

Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English



**An Evaluation of the Writing Skill in the Third Year Middle School
English Course Book ‘My Book of English’**

**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirement of a Master
Degree in English Didactics**

Submitted by:

Widad BOULASSEL

Meriem TEMIZA

Supervised by:

Dr. Hassiba BOUKHATEM

Board of examiners:

Chairman: Ms. Rafika MELEK

Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University, Jijel

Examiner: Dr. Slimane BOUKHENTACHE Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University, Jijel

Supervisor: Dr. Hassiba BOUKHATEM Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University, Jijel

2018-2019

Dedication

*To the ones who gave birth and meaning to my life, to the persons who gave me
strength and hope;*

The dearest persons to my heart, to my parents I dedicate this work,

To my sisters: Nesrine and Manel,

To my brothers: Mohammed, Islem and Khalil,

To all my family; especially my cousins Hana, Hocine, Haroune and Anes,

To all my friends who prayed for me and besought God to help me.

Widad

Dedication

In the Name of ALLAH, Most Gracious, Most Merciful

All the Praysis due to ALLAH alone, the Sustainer of all the worlds

This work is dedicated to the most precious people to my heart. To my special family.

*My beloved **parents** for their support, tenderness, endless love and patience.*

*To my beloved **sister Iman** for her support, encouragement and help.*

*My beloved **ness Lina**.*

*To my **brothers: Omar, Youness and Walid** who were continuously supporting me.*

*To the living memory of my brother **Kamel**. Although he is no longer of this world, his memory will live.*

To my friends and classmates who shared their words of advice and encouragement to finish this study.

To all those I forget to mention but they are always in my heart, thank you all for your unforgettable support .

Meriem

Acknowledgement

In the name of Allah, the most Merciful, the most Gracious. All praise be to Allah

The sustainer of the worlds

First and for most, we would like to thank God Almighty who supplied us with the strength, guidance and courage to do this work.

*We would like to extend our extreme thanks to our supervisor Mrs. **Hassiba Boukhatem** for her wise guidance, motivation, patience and significant support through the different stages of this work.*

We would like to thank the board of examiners for accepting to evaluate this piece of research and taking the trouble to read it.

*We owe profound gratitude to Mr. **Redouane Naili** for his guidance.*

We are grateful to all people who indirectly contributed in this dissertation.

Abstract

The present research has been conducted to investigate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the writing tasks in the third year middle school course book 'My book of English'. It also attempts to shed light on the teacher' perspectives and whether the course book meets their expectations and objectives in teaching the writing skill. It based on the hypothesis that if the course book 'My book of English' provides sufficient and appropriate content for teaching the writing skill third year middle school(MS) pupils would improve their writing. Hence, this research is composed of three chapters, the first one is about text book evaluation and the second one concerns the writing skill under the major teaching methods. The third chapter, which is the practical part, concerning the research tools, an adapted checklist is used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the course book 'My book of English' in terms of writing tasks. Besides, a questionnaire was submitted to 15 third year middle school teachers working at eight different middle schools in Jijel in order to gather the data about their perspective towards the appropriateness of the writing tasks included in ' My book of English' course book. The results obtained showthat 'My book of English' coursebook is not really effective and appropriate in teaching the writing skill and it does not match pupils' actual level.

*Key words:*text book evaluation, writing skill, tasks, teaching writing.

List of Abbreviations

CBA: Competency Based Approach

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

DM: Direct Method

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

ESL: English as a Second Language

ESP: English for Specific Purposes

FL: Foreign Language

GTM: Grammar Translation Method

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

MS: Middle School

Q: Question

List of Tables

Table 01: Number of English Teachers from Each Middle School.....	37
Table 02: The years of teaching English language.....	38
Table 03: Teaching Experience of MS English Teachers by Level.....	38
Table 04: The Years of Teaching the Third Year MS Classes.....	39
Table05: The Most Important Skill in Third Year MS English Learning.....	40
Table 06: The Criterion of Good Writing.....	41
Table 07: Pupils and Motivation to Write.....	41
Table 08: Teachers' Satisfaction with the Writing Level of Their Pupils.....	42
Table 09: Teachers' Opinion about the Time Allotted for the Production Of a Composition.....	43
Table 10: Teachers' Encouragement to their Pupils to Write at Home.....	44
Table 11: Pupils' Difficulties in Learning Writing.....	45
Table 12: Teaching Writing Approach.....	46
Table 13: The Teachers' Reliance on the course book in Teaching Writing.....	47
Table 14: The Writing Activities in the course book 'My Book of English'.....	48
Table 15: The Suitability of Third Year MS English course book to Learners' Needs.....	49
Table 16: The Correspondence of Third Year MS English course book with the Pupil' WritingLevel.....	49
Table 17: Teachers' Expectations about Teaching Writing in the course book...	50

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriatness

Table 18: Encouragement of ‘My book of English’ Activities for Pupils to Write.....51

Table 19: Examples of Tasks in ‘My book of English’ that Teach Writing in accordance of other Skills.....55

Table 20: Examples of Situation of Integration and Projects in ‘My Book of English’ course book.....56

Table 21: Examples of Course book’s Writing Tasks that Relay on other Materials.....58

Table 22: Examples of Tasks in ‘My book of English’ that Teach Writing indirectly.....59

Table 23: Examples of Tasks in ‘My book of English’ that Teach Writing directly.....60

Contents

Dedication.....	i
Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
List of Abbreviations.....	v
List of Tables.....	vi
General Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Aims of the Study.....	2
Hypotheses.....	2
Means of the Research.....	3
The Structure of the Study.....	3
Chapter one: Textbook Evaluation	
Introduction.....	4
1.1.Definition of Evaluation	4
1.2.Types of Evaluation	5
1.2.1. Formative Evaluation	5
1.2.2. Summative Evaluation	5
1.2.3. Process Evaluation	5
1.2.4. Outcomes Evaluation	6
1.2.5. Impact Evaluation	6
1.3. Definition of Textbook Evaluation	7
1.4. The Purpose of Textbook Evaluation	7
1.5. Methods of Textbook Evaluation	8
1.5.1. The Impressionistic Method.....	8
1.5.2. The checklist Method.....	9
1.5.3. The In-depth Method.....	9
1.6. Definition of Checklist.....	10
1.7. Models of Checklist.....	11

The Evaluation of the Writing Tasks Appropriateness

1.7.1. Williams Checklist (1983).....	11
1.7.2. Sheldon Checklist (1988).....	12
1.7.3. Cunningsworth Checklist (1995).....	17
Conclusion.....	20

Chapter two: The writing skill under the major teaching methods

Introduction.....	21
2.1. Writing Definition.....	21
2.2. Writing and the Other Skills.....	22
2.2.1. Writing and Speaking.....	22
2.2.2. Writing and Reading.....	23
2.3. Writing Approaches.....	23
2.3.1. The Product Approach.....	23
2.3.2. The Process Approach.....	24
2.3.3. The Genre Approach.....	25
2.3.4. The Free-Writing Approach.....	26
2.4. Writing in the Major Teaching Methods.....	26
2.4.1. Grammar Translation Method.....	26
2.4.2. Direct Method.....	27
2.4.3. Communicative Language Teaching.....	28
2.4.4. Competency Based Approach.....	30
Conclusion.....	31

Chapter Three:

The Evaluation of ‘My book of English’ Course book. Discussion and Interpretation of the results

Introduction.....	33
3.1. Section one: Discussion and interpretation of the teacher’s Questionnaire.....	33
3.1.1. General Information about the course book ‘My book of English’.....	33
3.1.2. Presentation of the course book ‘My book of English’.....	34
3.1.3. Population and sampling.....	34
3.1.4. Description of teacher Questionnaire.....	35
3.1.5. Analysis of the Teacher’s Questionnaire.....	36
3.1.6. Discussion and Interpretation of the results.....	50
3.2. Section Two: The Evaluation of ‘My book of English’ course book.....	50

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriatness

3.2.1. Writing skill evaluation checklist.....	50
3.2.2. Analysis of the checklist.....	53
Conclusion.....	59
General Conclusion.....	60
List of references.....	61
Appendices.....	66
Résumé.....	74
ملخص.....	75

General Introduction

1-Introduction

2-Statement of the Problem

3-Aims of the Study

4-Hypotheses

5-Means of the Research

6-The Structure of the Study

Introduction

Writing is one of the four basic language skills which one acquires in the formative years. It is a creative process which allows learners to express their ideas and provide knowledge. Writing is among the most complex human activities. It involves the development of a design idea, the capture of mental representation of knowledge, and experience with subject (Jozef, 2001). Hence, serious problems may occur when the students do not master writing well, they will not be able to state their thoughts clearly and accurately.

According to Shangarfan and Manipour(2001), ‘writing has largely attracted the attention of researchers as being a crucial skill that contributes in learning any language, and without with further education maybe largely impossible’.This means that writing is central to English language learning, because without writing students cannot express their thoughts and ideas.

Materials evaluation is quite a new phenomenon in the field of language teaching. Schon(1983)wrote that “evaluating language teaching and learning materials are really important in successful language teaching because it encourages us to be a reflective practitioner.” Hence, the evaluation of language teaching and learning course book is necessary for the improvement of education quality. Sheldon (1988) stated that “a textbook is referred to as a published book especially designed to aid language learners to improve their linguistic and communicative abilities.” This means that course books have an important role to provide pupils with strategies to master writing.

Nemati(2009) evaluated English pre-university textbook of Karnataka in the state of India. Accordingto the results, the teachers believed that textbook has the main criteria that are fundamental and necessary for any textbook such as the presentation of the four main language skills. The results of this study showed that writing have achievable goals and takes into consideration learner capabilities.

The statement of the problem

Writing is means of extending and deeping students' knowledge. For many years, teaching writing has been a pillar in foreign language teaching. Unlike, writing in an L1, writing in L2 language or in FL is a quite challenging task, it requires an attainment of sufficient linguistic proficiency (Hinkel, 2004).

Infact the major purpose motivating this study in that, there is a need to examine the quality of materials used in teaching writing in Algeria. It is intended to find out whether the Algerian third year middle school textbook "my book of English" provide sufficient content for students' writing understanding since it is the direct source that teachers rely on to teach writing skill.

Aims of the study

This research aims to evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of third year middle school course book "My book of English" in building the pupils' writing knowledge. It also aims to shed light on the teachers' perspectives about the activities of teaching writing third year course book.

Research questions

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1 – Does the course book "My book English" provide sufficient and appropriate writing skill for third middle school learner?

2 _ what are the perspectives and attitudes of teachers about the tasks in the course book of teaching writing in classroom?

Hypotheses:

As a major step in the present research, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

1- Third year middle school textbook does not provide sufficient content for teaching writing skill.

2- The course book doesnot meet teachers 'expectations and objectives.

Means of the research

The nature of the study entails the descriptive methodology relying on two instruments. The first one is a questionnaire for middle school teachers and the second is an adapted checklist. It will investigate the writing skill, in order to confirm or refuse the hypotheses.

Structure of the study:

This research is divided into three chapters, in addition to a general introduction which presents an overview about the topic, and a general conclusion that will summarize the whole work. The theoretical part includes two chapters. Chapter one “Textbook Evaluation” deals with evaluation and its major types. In addition, it provides definition of textbook evaluation and describes its purpose besides to the different methods of textbook evaluation.

The second chapter under the title “The Writing Skill under the Major Teaching Methods” focuses on defining writing and describes its different approaches. Then, it turns to discussing the writing skill under the major teaching methods. Concerning the last chapter, it is practical one. It consists of a questionnaire and an adapted checklist along with its analysis, interpretation and discussion of the obtained results.

