

https://dspace.org/

An analysis of the treatment of writing pedagogy in three ELT textbooks for grade 4 learners in Rwandan primary schools

Amini Ngabonziza, Jean de Dieu

2014-11-03
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/15820

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

An analysis of the treatment of writing pedagogy in three ELT textbooks for grade 4 learners in Rwandan primary schools

AMINI NGABONZIZA Jean de Dieu
746753

A Research report submitted to the Faculty of Arts, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Applied English Language Studies.

Supervisor: Dr. Belinda MENDELOWITZ

Johannesburg, June 2014

DECLARATION

I declare that this research report is my own work and that I have given acknowledgement to sources which I have used. It is submitted for the degree of Masters in Applied English Language studies at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted previously for any degree or examination at any university.

Signature:……..

Name: AMINI NGABONZIZA Jean de Dieu

Date …./ ……., 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Belinda Mendelowitz, without whose constructive feedback, patience, and unique understanding this research report would not have been completed. I extend my thanks to writing centre members, Mr. Richard Benabe and Mr. HilaireHabyarimana, for their writing guidance and to the Rwandan community that helped me to experience an academic life in South Africa (Sibomana Emmanuel, Kayisire, Niyibizi, Nzaramba, Dr. James and Claudine). I am grateful to all the friends that I made during my Masters studies at Wits (Navan, Sydney, Laura, Mariyeni, Uzamukunda Marie-Francoise, and Shirley Gamedze my group mate). I am indebted also to my Wits lecturers namely Professor Yvonne Reed, Professor Hilary Janks, Professor Leketi Makalela and Dr. Dominique Mwepu; your lectures and advice contribute in significant ways.

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the analysis of approaches to teaching writing embedded in three English language teaching (ELT) textbooks designed for grade 4 learners in Rwandan primary schools. In 2008, Rwanda switched from French to English as a medium of instruction from Grade 4 onwards. Given the limited knowledge of English by many people in Rwanda, teachers and learners are obliged to rely on English textbooks produced in the United Kingdom to learn and teach English. Thus, the quality of the textbooks is one of the main factors affecting the quality of teaching and learning. My research aims are three-fold: to analyse the approaches to teaching writing embedded in three ELT textbooks used in grade 4 classes in Rwanda; to explore how the designers of the textbooks attempt to assist grade 4 learners in their development as writers; and to investigate the implications for Rwandan primary school teachers and learners of the approaches to writing pedagogy in the three textbooks designed and produced by UK publishing houses.

The study employs the qualitative content analysis method for data collection. The analysis of the grade 4 pupils' ELT textbooks tasks was based on a three level framework proposed by Littlejohn (1998). The first level concerns the description of the pupils' textbooks, design, number of pages, and organisation principle. The second level involves the analysis of tasks and activities to find out the approaches to teaching writing contained in the textbooks. The third level consists of drawing on the first two analyses to explore the implication of the approaches found in the three ELT textbooks for Rwandan primary education. This framework is informed by English foreign language (EFL) writing pedagogy literature which helped to respond to the research questions.

The findings confirm, on the one hand, that the form focused approach is assumed to be appropriate method for teaching and learning writing in the EFL context. This is supported by the results indicating that the product approach to writing is a common approach embedded in the three ELT textbooks. The findings have shown also the implication of the focus on grammar at the expense of meaning and the study has argued that form focused/ controlled production practice need to be springboards for communicative tasks where learners are given opportunities

to develop writing in a range of contexts for a range of purposes. On the other hand, the findings challenge the assumption that textbooks produced by developed countries are Eurocentric. Publishers of the three analyzed textbooks are clearly aware of the issue and as a result they have included local environments in the ELT textbooks. This study further identifies gaps between the monolingual pedagogy used in the textbooks and the local reality of a multilingual context and the implications of this for Rwandan primary education.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACTFL: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching approach

EC: Expanded Circle (countries)

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

ESL: English as a Second Language

IC: Inner Circle (countries)

L1: First tongue

L2: Second language

MINEDUC: Ministry of Education (Rwanda)

NCDC: National Curriculum Development Centre

NISR: National Institute of Statistics Rwanda

OC: Outer circle

OUP: Oxford University Press

UK: United Kingdom

USA: United States of America

ZPD: Zone of Proximal development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

ABSTRACT iv

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS vi

TABLE OF CONTENTS vii

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Statement of the Research problem 1

