2</th>
<th>7th ch.6</th>
<th>8th ch.2</th>
<th>9th ch.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the given situation in the conversation/dialogue and reading sections of the randomly selected chapters?</td>
<td>ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC</td>
<td>ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC</td>
<td>ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC ABC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many expressions which are awkward/unnatural for the situation occur in each of these units?</td>
<td>ABC ABC</td>
<td>241 3</td>
<td>35 1 1 121 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABBREVIATIONS

C - conversation/dialogue
R - reading

NOTES

A is done by Rater A (IEOP instructor at ISU).
B is done by Rater B (IEOP instructor at ISU).
C is done by Rater C (IEOP instructor at ISU).
D is done by Rater D (Korean TESL student at ISU).
E is done by Rater E (Korean TESL student at ISU).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the given situation in the conversation/dialogue and reading sections of the randomly selected chapters?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many expressions which are awkward/unnatural for the situation occur in each of these units?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the students' age, proficiency level and interest in these units?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ch.6</td>
<td>ch.12</td>
<td>ch.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, how appropriate is the language use for the given situation in the conversation/dialogue and reading sections of the randomly selected chapters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat appropriate</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat inappropriate</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very inappropriate</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many expressions which are awkward/unnatural for the situation occur in each of these units?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>ABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 7 12 27 4 13 21 11 3 2 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 7 12 27 4 13 21 11 3 2 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat appropriate</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat inappropriate</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very inappropriate</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>