Chapter One: Textbook Evaluation

Introduction:

1.1. Definition of Evaluation

1.2. Types of Evaluation

1.2.1. Formative Evaluation

1.2.2. Summative Evaluation

1.2.3. Process Evaluation

1.2.4. Outcomes Evaluation

1.2.5. Impact Evaluation

1.3. Definition of Textbook Evaluation

1.4. The purpose of Textbook Evaluation

1.5. Methods of Textbook Evaluation

1.5.1. The impressionistic Method

1.5.2. The checklist Method

1.5.3. The In-depth Method

1.6. Definition of checklist

1.7. Models of checklist

1.7.1. Williams Checklist (1983)

1.7.2. Sheldon Checklist (1988)

1.7.3. Cunningsworth Checklist (1995)

Conclusion

Introduction:

Evaluation is the basic concerned of this chapter, which is entitled 'Textbook Evaluation', we start by defining Evaluation, giving the different types of evaluation: formative evaluation, summative evaluation, outcomesevaluation, process evaluation and impact evaluation. In addition to the definition of textbook evaluation, the purpose of textbook evaluation, methods of textbook evaluation: the impressionistic method, the checklist method and in-depth method. Then, we give a brief definition of checklist. Finally, we are going to discuss three different checklists models: Williams (1983), Sheldon (1988) and Cunningsworth (19

1.1. Definition of Evaluation :

Evaluation is a concept that refers to a process of determining the value of something as stated by Scriven who considered that evaluation is the determination of merits, worth or significance. According to Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2004), the most basic definition of Evaluation is "the act of considering something to decide how useful or valuable it is". Besides, Rea-Dickins and Germaine (1992) stated that "Evaluation is an intrinsic part of teaching and learning. It is important for the teacher because it can provide a wealth of information to use for the future direction of classroom practice, for the planning of courses, and for the management of learning tasks and students evaluation". Another definition is that of Brown (1989), he defined Evaluation as: "The systematic collection and analysis of all relevant information necessary to promote the improvement of the curriculum, and asses its effectiveness and efficiency, as well as the participants attitudes within a context of particular institutions involved". (Ascited in Wier and Roberts, 1994.p.19).Lynch(1996) provides us with the following definition of evaluation:

Evaluation is defined here as the systematic attempt to gather information in order to make judgments or decisions. As such, evaluation information can be both qualitative and quantitative in form, and can be gathered through different methods such as observation or the administration of pencil-and paper-test (p.2).

The diversity in defining what is meant exactly by evaluation depends mainly on what to consider in terms of objectives, needs or seeking for improving that specific material..

1.2. Types of Evaluation :

There are different types of Evaluation methods. Depending on the purpose of evaluation, we mention the following types: formative evaluation, summative evaluation, process evaluation, outcomes evaluation and impact evaluation.

1.2.1. Formative Evaluation :

Richards (2001) stated that formative evaluation focuses on ongoing development and improvement of the program (p.288).

According to Long (1984), 'Formative Evaluation typically looks at such factors as teachers 'and students' attitudes toward curriculum innovations, or at the usability of new instructional materials. Formative evaluations assess the strengths and limitations of a new program as it is developed and implemented' (p.417).

In other words, formative evaluation ensures that a program or program activity is feasible, appropriate and acceptable before it is fully implemented. It is usually conducted when a new program or activity is being developed or when an existing one is being adapted or modified.

1.2.2. Summative Evaluation :

Richards (2001) stated that 'Summative Evaluation is the type of evaluation with which most teachers and program administrations are familiar and which seeks to make decisions about the worth or value of different aspects of the curriculum. Summative Evaluation is concerned with determine the effectiveness of a program, its efficiency and to some extent with its acceptability. It takes place after a program has been implemented'. Besides, according to Long (1984) the purpose of summative evaluation is usually to determine whether or not the program should be continued. That is to say, summative evaluation is any method of evaluation performed at the end of a unit that allows a teacher to measure a student's understanding, typically against standardized criteria.

1.2.3. Process Evaluation :

Process Evaluation describes and assesses program materials and activities. Whowley and Hatry (1992) stated that 'process evaluation assesses the extent to which

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

a program is implemented and intended and operating up to the standards established for it. When the program is new, a process evaluation provides invaluable feedback to administrators and others takeholders about the progress that has made operationalizing the program theory' (as cited in Peter and Freeman, 1979, p.9). Additionally, Mertens and Wilson (2019) argued that process evaluation also called 'implementation evaluation', based on the suitability and quality of the project's implementation .According to US Library of congress, process evaluation is to determine if specific program strategies were implemented as planned. Examining the implementation of program activities is an important form of process evaluation. That is to say, process evaluation determines whether program activities have been implemented as intended.

1.2.4. Outcomes Evaluation :

According to Issel (2009), outcomes evaluation focus on difficult questions that ask what happened to program participants and how much of a difference the program made for them. Also, Issel(2009) stated that "an outcome assessment goes beyond merely documenting that the objectives were met by quantifying the extent to which the interventions seem related to changes observed or measured among program recipients". (p.369)

In other words, outcomes evaluation measures program effects in the target population by assessing the progress in the outcomes or outcome objectives that the program is to achieve.

1.2.5. Impact Evaluation :

Freeman, Lipsey& Rossi (1999) argued that "Impact Evaluation gauges the extent to which a program produces the intended improvement in the social conditions it addresses. The evaluation questions around which impact assessment it organized relate to such matters as whether the desired program outcomes were attained, whether the program was effective in producing change in the social conditions targeted" (p.70). That is to say, impact evaluation assesses the effectiveness of a program in achieving its ultimate goals.

1.3. Definition of textbook Evaluation:

Genesee (2001), argued that ‘textbook evaluation’ is a process of collecting, analyzing and interpreting information.(As cited in Rezaeian and Zamanian, 2015, p.106).

Weir and Robers (1994) are more specific, as they consider textbook evaluation to involve a systematic analysis of all relevant information necessary to improve the textbook. Nevo (1977) supports Weir and Robert’s view, adding that:

Evaluation refers to the process of delineating, obtaining and providing information on the merit of goals, designs, implementation and outcomes of educational activities, and should help to improve educational activities, and should help to improve an educational product during the process of its development, and/or demonstrate the merit of the final product when its development is completed (p.127)

According to Tomlinson (2001), textbook evaluation is ‘an activity within the applied linguistic discipline through which teachers, supervisors, administrators and material developers can make judgments about the effect of the materials on the people using them’ (as cited in Carter and Nunan, 2001). Besides, Sheldon (1988) views that the textbook evaluation ‘is fundamentally a subjective rule-of-thumb activity, and that no neat formula, grid or system will ever produce a definite yardstick’ (p.245).

Moreover, Sheldon (1988) argued that textbook evaluation is subjective, and no one set of criteria can fit all situations. Another definition is provided by Tomlinson (2003) that textbook evaluation is ‘a procedure that involves measuring the value (or potential value) of a set of learning materials’ (p.15). That is to say, textbook evaluation helps assign value to what teachers are using to teach and what learners are using to learn.

1.4. The purpose of textbook evaluation:

Cunningsworth (1995) claimed that textbook evaluation helps in selecting and determining whether a textbook really matches the needs of evaluation helps in

The Evaluation of the Writing Tasks Appropriateness

selecting and determining whether a textbook really matches the needs of learners, aims, methods and values of the teaching program or not.

Evaluation has many purposes but the main purposes of evaluation include examining the effectiveness of the instructional material, giving important information about the students' progress and curriculum development. In other words, evaluation enables to know whether the goals and objectives of a language program have been attained with a view of considering how it can be improved.

1.5. Methods of Textbook Evaluation:

There are three basic methods for evaluating course books: the first is called the impressionistic method, the second is the checklist method and the last one is the in-depth method.

1.5.1. The Impressionistic Method:

This method involves analyzing a textbook on the basis of general impression. Cunningsworth (1995) explained that general impression would be gained by looking through the course book and get an overview about its strengths and weaknesses, also by checking the textbook contents in view of organization, layout, items sequence, visuals, cover ...and so on. Cunningsworth (1995) said that:

It is particularly appropriate when doing a preliminary sift through a lot of course books before making a shortlist for more detailed analysis, and also when looking at new material that maybe considered for adoption at a later date. But will not necessary identify any significant omissions in the course book or locate any important weaknesses. Nor can it be relied on to give enough detail to ensure a good match between what the course book contains and the requirements of the learning/teaching situation (p.1)

Ellis (1997) stated that 'teachers can perform a retrospective evaluation impressionistically' (p.37). In other words, it provides the teacher with information which can be used to determine whether it is worth while using the materials.

1.5.2.The Checklist Method:

The checklist method comes as a reaction of limitations encountered in the impressionistic method. Demir&Ertas (2014) stated that ‘a checklist is an instrument that helps practioners evaluate course books in an effective and practical way’(p.244).Additionally, Hammer (1991) was convinced that using checklists could be beneficial in understanding whether a textbook is able to address the needs of learners (as cited in Cholami, Noordin, &Rafik-Golea 2017, p.156).

According to McGrath, there are four advantages of checklist method as follow:

- It is systematic, ensuring that all elements that are deemed to be important are considered.
- It is effective, permitting a good deal of information to be recorded in a relatively short space of time.
- The information is recorded in a convenient format, allowing for easy comparison between competing sets of material.
- It is explicit, and, provided the categories are well understood by all involved in the evaluation (as cited in Jusuf, 2018, p.21).

McDonough &Show (2003) explained that no standard checklist exists that is suitable for all learning environments. Accordingly, teachers should develop their own checklist based on their own classrooms and the needs of their students.(as cited in Cholami, Noordin, &Rafik-Golea 2017, p.156). Ansary&Babaii (2002) thought that the subjective judgments of this method are a source of disappointment although it is the most common one in the process of the textbook evaluation. That is why new checklists are offered over the year.

1.5.3. TheIn-depthMethod:

The in-depth method, suggest a careful examination of presentative features such as the design of one particular unit or exercise, or the treatment of particular language elements. According to McGrath (2002) ‘in-depth techniques go beneath the publishers and author’s claims to look at. For instance, the kind of language description, underlying assumptions about learning or value on which the materials are based, or in broader sense, whether the materials seem likely to live up to the claims

that are being made for them' (p.27-28). Moreover, Cholami, Noordin, & Rafik-Golea (2017) said that the in-depth method gives a careful checking of the representative aspects; for example, we are able to evaluate the design of particular language elements. Also, Widodo (2015) reports that 'this method elaborates on students' needs, their attitudes towards learning, besides the practical teaching-learning approach' (as cited in Cholami, Noordin, & Rafik-Golea, 2017, p.85).

1.6. Definition of checklist:

According to Collins dictionary, checklist is a list of all the things that you want to find out, or things that you want to take somewhere, which you make in order to ensure that you not forget anything. Richards & Schmidt (2002) stated that 'checklist in assessing or measuring behavior, the use of a list of skills or behavior that an observer checks off while observing someone doing something, such as while observing a student-teacher teaches a lesson' (p.69). Besides, Stufflebeam (2000) defines checklist as a worthy evaluation devices which carefully developed, validated, and applied. A sound evaluation checklist illustrates the criteria that should be taken into consideration when evaluating something in a particular area; aids the evaluator not to forget important criteria; and improves the assessment's objectivity, credibility, and reproducibility. Another definition is provided by Mukundun & Nimechislem (2012) that a checklist is an instrument that is used for evaluating textbook. Also, checklists are assessment tools that set out specific criteria, which educators and students may use to gauge skill development or progress. Generally speaking, checklists consist of a set of statements that correspond to specific criteria; the answer to each statement is either "Yes" or "No" or "Done" or "Not done". Hadjim mohamadi & Nimechislem (2011) stated that checklists allow for a more sophisticated evaluation of the course book in reference to a set of generalizable evaluation criteria (as cited in Demir & Ertas, 2014, p.245). A checklist can be quantitative or qualitative tool. Quantitative tool deals with specific criteria with yes/no answer. On the other hand, qualitative tool deals with specific criteria or indicators and describe what you observe deeply or briefly.

1.7. Models of checklist

Several researchers have developed checklists as a tool to judge the worth of textbooks.

Three of those checklists will be considered.

1.7.1. Williams Checklist (1983)

One of the most important evaluative frameworks belongs to David Williams. His checklist was utilized to examine the different language skills separately and in-depth. Williams (1983) suggested a checklist that can be adapted to fit specific situations, because no single textbook can address the requirements of every classroom context. He divided his ELT textbook checklist into 7 criteria. The seventh criteria are general, speech, grammar, vocabulary, reading, writing, and technical. Williams's textbook evaluation checklist can be seen as follow:

A. General

1. Takes into account currently accepted methods of ESL/EFL teaching.
2. Gives guidance in the presentation of language items.
3. Caters for individual differences in home language background.
4. Relates content to the learners' culture and environment.

B. Speech

5. Is based on a contrastive analysis of English and LI sound systems.
6. Suggests ways of demonstrating and practicing speech items.
7. Includes speech situations relevant to the pupils' background.
8. Allows for variation in the accents of non-native speakers of English

C. Grammar

9. Stresses communicative competence in teaching structural items.
10. Provides adequate models featuring the structures to be taught.
11. Shows clearly the kinds of responses required in drills (e.g. Substitution).
12. Selects structures with regard to differences between LI and L2 cultures.

D. Vocabulary

13. Selects vocabulary on the basis of frequency, functional load, etc.
14. Distinguishes between receptive and productive skills in vocabulary teaching.

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

15. Presents vocabulary in appropriate contexts and situations.
16. Focuses on problems of usage related to social background.

E. Reading

17. Offers exercises for understanding of plain sense and implied meaning.
18. Relates reading passages to the learners' background.
19. Selects passages within the vocabulary range of the pupils.
20. Selects passages reflecting a variety of styles of contemporary English.

F. Writing

21. Relates written work to structures and vocabulary practiced orally.
22. Gives practice in controlled and guided composition in the early stages.
23. Relates written work to the pupils' age, interests, and environment.
24. Demonstrates techniques for handling aspects of composition teaching.

G. Technical

25. is up-to-date in the technical aspects of textbook production and design.
26. Shows quality in editing and publishing (cover, typeface, illustrations, etc.).
27. Is datable, and not too expensive.
28. Has authenticity in language and style of writing(as cited in Josef, 2018, p.25-26).

1.7.2. Sheldon Checklist (1988)

Sheldon (1988) stated that we need to evaluate a textbook for two reasons. First, the evaluation will support the teacher on making decisions on selecting the appropriate textbook. And, evaluation aids teacher to explore the weaknesses and strengths of the textbook by evaluating its merits and demerits. That is to say, textbook evaluation has an important role in teaching and learning processes for teachers and learners. The checklist is the most useful tool for evaluating ELT/ESL materials especially course books. Sheldon designed a checklist that involves two major categories: factual details and factors. Sheldon textbook evaluation checklist can be seen as follow:

FACTUAL DETAILS

Title:

Author(s):

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

Publisher: Price:

ISBN: No. of Pages:

Components: SB/TB/WB/Tests/Cassettes/Video/CALL/Other.....

Level: Physical size:

Length: Units Lessons/sections..... Hours

Target skills:

Target learners:

Target teachers:

ASSESSMENT (* Poor ** Fair *** Good **** Excellent)

Factors :

A. Rationale

1. Why was the book written in first place, and what gaps is it intended to fill?
2. Are you given information about the Needs Analysis or classroom piloting that was undertaken?
3. Are the objectives spelt out?

B. Availability

4. Is it easy to obtain sample copies and support material for inspection?
5. Can you contact the publisher's representatives in case you want further information about the content, approach, or pedagogical detail of the book?

C. User definition

6. Is there a clear specification of the target age range, culture, assumed background, probable learning preferences, and educational expectations?
7. Are entry/exit language levels precisely defined, e.g. by reference to international 'standards' such as the ELTS, ACTFL or Council of Europe scales, or by reference to local or country-specific examination requirements?
8. In the case of an ESP textbook, what degree of specialist knowledge is assumed (of both learners and teacher)?

D. Layout/graphics

9. Is there an optimum density and mix of text and graphical material on each page, or is the impression one of clutter?

10. Are the artwork and typefaces functional? Colorful? Appealing?

E. Accessibility

11. Is the material clearly organized?

12. Can the student find his or her location in the material at any point, i.e. is it possible to have a clear view of the 'progress' made, and how much still needs to be covered?

13. Are there indexes, vocabulary lists, section headings, and other methods of signposting the content that allow the student to use the material easily, especially for revision or self-study purposes?

14. Is the learner (as opposed to the teacher) given clear advice about how the book and its contents could be most effectively exploited?

F. Linkage

15. Do the units and exercises connect in terms of theme, situation, topic, pattern of skill development, or grammatical/lexical 'progression'?

16. Is the nature of such connection made obvious, for example by placing input texts and supporting exercises in close proximity?

17. Does the textbook cohere both internally and externally (e.g. with other books in a series)?

G. Selection/Grading

18. Does the introduction, practice, and recycling of new linguistic items seem to be shallow/steep enough for your students?

19. Is there a discernible system at work in the selection and grading of these items (e.g. on the basis of frequency counts, or on the basis of useful comparisons between the learner's mother tongue and English)?

20. Is the linguistic inventory presented appropriate for your purposes, bearing in mind the L1 background(s) of your learners?

H. Physical characteristics

21. Is there space to write in the book?

22. Is the book robust? Too large? Too heavy?

23. Is the spine labeled?

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

24. Is it a book that could be used more than once, especially if it is marked by previous students?

I. Appropriacy

25. Is the material substantial enough or interesting enough to hold the attention of learners?

26. Is it pitched at the right level of maturity and language, and (particularly in the case of ESP situations), at the right conceptual level?

27. Is it topical?

J. Authenticity

28. Is the content obviously realistic, being taken from L1 material not initially intended for ELT purposes?

29. Do the tasks exploit language in a communicative or 'real-world' way?

30. If not, are the texts unacceptably simplified or artificial (for instance, in the use of whole-sentence dialogue)

K. Sufficiency

31. Is the book complete enough to stand on its own, or must the teacher produce a lot of ancillary bridging material to make it workable?

32. Can you teach the course using only the student's book, or must all the attendant aids (e.g. cassettes) be deployed?

L. Cultural bias

33. Are different and appropriate religious and social environments catered for, both in terms of the topics/situations presented and of those left out?

34. Are students' expectations in regard to content, methodology, and format successfully accommodated?

35. If not, would the book be able to wean students away from their preconceived notions?

36. Is the author's sense of humor or philosophy obvious or appropriate?

37. Does the course book enshrine stereotyped, inaccurate, condescending or offensive images of gender, race, social class, or nationality?

38. Are accurate or 'sanitized' views of the USA or Britain presented; are uncomfortable social realities (e.g. unemployment, poverty, family breakdowns, and racism) left out?

M. Educational validity

39. Does the textbook take account of, and seem to be in tune with, broader educational concerns (e.g. the nature and role of learning skills, concept development in younger learners, the function of ‘knowledge of the world’, the exploitation of sensitive issues, and the value of metaphor as a powerful cognitive learning device)?

N. Stimulus/practice/revision

40. Is the course material interactive, and are there sufficient opportunities for the learner to use his or her English so that effective consolidation takes place?

41. Is the material likely to be retained/ remembered by learners?

42. Is allowance made for revision, testing, and on-going evaluation/markings of exercises and activities, especially in large-group situations; are ready-made achievement tests provided for the course book, or is test development left for the hard-pressed teacher? Are ‘self checks’ provided?

O. Flexibility

43. Can the book accommodate the practical constraints with which you must deal, or are assumptions made about such things as the availability of audio-visual equipment, pictorial material, class size, and classroom geography; does the material make too many demands on teachers’ preparation time and students’ homework time?

44. Can the material be exploited or modified as required by local circumstances, or is it too rigid in format, structure, and approach?

45. Is there a full range of supplementary aids available?

P. Guidance

46. Are the teacher’s notes useful and explicit English?

47. Has there been an inordinate delay between the publication of the student’s and teacher’s books which has meant that teachers have had to fend for themselves in exploiting the material?

48. Is there advice about how to supplement the course book, or to present the lessons in different ways?

49. Is there enough/too much ‘hand-holding’?

50. Are tape scripts, answer keys, ‘technical notes’ (in the case of ESP textbooks), vocabulary lists, structural/functional inventories, and lesson summaries provided in the Teacher’s Book?

The Evaluation of the Writing Tasks Appropriateness

51. Is allowance made for the perspectives, expectations, and preferences of non-native teachers of English?

Q. Overall value for money

52. Quite simply, is the course book cost-effective, easy to use, and successful money in your teaching situation, in terms of time, labor, and money?

53. To what extent has it realized its stated objectives? (as cited in Jusuf, 2018, p. 27-28-29-30).

1.7.3. Cunningsworth Checklist (1995)

Cunningsworth (1995) argued that textbooks were an effective resource for self-directed learning, an effective source for presentational material, a source of ideas and activities, a reference source for students, a syllabus where they reflected pre-determined learning objectives, and supported for less experienced teachers to gain confidence (as cited in Papajani .p.8). In order to cover all the aspects of textbooks, Cunningsworth developed a set of checklists. He developed his first textbook evaluation checklist in 1974. Besides, in 1995 Cunningsworth provided a checklist that consists of eight categories. They are aim and approaches, design and organization, language content, skills, topic, methodology, teacher's books, and practical consideration. The special feature of his checklist is using *Yes/No* questions.

Cunningsworth(1995) suggests a checklist for evaluation and selection of textbook as follows:

A. Aims and approaches

1. Do the aims of the course book correspond closely with the aims of the teaching program and with the need of the learners?
2. Is the course book suited to the learning/ teaching situation?
3. How comprehensive is the course book? Does it cover most or all of what is needed? Is it a good resource for students and teachers?
4. Is the course book flexible? Does it allow different teaching and learning styles?

B. Design and organization

5. What components make up the total course package (e.g., Students' books, teachers' books, work books, cassettes)?

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

6. How is the content organized (e.g. according to structures, functions, topics, skills, etc.)?
7. How is the content sequenced (e.g. on the basis of complexity, “learn-ability”, usefulness, etc.)?
8. Is the grading and progression suitable for the learners? Does it allow them to complete the work needed to meet any external syllabus requirements?
 9. Are there reference sections for grammar, etc.? Is some of the material suitable for individual study?
 10. Is it easy to find your way around the course book? Is the layout clear?

C. Language content

11. Does the course book cover the main grammar items appropriate to each level, taking learner’s needs into account?
12. Is materials for vocabulary teaching adequate in term of quantity and range of vocabulary, emphasis placed on vocabulary development, strategies for individual learning?
13. Does the course book include material for pronunciation work? If so, what is covered: individual sounds, word stress, sentence stress, intonation?
- 14.
15. Does the course book deal with the structuring and conventions of language use above the sentence level, for example, how to take part in conversations, how to identify the main points in a reading passage?

D. Skills

16. Are all four skills adequately covered, bearing in mind your course aims and syllabus requirements?
17. Are there materials for integrated skills work?
18. Are reading passages and associated activities suitable for your students’ levels, interests, etc.? Is there sufficient reading material?

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

19. Is listening material well recorded, as authentic as possible, accompanied by background information, questions and activities which help comprehension?
20. Is material for spoken English well design to equip learners for real life interactions?
21. Are writing activities suitable in term of amount of guidance/ control, degree of accuracy, organization of longer pieces of writing (e.g. paragraphing) and use of appropriate styles?

E. Topic

22. Is there sufficient material of genuine interest to learners?
23. Is there enough variety and range of topic?
24. Will the topic help expand students' awareness and enrich their experience
25. Is the topic sophisticated enough in content, yet within the learners' language level?
26. Will your students be able to relate to the social and cultural contexts presented in the course book?

F. Methodology

26. What approaches to language learning are taken by the course book?
27. What level of active learner involvement can be expected? Does this match your students' learning styles and expectations?
28. What techniques are used for presenting/ practicing new language items? Are they suitable for your learners?
29. How are the different skills taught?
30. How are communicative abilities developed?

G. Teacher's books

31. Is there adequate guidance for the teachers who will be using the course book and its supporting materials?
32. Are the teachers' books comprehensive and supportive?

33. Do they adequately cover teaching techniques, language items such as grammar rules and culture-specific information?

H. Practical considerations

34. What does the whole package cost? Does this represent good value for money?
35. Are the books strong and long lasting? Are they attractive in appearance?
36. Are they easy to obtain?

Conclusion:

Evaluating textbooks provide great help for language teachers and learners, this chapter gave brief definitions of evaluation, textbook evaluation. It has also presented the different types of evaluation; also we have seen the purpose of textbook evaluation, as well as the different methods of textbook evaluation. Followed by some checklists models.

Chapter two: The Writing Skill under the Major Teaching Methods.

Introduction

2.1. Writing definition

2.2. Writing and the other skills

2.2.1. Writing and speaking

2.2.2. Writing and reading

2.3. Writing approaches

2.3.1. The product approach

2.3.2. The process approach

2.3.3. The genre approach

2.3.4. The free-writing approach

2.4. Writing in the major teaching methods

2.4.1. Grammar translation method

2.4.2. Direct method

2.4.3. Communicative language teaching

2.4.4. Competency based approach

Conclusion

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to general definitions of writing, the relation of writing with speaking and reading. Besides the different writing approaches: the product approach, the process approach, the genre approach and the free-writing approach. In addition, we are going to discuss the writing skill under the major teaching methods : Grammar translation method, Direct method, Communicative language teaching and Competency-based approach.

Section one

2.1. Writing definition:

Writing is one of the four skills in language learning. It is the system of written symbols, representing the sounds syllables or words of language. With different mechanisms capitalization, spelling and punctuation, word form and function. Bell and Barnaby (1984) , writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables simultaneously. At the sentence level these include control of content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and letter formation Beyond the sentence, the writer must be structure and integrate information into cohesive and coherent paragraphs and texts (p.36). Another definition by Byrne (1988) 'writing involves the conventional arrangement of letters into words, and words into sentences that need to follow smoothly to form a coherent whole'.

Additionally, Labo (1989) defined writing in a foreign language 'the ability to use structures, the lexical items, and their conventional representation in ordinary matter of fact writing' (p.248). This means, that Labo views writing in a foreign language in terms of the ability of manipulating structures, vocabulary and their conventional representations. Similarly, Widdowson (1978) stated that writing is the production of correct sentences and transmitting them through the visual medium as marks on paper.

According to Nunan (1989), success writing involves:

- Masteries mechanics of letter formation.
- Mastering and obeying conventions of spelling and punctuation.
- Using the grammatical system to convey one's intended meaning.

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriatness

- Organization content at the level of the paragraph and the complete text to reflect given / new information and topic / comment structures.
- Polishing and revising one's initial efforts.
- Selecting an appropriate style for one's audience. (p.37)

Writing is one of the most important skills for educational success, but also one of the most complex skills to be mastered.

2.2 Writing and the other Skills

2.2.1. Writing and Speaking

It is worth noting that the relationship between speaking and writing is very important in language teaching and learning. The two skills are productive skills that need a considerable competence to perform appropriately in communication. However, writing and speaking are different skills. Vygotsky (1962) stated that 'written speech is a separate linguistic function, differing from oral speech in both structure and mode of functioning' (p.98). That is to say, learning to write is different from learning to speak in that 'writing abilities are not naturally acquired; they must be culturally (rather than biologically) transmitted in every assisting environment'(Grabe and Kplan, 1996,p.6). Which means that, students may face many problems in learning writing i.e. they have to practice a lot to develop the different skills of composing, including spelling, writing mechanism, capitalization, paragraphing, coherence, unity, etc. which cannot be acquired by knowing the oral skill.

In the other hand, some researchers have demonstrated that the integration of dialogue into ESL writing classrooms can have positive effects on certain aspects of composition instruction. Manglesdorf (1989), Blanton (1992), and Weissberg (1994) have claimed that classroom dialogue may enhance learners' use of composition process for cognitive growth, raising their awareness of the cognitive processes involved in producing written text. They further claim that mixing speaking and writing within the same instructional space helps language learners to gain more conscious control over their own writing processes.(as cited in Hubert, 2011).

2.2.2. Writing and Reading

Writing and reading are intimately connected processes. Krashen(1984) stated that ‘it is reading that gives the writer the ‘feel’ for the look and texture of reader-based prose’(as cited in Kroll,1990,p.88), which means that as students become skilled readers, they notice more than just the content of the text. Readers potentially observe sentence and paragraph structures, variations in pacing, and recurring themes. According to Byrne (1979) what makes writing difficult is that the writer writes for a reader. So, he must follow some rules and processes to produce an appropriate piece of writing to the reader comprehension. From this, we can say that Writing and reading are both acts of communication.

Additionally, Stotsky (1983) stated that better writers tend to be better readers, good writers read more than poorer writers and good readers tend to produce more syntactically mature writing. That means when combining reading and writing for functional purposes our background knowledge helps us interpret what we are reading. So, if students read about a topic before they write about it, this gives them information that they can use when writing. In short, when combining reading and writing, there are positive effects both in terms of students learning to write and in terms of students to learning to read.

2.3. Writing approaches

Writing is one of the most important skills in learning a foreign language. The signification of being able to write in a second language or foreign language has become clearer new day. Teaching writing has seen numerous approaches since the early eighties the focus has shifted from sentences structure and grammar drills to usage and text organization.

2.3.1. The product approach

The product approach is concerned with the final result of the writing. Nunan stated that (1989) ‘the product approach to writing focuses on the end result of the act of composition,i.e. the letter, essay, story,and so on’ (p.36). In this approach what is emphasized is raising students’ awareness, especially in grammatical structures. According to Nunan (1989)the teacher who accedes to the product approach his focus will be on the final product which should be readable,

grammatically correct, coherent, and students will initiate copy and transform models provide by text books or by teachers.

In other words, the product approach focuses on model texts in order to make students aware of the text features. It consists in analyzing the student's writing in order to identify and quantify their strengths and weaknesses. The adopting of the product approach is leading to accuracy. In fact, it attempts to make the student familiarized with the convention of writing through a model, which always taken as the starting point. It is students and analyzed from all points of view: structures of grammar, content, sentences organization and rhetorical patterns.

Escholz (1980) criticized the product approach pointing out that 'models tend to be long and too remote from the student's own writing problems' Escholz views the imitation of models as being 'stultifying and inhibiting writers rather than empowering them or liberating them' (p.232).

2.3.2. The process approach

Until the 1970s, most studies of writing were about the written product. During this decade, the focus shifted from product to process, and the main reason for this change was the new awareness that each piece of writing had its own history and followed its own developmental path.

Nunan (1989) stated that 'those who advocate a process approach to writing see the act of composition from a very different perspective, focusing as much on the means whereby the completed text was created as on the product itself' (p.36). Besides, Stanley (1993) argued that the process approach treats all writing as a creative act which requires time and positive feedback to be done well in process writing, the teacher moves away from being someone who sets students a writing topic and receives the finished product for connection without any intervention in the writing process itself. According to Murray (1992) the process approach many include identified stages of the writing process such as: pre-writing, writing and re-writing on the rough draft has been created, it is polished into subsequent drafts with the assistance of peer and teacher conferencing. Final editing and publication can follow if the author chooses to publish their writing (p.16). That is to say, although there are many ways of approaching writing. Scholars recognize that the following are the most recursive ones:

- **Prewriting:** the teacher needs to stimulate students' creativity, to get them thinking how to approach a writing topic. Prewriting activities may include drawing, talking, thinking, reading, listening, problem solving and soon.
- **Revising:** the writer makes whatever changes he/she feels are necessary, revision may involve rearrange, delete text, re-reading and additions.
- **Editing:** students should focus more on form and on producing a finished piece of work.
- **Publishing:** now the writing is adapted to a readership.

The major aim of the process approach is to train students how to plan and revise, rearrange and delete text, re-reads and producing multiple drafts before they produce their finished document.

2.3.3. The genre approach

The genre approach to teaching writing is mainly concerned as the name indicates, on teaching particular genres that students need control of, in order to succeed in particular situations. This might include an emphasis on the content of text as well as the context in which the text is produced.

Genre approach as defined by Swales (1990) is 'a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes' (p.58). His definition offers the basic idea that there are certain conventions or rules which are generally associated with a writer's purpose. Likewise, Hyland points out that under the genre – based approach, the writer writes something to reach some purpose (p.18).

Additionally, Richard and Smith (2002) stated that the genre approach is based on different types of text structures genres children encounter in school work are observation, comment, recount, narrative and report. It is also control specific types of writing to participate in social process. However, to the adult it starts from recognition of discourse community in which the learners will be functioning. Also, Denis (1988) pointed out that within an academic setting the importance of the skill of identifying and reproducing genres may be critical for the success or failure of a student.

2.3.4. The free- writing approach

The free- writing approach is based on quantity over quality in writing and does minimal error correction, which means that students write without the teacher's interference and they are encouraged to emphasize content and fluency first.

According to Raimes (1983) in the free- writing approach freedom is given to students to choose or propose their own topics to write about. The teacher's interference is limited because he gives the instructions first and allows his students to write freely. So, they can write without worrying about grammar or spelling mistakes. The role of the teacher is limited to reading the students' productions and sometimes making comments on the expressed ideas. In other words, the pieces of writing should not be corrected, but possibly read aloud the content commented upon. Anderson (1992) also, stated that free writing allows students to put their thoughts on paper even if they are not sounding right. Therefore with the adaptation of this method, the students should not feel concerned with grammar, punctuation, spelling or style.

Anderson (1992) strongly encourages that 'while free writing, you' should not reread what you have already written. Rather, just continue to write anything that comes to mind'. (p. 198).

The act of free-writing allows the students to think about the text being written without the pressure of having an audience. While revising they decide what ideas are usable, what sentences need to be rewritten. Free-writing does not always produce interesting or good material. However, as Anderson (1992) said that 'Free-writing makes a mess, but in that mess is the material you need to make a good paper.'(p.200)

2.4. Writing in the major teaching method:

2.4.1. Grammar translation method

GTM is considered the oldest language teaching method ever existed. However, this method is still practiced in some English course for specific purposes, especially for understanding particular foreign literatures.

The goal of the grammar translation method is to understand the written form a particular language through exploring its literature. That is why in GTM writing becomes a dominant skill that students should master in the early phase of language teaching. It is usually incorporated with the teacher of reading skill. Freeman and

The Evaluation of the Writing Tasks Appropriateness

Anderson (2011) stated that reading and writing are the primary skills that the students work on (p.21) .

The primary goals of the GTM is to enhance reading and writing skills, therefore, it has lack of weakness in speaking or listening skill. Freeman and Anderson (2011) argued that ‘the primary skills to be developed are reading and writing. Little attention is given to speaking and listening’(p.18). Furthermore, Richard and Rodgers(2000) stated that ‘reading and writing are the major focus; little or no systematic attention is paid to speaking or listening’. Practically, teaching writing using this method can be carried out by asking the students to compose an essay in particular topics. Instead of that, they also can be assigned to write a precise of it. The following techniques of teaching writing of the GTM, which is adapted from Freeman (2011) based on her experiences.

- **Translation of a literary passage:** the writing skill is drilled by translating the sentence into the target language and understanding the grammar roles. In fact writing it taught spontaneously. The student is emphasized to read the target language texts and write the target language while translating process.
- **Use words in sentences:** in order to show that students understand the means and use of a new vocabulary item. They make up sentences in which they use the new words.
- **Composition:** the teacher gives the students a topic to write about in the target language.
- **Deductive application of rules:** grammar rules are presented with examples. Once students understand a rule. They asked to apply it by makes some sentences.

The GTM considers grammar and vocabulary important elements to be emphasized in teaching writing.

2.4.2. Direct Method

The Direct Method was established in the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was the response to GTM which gave an over whelming emphasis on grammatical analysis.

For Freeman and Anderson (2011) ‘ the direct method receives its name from the fact that meaning is to be conveyed directly in the target language through the use of demonstration and visual aids, with no recourse to the students native language’(p.25)).

So, the direct method presented a new insight in foreign language teaches; that language should be taught naturally, spoken language get more priority than other language skills. Although the direct method emphasizes the importance of spoken language, writing is still considered an important skill to be taught from the beginning of language instruction.

Regarding writing skill in the direct method, Freeman and Anderson (2011) wrote that‘although work on all four skills) reading, writing, speaking and listening) occurs from the start, oral communication is seen as basic. Thus, the reading and writing exercises are based up on what the students practice orally First’ (p.30). So, in direct method teaching writing is never independent. At least, it can be incorporated with teaching reading and grammar.

Practically, according to Freeman and Anderson (2011), there are some techniques of teaching writing of the direct method:

- ✓ **Paragraph writing:** in which learners are asked to write a paragraph based on the passage that has been taught orally or they may write by their own words.
- ✓ **Question and answer exercise:** students are asked questions and answer in full sentences so that they practice new words and grammatical structures.

Accuracy still has an important attention in DM. Students should make sure that their writing uses the accurate grammatical structures.

2.4.3. Communicative language teaching

CLT is different from the other methods. There are many factors leading to its emergence in English language teaching such as; promoting social interaction, creating authentic language making communicative language teaching in teaching four English skills and building learner-centered instruction.

Horwitz (2008) stated that CLT is an approach in teaching language that emphasizes authentic communication from beginning of class.

The Evaluation of the Writing Tasks Appropriateness

According to Richards(2006) the overarching principles of CLT methodology can be summarized as follow:

- Make a real communication, the focus language learning.
- Provide opportunities for learners to experiment and try out what they know.
- Be tolerant of learners' errors as they indicate that the learner is building up his or her communicative competence.
- Provide opportunities for learners to develop both accuracy and fluency.
- Link the different skills such as speaking, reading, listening and writing, since they usually occur so in the real word.
- Let students induce or discover grammar rules(p.13).

One of the key factors of CLT is promoting the effective use of English for second language learners in social interactions. According to Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983). In CLT classes, teachers expect students to interact with other people through pair and group work or even in their writing (as cited in Brown, 2001, p.45). reading and writing are needed to achieve communicative competence (lee and Vanpatten,1995). That is to say, writing in CLT is transferring ideas to paper. Dvorak(1986) stated that writing is an activity that transfer thought to paper, which focus on language from: grammatical and lexical structure (as cited in Lee and Vapatten, 1995,p.214). Since writing transfer ideas, teachers might encourage students to write. Sokolik (2003) suggested teachers attempt to give opportunities to students to write starting from short paragraph.

Freeman and Anderson (2011) argued that students must learn about cohesion and coherence, and work on all four skills from the beginning. The following techniques of teaching writing of the CLT, which is adapted from Freeman (2011) based on her experiences:

- **Scrambled sentences:** the students told to unscramble some sentences so that the sentences are restored to their original order. This type of exercise teaches students about cohesion and coherence properties of language. They learn how sentences are bound together at the supra sentential level through formal

linguistic devices such as pronouns, which make a text cohesive and semantic propositions, which unify a text and make it coherent.

- **Picture strip story:** the students asked to put the pictures of a picture strip story in order and write lines to accompany the pictures (p.126-127)

2.4.4. Competency- based approach

Algeria has adopted a new educational system called 'the educational reform' characterized by using the competency-based approach (CBA).

It emerged in the United States in the 1970s and it was mostly used in work- related and survival –oriented language teaching programs for adults (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Since the 1990s, CBLT has been seen as the state of the art approach to adult ESL, so that any refugee in the United States who wished to receive federal assistance had to attend a competency-based program in which they learned a set of language skills that are necessary for individuals to function proficiently in the society in which they live. (Auerbach, 1986)

Competency -based approach is a very popular approach which focuses on measurable and useable knowledge, skill and abilities. It consists of organizing the content of a curriculum in terms of the development of competencies using specific pedagogical practices. Richards and Rodgers stated that competency- based approach focuses on outcomes of learning, it addresses what the learners are expected to do rather than on what they are expected to learn about. According to Norland and Pruett (2006) the main strategies of the competency- based approach are:

- ✓ The teacher conducts a needs assessment to see how where student will need to use English to be successful in the future.
- ✓ The teacher defines tasks, or competencies that students will need to accomplish. Examples of competencies might include requesting and giving personal information, asking for the time, practicing transactions in the post office, and making a doctor's appointment.
- ✓ The teacher creates lessons and activities that will teach students how to accomplish the tasks or competencies that have been prescribed. Lessons might include new vocabulary, understanding and practicing dialogues, reading and

filling out forms, and discussing previous experiences and future problems that might occur.

- ✓ Students are evaluated on their ability to perform the designated task or competency.(p.57)

The competency –based approach came in an attempt to bridge the gap between school life and real life, by relating school acquisitions to varied and pertinent contexts of use inside as well outside school. CBA is learner centered in that it regards learners as being responsible and active agents in their learning process. In addition, it aims to form autonomous individuals capable of coping with the changing world to enable them to utilize the skills acquired in the school environment for solving real life problems.

Richards and Schmidt (2002) define the competence as action which includes a person's ability to create and understand sentences, including sentences they have never heard before, knowledge of what are and what are not sentences of a particular language, and the ability to recognize ambiguous and deviant sentences. Language involves three basic competencies; interactive competency, interpretive competency and productive competency, this later, is the ability to produce coherent, appropriate and relevant messages in writing and speaking. It is also the ability to effectively express ideas and organize taught appropriately. It is more often associated with writing because writing involves producing texts such as letters or essays. In CBA none of the four skills should be neglected. Learners are trained on listening and speaking, including pronouncing the different English sounds. They are, also, expose to written texts in which they explore different functions and different linguistic forms which they produce later. So, writing in CBA is taught in relation to everyday situations.

Conclusion

This chapter gave general definition of writing, writing and the other skills, speaking and reading. It has also presented different writing approaches. Also, we have seen the major teaching methods of the writing skill.

Chapter Three: The Evaluation of ‘My book of English’ Coursebook. Discussion and Interpretation of the results

Introduction

3.1. **Section one:** Presentation of the teacher’s Questionnaire

3.1.1. General Information about the course book ‘my book of English’

3.1.2. Presentation of the course book ‘my book of English’

3.1.3. Population and sampling

3.1.4. Description of teacher Questionnaire

3.1.5. Analysis of the Teacher’s Questionnaire

3.1.6. Discussion and Interpretation of the results

3.2. **Section two:** the evaluation of ‘My book of English’ course book

3.2.1. Writing skill evaluation checklist

3.2.2. Analysis of the checklist

3.3. Pedagogical Recommendations

Conclusion

Introduction

This chapter aims to evaluate and analyze the writing skill in the third year middle school 'my book of English' so as to test the validity of the set hypothesis at the preliminary phase of the dissertation in hand. This chapter is divided into two sections, concerning the first section we start by giving general information about the course book 'My book of English', presentation of the course book, population and sampling are defined, as well as the teachers' questionnaire and its analysis, discussion and interpretation of the results. In section two, we deal with the writing skill evaluation checklist and its analysis.

3.1. Section one: Presentation of the teacher's Questionnaire

This study aims at examining the effectiveness of third year MS course book 'my book of English' in learning of the writing skill. So, the study should be supported by information collected from teachers because they are aware about the content of the course book. These data will be collected through a teacher's questionnaire which is given to third year MS English language teachers.

3.1.1. General Information about the Coursebook 'My Book of English'

- Name of the course book : My book of English
- Intended learners' level : third year middle school
- Head of project : Mr.L.Tamrabet
- Material writer : M.r.A.Chenni
- Trainers M.r:T.Bouazid
M.r.A.Smara
M.s.N.Boukri
- Page number : 158 pages

3.1.2. Presentation of the course book ‘my book of English’

My book of English is one of three textbooks introduced recently in Algeria middle schools under the so-called ‘second generation manuals’.

The textbook under investigation is organized in terms of the following four sequences:

- a) Sequence 1: Me, My abilities, my interest, my personality.
- b) Sequence2: Me and life styles.
- c) Sequence 3: Me and the scientific world.
- d) Sequence 4: Me and my environment.

Each of the book’s sequences includes the following rubrics:

- a. MyProject.
- b. I listen and do
- c. I pronounce
- d. MygrammarTools
- e. I practice
- f. I read and do
- g. I learn to integrate
- h. I think andwrite
- i. Now , I Can
- j. I Play and enjoy
- k. I read for pleasure

3.1.3. Population and Sampling

The target population of this study presents third year MS English language teachers. As sample, 15 teachers working at eight different middle schools in Jijel have been involved.

Table1.

Number of English Teachers from Each Middle School

Middle school	Number of Teachers
BouhlaMessaoud	2
Zidan Salah	2
Moustafa El-Wali	2
Boutasetta Mahmoud	2
Boumanna Abdullah	2
Iben El-Haithem	2
Assila El-Said Ben El-Tayeb	1
AbadoAbd-Elkamel	2
Total	15

3.1.4. Description of the Teachers' Questionnaire

The teacher's questionnaire consists of twenty four (24) open-ended and multiple-choice questions(See appendix I),given to 15 MS English teachers at eight different schools in Jijel. 15 questionnaires were given back will the rest of the teachers did not hand them back.

The questionnaire includes three(3) sections. They are divided as follows:

Section One, from Question 1 to Question 3: includes general information about teachers experience and the different levels they teach.

Section Two, from Question 4 to Question 15: is about the writing skill and learning processes.

Section Three, from Question 16 to Question 24 : is about textbook evaluation, it investigates the teachers' opinions about the effectiveness of the coursebook 'My Book of English' in writing skill teaching and learning processes.

3.1.5. Analysis of the Teacher’s Questionnaire

Section One: General Information

Q.1. How long have you been teaching English language?

Table 2

The years of teaching English language

Option	Subjects	Percentage %
Less than 10 years	7	46,66
10 years or more	8	53,34
Total	15	100%

The aim behind asking this question is to determine whether teachers have a long experience in teaching English

The results in table 2 above show that 46, 66% of the questioned teachers have been teaching English for less than 10 years. 8 teachers out of 15, i.e. 53, 34 have been teaching English for 10 years or more. This implies that the majority of teachers were experienced in teaching English language. So, those experienced teachers have more knowledge about the content of the coursebook ‘my book of English’.

Q.2. which level (s) are you currently teaching?

Table3.

Teaching Experience of MS English Teachers by Level

Options	Subjects	Percentage %
3rd year MS	02	13,33
1st+3rd year MS	05	33,34
2 nd +3rd year MS	02	13,33
4th+3rd year MS	05	13,33

1st+2 nd +3rd+4th year MS	01	6,66
Total	15	100

The aim of this question is to investigate the teachers experience teaching English in third year MS level. We notice that 13 teachers taught more than one level : 5 teachers taught first and third level i.e. 33,34% , 2 teachers taught second and third year levels i.e.13,33% , 5 teachers taught fourth and third levels i.e.33,34% and one teacher taught all levels i.e. 6,66%. These results showed that all the teachers were familiar with teaching the third year level.

Q.3. How long you have been teaching the third year classes?

Table 4

The Years of Teaching the Third Year MS Classes

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Less than 5 years	06	40
5 years or more	09	60
Total	15	100%

This question aimed at determining the years of teaching the third year classes. The results of table 4 above show that 40% of teachers have been teaching the third year classes for less than 5 years and 60% of teachers have been teaching the third year classes for more than 5 years.

Section Two: The Writing Skill

Q.4. At the third year middle school level, which skill of language is most important for learning English language?

Table 5

The Most Important Skill in Third Year MS English Learning

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Listening	05	33,34
Listening +Speaking	02	13,34
Writing+ listening	01	6,66
Speaking + writing	04	26,66
The four skills	03	20
Total	15	100

This question aimed at figuring out which skill of language is most important for learning English at the third year MS level. The results in table 5 show that 5 teachers out of 15 ; who represent a percentage of 33,34 %, view that listening is the most important to English learning at that level, 2 teachers i.e.13,34 % said that listening and speaking are the most important skills. While one of them gives the importance to writing and listening with a percentage of 6,66 % . 4 Teachers argued that speaking and writing are more important than the other skills, with a percentage of 26, 66 %. 20 % of teachers see that all the four skills are important in the third level.

Q.5. what is good writing?

- Correct grammar
- Good ideas
- Spelling
- Precise vocabulary
- Other(please specify)

Table 6

The Criterion of Good Writing

Option	Subjects	Percentage %
a,b	5	33,34
a,b,c	1	6,66
a,b,c,d	6	40
a,b ,d,e	3	20
Total	15	100

The aim of this question sought to determine the criteria of good writing from the teachers' perspective .33 ,34% of the teachers see that good writing is correct grammar and good ideas, 6,66% argued that good writing combines correct grammar, good ideas and spelling. While, 6 teachers out of 15 i.e. the percentage of 40% said that good writing is correct grammar, good ideas, spelling and precise vocabulary. 3 teachers out of 15i.e. 20% mentioned that good writing based on (a,b,d ;e) the other criteria that the teachers added are :

- Good writing combines the mentioned elements in addition to the mechanics of writing (punctuation and capitalization).
- Good writing is also a completion of the whole entity, including a sence of logic, reason and chronology.

Q.6. Are the pupils motivated to write?

Table 7

Pupils and Motivation to Write

Option	Subjects	Percentage %
Yes	2	13,34
No	13	86,66
Total	15	100

This question aimed at knowing if pupils are motivated to write. The great majority of teachers (86, 66%) claim that the pupils are not motivated when they write. While 13,34% of teachers see that their pupils are motivated.

Q.7. Whatever your answer, please explain.

It is important to note that one of the major problems teachers face is lack of motivation from the part of their pupils who do not be motivated to write because they consider writing a very hard task since they lack of vocabulary, they can not apply the grammar rules correctly and they cannot express their ideas, they do not like the subjects and sometimes it is a matter of timing and preparation.

Concerning the pupils who are motivated to write, teachers answer that forming groups and working together help pupils to exchange their ideas, so, they can be motivated to write

Q .8: Are you satisfied with your pupils' level of writing?

Table 8

Teachers' Satisfaction with the Writing Level of Their Pupils

Option	Subjects	Percentage
Yes	1	6,66
No	14	93,34
Table	15	100

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

The aim of this question is to know whether the teachers are satisfied with their pupils' writing level or not. The majority of the teachers said that they are satisfied with their pupils' level of writing with a percentage of 33,34 %, one out of 15 teachers i.e. 6,66% are satisfied.

Q.9.If no, please explain why

The following explanations were given by teachers:

- The pupils have not yet mastered the basics of writing.
- Each year, we teach them about writing, but they forget about it easily. Pupils do not have a follow-up, so their level is always limited and the same mistakes are made.
- Our pupils do not write in the proper sense; their writing is full of mistakes, ambiguity, confusion, jumbled sentences and mere repetitions.
- When they write, they forget all the norms they should follow to produce a good piece of writing.

Q. 10. Do you think the time given to pupils enough to write a composition?

Table 9

Teachers' Opinion about the Time Allotted for the Production of a Composition

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Yes	5	33,34
No	10	66,66
Total	15	100

This question aimed at determining whether the time given to pupils to write a composition is enough or not, since, there is a great relationship between time, which is a key factor, and the

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

different aspect of writing. Pupils should not work under time pressure because it is an unnatural situation that might not lead to a truly representative of their actual capacities. 66, 66% of teachers claimed that time allotted for pupils to write a composition is not enough. 33, 34 % of teachers considered that the time given to pupils in enough.

Q.11. If no please explain why

The 10 teachers who answered 'No' gave the following justifications:

- Writing is a difficult task that demands time and content revision.
- The official syllabus does not allow enough time.
- Generally, the pupils have always to finish their writing at home.
- Students have a lot of language problems that is why they need more time when they produce a piece of writing.

It is important to discuss the topic before writing, this can take more than one hour specially when the pupils are working on groups.

Q.12.Do you encourage your pupils to write at home?

Table 10

Teachers' Encouregment to their Pupils to Write at Home

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Yes	15	100
No	0	00
Total	15	100

This question attempted to investigate whether the teachers encourage their pupils to write at home. As we expected all the teachers encourage their pupils to write at home i.e.100% .Because when pupils write and write again will help them develop fluency and accuracy.

Q.13. Do your pupils have difficulties in learning writing?

Table 11

Pupils' Difficulties in Learning Writing

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Yes	10	66,66
No	0	00
Sometimes	5	33,34
Total	15	100

This question aimed to investigate whether pupils are facing difficulties in learning writing or not. 66, 66 % of teachers i.e. 10 out of 15 claimed that their pupils had difficulties in learning writing. While 5 teachers with a percentage of 33, 34 % stated that their pupils sometimes had difficulties in learning writing. Whereas, no teacher said no. This indicates that the third year M S pupils do face serious problems in the process of learning writing.

Q.14. What are the main reasons behind your pupils' failure in writing?

This question aimed at figuring out teachers' analysis about the factors that make pupils fail in learning writing. Teachers gave the following reasons :

- The writing topics introduced in 'My Book of English' was higher than the pupils' level.
- Lack of vocabulary, lack of motivation, spelling mistakes and misuse of grammar rules.
- The situation of integration is complicated and difficult and beyond the pupils' level.

The answers regained from teachers' answers indicates that the suggested writing topics by the course book 'My Book of English' was beyond the pupils' level.

Q.15. what is the approach you use to teach writing?

Table 12

Teaching Writing Approach

Option	Subject	Percentage %
The product approach	4	26,66
The process approach	10	66,66
Both	1	6,66
Total	15	100

The aim of this question is to know the appropriate approach used by teachers in writing. 66, 66 % of teachers said that they use the product approach. While 4 teachers out of 15 i.e. 26, 66 % used the process approach and only one teacher admitted using both of them. Each teacher feels that his approach is appropriate approach to their pupils to improve their writing skill according to their point of view.

Q.16. Explain the reason for your choice of the approach

The teachers provided us with the following reasons for their choice of the approach :

a) The ProductApproach :

- I prefer the product approach because of lack of time and overloaded classes.
- I think that the product approach makes the pupils more

creative in producing written tasks because, they do not obliged to follow certain steps.

b) The Process Approach :

- This approach helps pupils to be more careful from going out of subject.
- The process approach is the best way to get pupils involved into writing and to develop their abilities to more comprehensive divices of the language.

c) Product and Process Approaches :

- I think that pupils should know the steps to follow then product comes later.

Section three: Textbook Evaluation

Q.17. Do you rely always on the course book while teaching writing?

Table 13

The Teachers' Reliance on the Course book in Teaching Writing

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Yes	6	40
No	9	60
Total	15	100

The aim of this question is to investigate whether third year MS English teachers relied all the time on the course book or used other materials. 9 teachers out of 15 i.e. 60 % claimed that did not relay too much on the course book 'My Book of English, on the other hand ,

6 teachers out of 15 in a percentage of 40% stated that they rely always on the coursebook while teaching writing. This indicates that teachers are likely dissatisfied with the textbook writing instruction.

Q.18. If no, what are other materials that you use?

Teachers used other materials for teaching writing such as :

- Information communication technologists (ICTs).

Magazines, newspapers' articles, maps, pictures and flashcards.

Q.19. which of the following do you mostly use from the course book while teaching writing.

Table 14

The Writing Activities in the Course book 'My Book of English'

Option	Subject	Percentage %
a,d	2	13,34
a,e	3	20
a,c,d	2	13,34
a,d,e	3	20
a,b,d,e	5	33,34
Total	15	100

This question aimed at identifying which of the course book activities that were mostly used while teaching writing. 40% of teachers said that they mostly used dialogue writing while teaching writing. 26, 66% of teachers used paragraph writing. This means that dialogue and paragraph writing was very helpful in teaching writing.

Q.20. Are you agree that the third year middle school English course book ‘My Book of English’ satisfy writing pupils’ needs?

Table 15

The Suitability of Third Year MS English Course book to Learners’ Needs

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Strongly disagree	2	13,34
Disagree	8	53,34
Some what agree	3	20
Agree	2	13,34
Strongly agree	0	00
Total	15	100

This question attempted to figure out if the the third year MS English course book ‘My book of English’ satisfied writing learners’ needs. 2 teachers out of 15 i.e. a percentage of 13, 34% were stongly dissagree, 53, 34% teachers were disagree. So, the majority of teachers responding that the third year MS course book ‘My book of English’ did not satisfy the learners’ writing needs. Thus, the course book needs to be reviewed. Because, teaching writing activities must suit learners’ level.

Q.21. Does the third year MS English course book‘my book of English’ match the pupils’ writing level?

Table 16

The Correspondence of Third Year MS English Course book with the Pupils' Writing Level

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Yes	7	46,66
No	8	53,34
Total	15	100

This question aimed at investigating whether third year MS English course book 'MY book of English' activities matched the pupils' writing level. As shown in the table 16, the majority of teachers i.e. 53, 34% argued that the course book activities did not match the pupils' writing level. While, 7 teachers out of 15 answered with yes. This indicates that 'My book of English' activities are beyond pupils' level.

Q.22. Does the course book 'my book of English' meet your expectations as a teacher, as far as the teaching of writing is concerned?

Table 17

Teachers' Expectations about Teaching Writing in the Coursebook

Option	Subject	Percentage %
No	8	53,34
Yes	7	46,66
Total	15	100

This question aimed at investigating whether the course book 'My book of English' meets teachers' expectations' about teaching writing. According to the results revealed in table 17, we noted that 7 teachers out of 15 i.e. 46, 66 % responded that they were satisfied. While, 8 teachers

with the percentage 53.34% answered that the course book did not meet their expectations in teaching writing. Because, they considered the course book does not give too much time to do the tasks and the situation given most of the time is beyond the pupils' level.

Q.23. Do the course book activities encourage pupils to write?

Table 18

Encouragement of 'my book of English' Activities for Pupils to Write

Option	Subject	Percentage %
Yes	8	53,34
No	7	46,66
Total	15	100

This question aimed that investigating whether the course book activities encourage pupils to write. 8 teachers out of 15 i.e.53, 34% answered positively. Whereas, 46, 66 % answered negatively. So, from these results we noticed that the course book activities encourage pupils to write.

Q.24. What is your general evaluation and opinion about teaching the writing skill in 'my book of English' course book?

This question demanded teachers to state their opinion and evaluation about teaching the writing skill in 'My book of English' course book. The teacher gave the following answers :

- I think that the course book 'My book of English' is generally acceptable.
- I believe that there are gaps between the receptive skills and the productive skills.
- The textbook does not provide sufficient writing strategies.
- The writing topics does not meet the pupils' level, specially the situation of integration, which is very hard, it should be shorter and at the right level of all pupils, not only the good and fast learners.
- The length of tasks and the insufficient time to cover all of them or even the majority of them.

The previous answers showed that the majority of third year MS teachers of English saw that the course book 'My book of English' did not meet their expectations and objectives in teaching writing.

3.1.6. Discussion and Interpretation of the results

After analyzing and interpreting the results of the questionnaire, we can say that 'My book of English' course book, to some extent, consider the teaching of the writing skill. Nevertheless, it neither matches the third year MS pupils' writing level nor satisfied their writing needs. Also, teachers find it difficult and challenging, most of the time, to cover all the writing tasks because of their length and the insufficient time to do this. Although 'My book of English' course book has motivating topics to write about, because, it focuses on real life situations. But, the book is not sufficient in terms of writing strategies that is why most of third year MS English teachers adopted other materials such as: ICT means to facilitate the process of teaching writing. In addition, learners are responsible and active agent in their learning process and the teacher is just a guide since the CBA was adapted in the new educational system 'the educational reform', which makes the writing tasks and the situation of integration a little bit complicated for them.

3.2. Section Two: The Evaluation of 'My book of English' Course book

The aim of this study is to evaluate the writing skill in the third year MS 'My book of English' course book, which based on Cunningsworth's checklist (1995). In this section we try to explore the importance given to teaching writing.

3.2.1. Writing Skill Textbook Evaluation Check-list

One of the common methods to evaluate English language teaching (ELT) course books is the checklist. It is an instrument that provides the evaluators with a list of features of successful learning- teaching materials, so, they can rate the quality of the course book. Hence,

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriatness

we choose Cunningsworth (1995) checklist to adapt our checklist for writing skill, Because we consider it the most appropriate to be relied on to analyze writing activities included in ‘ My book of English’ course book in accordance of teachers responses in the questionnaire.

Criterion	Applicable	Slightly applicable	Not applicable	
<p>1. Does the course book ‘my book of English’ cover most of all what is needed to teach writing skill? is it a good resoure for teachers in teaching writing ?</p>				
<p>➤ Relying always on the course book ‘my book of English’while teaching writing.</p> <p>➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ satisfies writing learner’s needs.</p> <p>2. Are writing tasks suitable for students’levels, interest?</p> <p>➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ writing tasks suitable for students’ level.</p>		<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>		

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriatness

<p>3. Is paragraphing taught adequately ?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course book ‘my book of english’ has sufficient writing paragraphs 		✓		
<p>4. Is there sufficient writing material?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ has sufficient writing material 		✓		
<p>5. Will the writing topics help expand students’ awareness and enrich their experience?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ writing topics help pupils to improve their creativity. ➤ The course book’ my book of English’ writing topics match the pupils’ language level. 		✓	✓	
<p>6. How are the writing skill taught?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ follows an incidental approach in teaching writing. ➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ follows an intentional approach in teaching writing. 	✓			

3.2.2. Analysis of the Check-list

Criterion 1

Does the course book ‘my book of english’ cover most of all what is needed to teach writing skill? is it a good recourse for teachers in teaching writing ?

The results obtained from teachers’ questionnaire and the reliance on the first criterion in Cunningsworth’s checklist show that the first criterion is slightly applicable because the course book ‘My book of English’ does not cover most of what is needed to teach writing skill. Because it taught in accordance of the other skills (listening, reading, speaking and grammar) in each sequence of the course book.

Table 19

Examples of Taskes in ‘My book of English’ that Teach Writing in accordance of other Skills

Sequence	Number of task	Instruction
01	Task 18 p.16	I listen to the conversation and fill in each gap with the missing word.
02	Task 5 p.68	I read my partner’s questionnaire about my first year at primary school and write true, personal answers.
	Task 4 p.68	I work with my partner.We read again ‘My Grammar Tools’(2) and correct each other’s sentences.
03	Task 22 p.90	My partner plays the role of our history teacher. I listen to his/her questions and answer him/her using the information in the timetable.
04	Task 2 p.140	I read text (2) and fill in the ‘Bibliographical Note’. Then, I answer the questions in the ‘Reading Notes’.
	Task 2 p.142	To write my eco- principles, my listening tasks, my ‘Grammar Tools’, I practise’ tasks, my reading texts and guideline below will also help me.

Criterion 2

Are writing tasks suitable for your students' levels, interest?

The results obtained from teachers' questionnaire and the checklist showed that the second criterion is slightly applicable. The course book 'My book of English' is to some extent beyond the third year MS pupils' level, because the situation of integration is very hard as well as the projects in the beginning of each sequence. Besides, teachers would not have enough time to well teach the whole objectives. Since the projects and tasks of integration are too long. So, it becomes clear that the format of the course book's units is, somehow, difficult of the teachers to achieve the tasks goals.

Table 20

Examples of Situation of Integration and Projects in 'My Book of English' Coursebook

Sequence	Number of tasks	Instruction
01	Project 1 p.10	My partner and i decide to write a short article (with photos) and send it to the press to raise people's awareness of the importance to preserve this part of our cultural and national heritage.
01	Task 1 p.39	Write a poster about the winner Mohamed Farah Djeloud, using the following steps.....
03	Task 1 p.103	It is 'National Inventor's Day'. To celebrate the event, I am going to write Dr Bourouis' biography and put it on display in the local public library where an official ceremony will be held.

	Task p.106	Technology teachers want us to design a brochure in English about ‘Islamic Scientific and Cultural Heritage’ the brochure will include a historical introduction. Iam going to write the historical introduction in the brochure.
04	Task 1 p.141	Our school has applied to become a member of the International Eco- School Programme .Therefore, i am going to write a list of ten eco-principles that should be discussed by my class and included in our ‘ School Eco-Charter’

Criterion 3

Is paragraphing taught adequately?

The results reached from the cheklist showed that the third criterion is slightly applicable. Paragraph and text writing tasks in the course book ‘My book of English’ are presented only once in each sequence. For example, in sequence one (rubric under the title ‘I think and write’, task 1 page 39). In sequence two (task 1 page 77) which asked the pupils to write comparative texts about two different cities. Whereas, in sequence three (task 1 page 106) they are going to write a historical intoduction to the brochure using some information in a timeline. In the last sequence (task 1 page 143) pupils were asked to write a descriptive text about an aminal using catchy slogan and photos of this aminal. That is to say, the paragraph and text writing tasks presented in the course book ‘My book of English’ are not enough. While, the most writing tasks are about writing dialouges, filling the gaps which are not sufficient to improve pupils’ writing skill.

Criterion 4

Is there sufficient writing material?

The results obtained from the checklist and teachers' questionnaire (question number 17) , the fourth criterion is slightly applicable. The course book uses some materials in the writing tasks. Such as pictures and dictionaries.

Table 21

Examples of Course book's Writing Tasks that Relay on other materials.

Sequence	Number of task	Instruction
01	Task 10 p.13	I listen to the BBC Radio interview (part1) and fill in the first part of each teenagers' profile.
03	Task 11 p.102	Look at the pictures and complete boxes (1) and (3) using the following words.
	Task6 p.100	I choose diagram (A) or (B) and write three or four sentences to describe how an image of a real object is created. I can use adictionary.

Criterion 5

Will the writing topics help expand students'awareness and enrich their experience?

As the checklist's results show along the data generated from teachers' questionnaire, this criterion is applicable. Most of the writing topics which are introduced in 'My book of English' are realistic and in contact with pupils' environment and culture. That is to say, they are very close to the pupils' real life situations. In sequence one, the writing topics are about pupils' abilities, interest and personality. Concerning the second sequence the writing topics are related to pupils' lifestyles. Whereas, sequence three is about the scientific world and the last sequence the writing topics are related to the environment.

Criterion 6

How are the writing skill taught?

The result reached from the checklist showed that the sixth criterion is applicable because the course book 'My book of English' teaches writing follows both incidental and intentional approaches.

Table 22

Examples of Tasks in 'My book of English' that Teach Writing Indirectly.

Sequence	Number of Tasks	Instruction
01	Task 4 p.11	I listen and fill in the profile
	Task 7 p.12	I work with my partner and interview him/her as in the example.
02	Task 3 p.67	I look at each picture and write sentences using the semi-modal verb 'used to' and prompts between brackets as in the examples.
03	Task 1 p.99	I read text 1 and 2 and complete the bibliographical notes
04	Task 4 p.133	I work with my partner. We read again 'My Grammar Tools' (1) and compare our answers in task (1,2 and 3). Then, we correct each other.

Table 23

Examples of Tasks in 'My book of English' that Teach Writing Directly.

Sequence	Number of Task	Instruction
01	Task 15 p.29	I write four sentences to describe my partner's personality.
	Task 2 p.40	I follow the layout below. I use my answers to the questions to write my paragraphs.
02	Task p.77	I am going to write two short texts (one about Setif and the other about Constantine) each divided into two parts (one about the past city and the other about the present day).
03	Task 6 p 100	I choose diagram (A) or (B) and write three or four sentences to describe how an image of a real object is created. I can use a dictionary.
04	Task 1 p.143	I need the following profile to write my text about the Barbary deer and the list of the threats facing this animal.

3.3. Pedagogical Recommendations

The literature review about writing tasks and textbook evaluation enlightened us to suggest some recommendations to textbook designers, In order to make “ My Book of English” course book more useful and appropriate for both teachers and pupils. Thus, we recommend:

- More time should be devoted to the writing tasks sections in order to prepare pupils for higher levels.
- More tasks should be devoted to writing.
- The formulation of the writing tasks ought to be at the pupils' level, not only the good ones.

- It is better for teachers to adopt other teaching materials to cope with the weaknesses of the course book “ My Book of English” in teaching the writing skill.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have started by describing ‘My book of English’ course book and analyse the questionnaire which obtains the information we need it from the teacher about their opinion about the course book and if it helps their pupils to improve their writing skill. Then, we analysed the writing tasks in the course book throughout an adapted checklist from Cunningsworth (1995). The results obtained from both the teachers’ questionnaire and the checklist showed that, the course book ‘My book of English’ does not give sufficient help and support for both teachers and pupils. So, the course book is not really effective and appropriate in teaching the writing skill.

General Conclusion

The present study aimed to evaluate and investigate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the third year MS course book 'My book of English' used in teaching the writing skill. It also aimed to shed light on the teachers' perspective about the tasks of teaching writing and whether this course book matches the third year MS pupils' level.

This dissertation is divided into two parts: one theoretical and the other is practical. The theoretical part includes two chapters, while one chapter was devoted to the practical part. The first chapter that is concerned with text book evaluation, it started by defining evaluation and its different types. After that, a definition of text book evaluation was submitted in addition to describing its purpose. Then, we moved to text book evaluation methods, and ended by listing some checklist models.

The second chapter started by defining writing and discussing the writing relation to the other skills, particularly speaking and reading, besides to the different writing approaches. Lastly, the chapter ended by discussing writing under the major teaching methods.

For achieving the already mentioned aims and answering the already asked questions a descriptive methodology was adopted relying on two instruments; an adapted checklist from Cunningsworth (1995) was used to identify how are the writing tasks are presented in the course book and also it set to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the course book 'My book of English' in terms of writing teaching and learning. The other research tool was teachers' questionnaire. The findings obtained results showed that 'My book of English' course book is not really effective and appropriate in teaching the writing skill and it does not match pupils' actual level as far as writing is concerned as revealed through the analysis of the checklist and as stated by teachers' questionnaire. Consequently, most of third year MS were not really good in regard to the writing skill as stated by teachers in the questionnaire. Hence, the already set hypotheses were confirmed.

List of references

- Anderson, C. (1992). *Free style : A direct approach to writing*. Boston : Houghton.
- Ansary, H. & Babaii, E. (2002). Universal characteristics of EFL/ ESL textbooks: A step towards systematic textbook evaluation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 8(2). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Ansary-textbooks/>.
- Barnaby, B. & Bell, J. (1984). *A handbook for E.S.L literacy*. Toronto: O.I.S.E.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Byrne, D. (1979). *Teaching writing skills*. London: Longman.
- Carter, R. & Nunan, D.(2001). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your course book*. Oxford. UK: Macmillan Education.
- Demir, Y. & Ertas, A. (2014). A suggested eclectic checklist for ELT course book evaluation. *The Reading Matrix*, 14(2), 243-252. Retrieved from [http://www.readingmatrix.com / files/11-1n844ug7. pdf](http://www.readingmatrix.com/files/11-1n844ug7.pdf).
- Dos Santos, L.M. (2017). Evaluation of a foreign language textbook used in the greater Boston Region: An evaluation of a Japanese as a foreign language textbook. Retrieved from <http://pdfs.semanticscholar.org>
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 36-42. Retrieved from <http://www.eltj.oxfordjournals.org>
- Escholz, P. A. (1980). The prose model approach: Using products in the process. In T.R. Donovan and B. W. McClelland. (eds.). *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*, Urbana 111: National council to Teachers of English.
- Freeman, H., Lipsy, M. & Rossi, P.(1999). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (6th ed.). New Delhi: International Educational and Professional Publisher.
- Freeman, D.L & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principals in language*

Teaching (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Germanine, K. & Rea-Dickins, P. (1992). *Evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gholani, R., Noardin, N. & Rafik –Galea, S. (2017). A thorough scrutiny of ELT textbook evaluation: A review inquiry international <http://www.ijels.aiac.org.au> *Journal of education and literacy studies* <http://www.ijels.aiac.org.au>

Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R.B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Stanly, G. (1993). *Process writing*. Barcelona: British Council.

Hinkel, I. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical technique in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Hubert, M. D. (2001). The Speaking-Writing Connection: Integrating Dialogue into a Foreign Language Writing Course. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8(2), 170-183.

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4c42/41c0e6247ff44f04afe88adaa4a767d8c1bf.pdf>

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Issel, L. M. (2009). *Health program planning and evaluation: A practical, systematic approach for community health* (3rd ed.). Chicago: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Jozef, H. (2001). *Advanced writing in English as a foreign language: A corpus-based study of processes and products*. Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.

Jusaf, H. (2018). The models of checklist method in evaluating ELT textbooks. *Journal el-lisan*. <http://journal.iaingorontalo.x.id/index.php/a/>

Kroll, B. (1996). *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, J. G. & Vanpatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

The Evaluation of the Writing Tasks Appropriateness

- Long, M. H. (1984). Process and product in EFL program evaluation. Retrieved from <http://www.joster.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>
- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Material evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.
- Mertens, D. M. & Wilson, A. T. (2019). *Program evaluation theory and practise* (2nd ed.). New York : The Guilford Press.
- Mukundan, I. & Nimehchisalem, V. (2012). Evaluating the validity and economy of the English language teaching textbook evaluation. *World Applied Science Journal*, 20(3), 458, 463, doi: 105829/idosi.wasj.2012.2003.1924.
- Murray, D.M. (1992). *Writing as process: How writing finds its own meaning*. Urbana. IL: National Council to Teachers of English.
- Nemati, A. (2009). Evaluation of an ESL English language Course book: A step towards systematic vocabulary evaluation. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(2), 91-99. Retrieved from <http://www.krepublishers.com/...Nemati.../JSS-20-02-091-0>
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Honk Kong : Oxford American English.
- Recycle. (2013). Collins.com. Retrieved from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/recycle>
- Rezaeian, M. & Zamanian, M. (2015). Textbook evaluation : ELT teachers' perspectives on learning to read English for pre-university students. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 4(2), 105-118. Doi : 10.5861/ijrsl.2014.891.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2000). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Evaluation of the Writing Tasks Appropriateness

- Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman: Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, J. & Weir, C. (1994). *Programme evaluation in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R. W. Tyler, R. M. Gagné, & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Sheldon, L. (1988). Evaluating EFL Textbooks and Materials *ELT Journal*, 42(2), 237, 247.
- Sokolik, M. (2003). Writing. In D. Nunan (Eds), *Practical English language teaching (PELT)*. New
- Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. *Language Arts*, 60, 627-643.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000). Guidelines for developing evaluation checklists: The Checklists Development Checklist (CDC). Retrieved December 25, 2016 from www.wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/4350/2014/guidelinescdc.pdf.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: C.U.P
- Tomlinson, B. (2001). Materials development. In Carter, R. & Nunan, D, *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum.
- US. Library of Congress. <http://www.everyculture.com/>

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriatness

[http://www. Meducation.dz//](http://www.Meducation.dz//)

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge : The MIT Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Language as communication*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

William, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 37(3), 251-255. Retrieved from [http//www.textbookuse.pbworks.com](http://www.textbookuse.pbworks.com)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX(I)

Teacher's Questionnaire

Dear teacher,

This questionnaire is a research tool for a dissertation leading to a master degree in English didactics .It aims to examine the role of the third year middle school course book 'my book of English' in learning writing skill.

Please tick (√) the appropriate box (es) or give full answer(s) on the broken lines whenever necessary.

Thank you in advance for your collaboration.

Section one : General Information

1. How long have you been teaching English Language?

.....year(s)

2. Which level (s) are you currently teaching?

a. 1st year middle school.

b. 2nd year middle school.

c. 3rd year middle school.

d. 4th year middle school.

3. How long have you been teaching the third year classes ?

.....year(s)

Section two : The writing skill

4. At the third year middle school level which skill of language is most important for learning English language?

- a. Listening
- b. Speaking
- c. Reading
- d. Writing

5. Good writing is (you can tick more than one box)

- a. correct grammar
- b. good ideas
- c. spelling
- d. precise vocabulary
- e. other : please, specify :

6. Are the pupils motivated to write?

- a. yes
- b. no

7. whatever your

answer. please. Explain

.....

8. Are you satisfied with your pupils' level of writing?

- a. Yes

b. No

9. If no, please explain why.....

.....

.....

.....

10. Do you think the time given to pupils enough to write a composition?

a. Yes

b. No

11.If no, please explain why

.....

.....

.....

.....

12.Do you encourage your pupils to write at home?

a. Yes

b. No

13. Do your pupils have difficulties in learning writing?

a. Yes

b. No

c. Sometimes

If your answer is (a –c) would you please answer the following question

14. What are the main reasons behind your pupil's failure in writing?

.....
.....
.....
.....

15. What is the approach you use to teach writing ?

- a. The product approach
- b. The process approach
- c. Both

16. Please, explain the reasons for your choice of the approach.

.....
.....

Section three : Textbook Evaluation

17. Do you rely always on the course book while teaching writing?

- a. Yes
- b. No

18. If no, what are other materials that you

use ?.....
.....
.....
.....

19. Which of the following do you mostly use from the course book while teaching writing ?

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriateness

- a. Letterswriting
- b. Filling in form
- c. Picture composition
- d. Dialogue writing
- e. Paragraphwriting

20. Are you agree that the third year middle school English course book ‘my book of English ‘satisfy writing pupil’s needs?

- a. Stronglydisagree
- b. Disagree
- c. Somewhatagree
- d. Agree
- e. Stronglyagree

21. Does the third year middle school English course book ‘my book of English ‘match the pupil’s writing level?

- a. Yes
- b. No

22. Does the course book ‘my book of English’ meet your expectations

As a teacher, as far as the teaching of writing is concerned?

- a. Yes

The Evaluation of the WritingTasks Appropriatness

b. No

How ?.....
.....
.....

23. Do course book's activities encourage pupils to write ?

a. Yes

b. No

24. What is your general evaluation and opinion about teaching the writing skill in 'my book of English 'course book?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

APPENDIX(II)

Criterion	Applicable	Slightly applicable	Not applicable	
<p>1. Does the course book ‘my book of English’ cover most of all what is needed to teach writing skill? is it a good resoure for teachers in teaching writing ?</p>				
<p>➤ Relying always on the course book ‘my book of English ‘while teaching writing.</p> <p>➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ satisfies writing learner’s needs.</p> <p>2. Are writing tasks suitable for students’levels, interest?</p> <p>➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ writing tasks suitable for students’ level.</p>				

<p>3. Is paragraphing taught adequately ?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course book ‘my book of english’ has sufficient writing paragraphs <p>4. Is there sufficient writing material?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ has sufficient writing material <p>5. Will the writing topics help expand students’ awareness and enrich their experience?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ writing topics help pupils to improve their creativity. ➤ The course book’ my book of English’ writing topics match the pupils’ language level. <p>6. How are the writing skill taught?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ follows an incidental approach in teaching writing. ➤ The course book ‘my book of English’ follows an intentional approach in teaching writing. 				
--	--	--	--	--

Résumé

La présente recherche a été menée pour étudier l'efficacité et la pertinence des activités d'écriture dans le livre de cours de troisième année moyenne «**My book of English**». Elle tente également de faire la lumière sur les perspectives de l'enseignant et si le livre de cours répond à leurs attentes et objectifs dans l'enseignement de la compétence d'écriture. Il s'est basé sur l'hypothèse que si le livre de cours «**My book of English**» fournit un contenu suffisant et approprié pour l'enseignement de la compétence d'écriture élèves de troisième année moyenne améliorerait leur écriture. Par conséquent, cette recherche est composée de trois chapitres, le premier est sur l'évaluation des manuels et le second concerne la compétence d'écriture sous les principales méthodes d'enseignement. Le troisième chapitre, qui est la partie pratique, concernant les outils de recherche, une liste de contrôle adaptée est utilisée pour évaluer les strengths et les faiblesses du livre de cours «**My book of English**» en termes de activités d'écriture. En outre, un questionnaire a été présenté à 15 enseignants de troisième année moyenne travaillant dans huit collèges différents de Jijel ,afin de recueillir les données sur leur perspective vers la pertinence des tâches d'écriture incluses dans «**My book of English**» manuel. Les résultats obtenus ont montré que «**My book of English**» livre de cours n'est pas vraiment efficace et approprié dans l'enseignement de la compétence d'écriture et il ne correspond pas au niveau réel des élèves .

تم إجراء هذا البحث لاستقصاء فعالية و مدى ملائمة الأنشطة الخاصة بتدريس الكتابة في الكتاب المدرسي للسنة الثالثة متوسط
"My book of English" كما يحاول تسليط الضوء على وجهة نظر المعلم و ما إذا كان الكتاب المدرسي يلبي توقعاتهم
وأهدافهم في تدريس مهارة الكتابة. يعتمد ذلك على الفرضية القائلة بأنه إذا كان كتاب "My book of English" يوفر
محتوى كافا و مناسباً لتدريس مهارة الكتابة فان تلاميذ السنة الثالثة من التعليم المتوسط سيحسنون من مهارتهم في الكتابة بالتالي،
يتكون هذا البحث من ثلاثة فصول، الفصل الأول يتعلق بتقييم الكتاب المدرسي و الفصل الثاني يتعلق بمهارة الكتابة في إطار
أساليب التدريس الرئيسية. الفصل الثالث ، وهو الجزء العملي، فيما يتعلق بأدوات البحث ، يتم استخدام قائمة مرجعية مكيمة
لتقييم نقاط القوة والضعف في الكتاب المدرسي "My book of English" من حيث الأنشطة . بالإضافة لذلك ,تم تقديم
استبيان الى 15 مدرسا من الصف الثالث في المدارس الإعدادية يدرسون في مدارس مختلفة في جيجل من اجل جمع البيانات حول
منظورهم نحو مدى ملائمة الأنشطة الخاصة بتدريس الكتابة المدرجة في الكتاب المدرسي "My book of English". أظهرت
النتائج التي تم الحصول عليها ان الكتاب المدرسي "My book of English" غير فعال ومناسب حقا في تدريس مهارة الكتابة
ولا يتناسب مع المستوى الفعلي للتلاميذ . و بالتالي فان هذه النتائج تؤكد صحة الفرضية السابقة الذكر