1.2 Rationale 2

1.3 Study objectives 3

1.4 Research questions 4

1.5 Research context 5

1.5.1 Linguistic landscape of Rwanda 5

1.5.2 Educational system 5

2.1 Approaches to teaching writing 7

2.2 EFL writing pedagogy/development for children 9

2.3 Debating writing pedagogy 12

2.4 Hegemonic practices in the EFL textbooks 14

3.1 Introduction 16

3.2 Methods to analyze textbooks 17

3.2.1 Impressionistic 17

3.2.2 Checklist 17

3.2.3 In-depth method 18

3.3 Analytical framework for textbook analysis 18

3.4 Data collection 20

3.4.1 Selection of textbooks for analysis 21

3.4.2 Organization of the textbooks 22

3.4.3 Sampling of pages and units of analysis 23

3.4.4 Developing content categories 24

3.5 Data analysis 25

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS 27

4.1 Introduction 27

4.2 Summary presentation of findings 27
4.2. 1 New Progressive Primary English 4 28
4.2.2 New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4) 29
4.2.3 Keynote English Primary 4 30
4.2.4 Teachers' guides of each of the three pupils' textbooks 31
4.3 Teaching writing approaches embedded in the three textbooks 32
4.4 Teaching grammar in relation to writing 37
4.5 Integration of Skills: teaching writing in relation to reading and oral skills 39
4.6 Implications, suggestions and pedagogical complexities in the three foreign language teaching textbooks cases 42
4.6.1 Implications of the fact that the textbooks were designed and produced by UK publishing houses 42
4.6.2 Implications of the approaches to writing pedagogy embedded in the three ELT textbooks 46
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY 54
5.1 General conclusion 54
5.2 Recommendation 56
5.3 Limitations and further research 57
REFERENCES **59**

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Research problem

In October 2008, the government of Rwanda instated English as a medium of instruction from the fourth grade to the university level (Parliament of Rwanda, 2008). The English language replaced French, the medium of instruction since colonial times, which was inherited from the Belgian colonizer. Since the early 1920s, French had been an official language and language of instruction of Rwanda until the policy changed in 2008 (Twagilimana, 2007; Rosendal, 2010).

The government explained the language policy shift as designed to meet the communication needs for regional integration and participation in the global community (MacGreal, 2009). Rwanda joined a regional and an international organization, namely the East African Community, composed of English speaking members (Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda), and the Commonwealth of Nations, composed of mainly former United Kingdom (UK) colonies. Government officials of Rwanda declared that the ability of its citizens to speak English would boost the integration of Rwanda into the regional and global business community (Ruburika, 2009). However, the decision to change the language policy immediately impacted on the education system in Rwanda as teachers attempted to implement the policy with little preparation.

From January 2009, teachers were required to implement the policy with little linguistic background in English. Most teachers in Rwanda learnt English as a subject during their secondary education but they were not trained to teach through English as the medium of instruction; consequently they were obliged to rely on English textbooks because learners were required to study and write their assignments and exams in English.

From the beginning of the implementation of the policy in 2009 to date, there has been little investigation of the suitability of the textbooks for teaching learners writing skills. The purpose of this study is to analyze English Language Teaching (ELT) textbooks in relation to theories about writing pedagogy.

1.2 Rationale

The motivation for analyzing ELT textbooks in relation to writing pedagogy is connected with my interest in foreign language learning and teaching. Throughout my primary and secondary education, I enjoyed writing in Kinyarwanda and French (Kinyarwanda is my mother tongue and French was the language of instruction during my primary and secondary studies). However, when I went to university, writing in English became difficult for me. But due to my love of writing, especially poems, I persisted and developed. After completing my undergraduate studies, I observed how textbooks were crucial in the teaching process, especially in primary schools where I was a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) teacher trainer, observing student teachers at work.

It has been claimed that ELT textbooks play an important role both in teaching and learning English by a number of scholars (Tomlinson, 1998; Hutchinson & Torres, 1994; Cunningsworth, 1994). Hutchinson & Torres (1994) state that the teaching and learning process needs relevant textbooks to successfully mediate knowledge to learners. Textbooks are essential tools for transmitting knowledge, but in Africa, EFL textbooks have been used to transfer the values and culture of countries producing these textbooks. In addition, it can be argued that textbooks always promote specific values and a specific agenda (Rogoff, 1990). Though this issue is not the main focus of this study, the production of EFL textbooks from Western industries and the implications of this for the Rwandan context will be investigated.

It might seem like studying writing pedagogy in three ELT textbooks in grade 4 is limited in scope. However, this supposition is based on the assumption that writing happens in isolation from other linguistic skills, which is not the case. This study will be based firstly on the fact that writing is situated in concrete interactions which are influenced by social practice, involving oral, reading and grammar skills (Myhill, 2010, Andrews & Smith, 2011). Secondly, the study explores how the textbooks facilitate the writing development of grade 4 learners during this transition to English as a Medium of Instruction (MoE). Grade 4 level has been selected because it is a transitional period from English as a subject to English as the medium of teaching and learning in Rwandan primary schools (See section 1.5). Thus, this study focuses on analysing writing pedagogy, in relation to other linguistic skills, in three ELT textbooks for grade 4.

In addition, this study will draw on the literature on writing pedagogy for young learners in the context of learning to write in another language. This literature is based on the difference between native-speaking children and second/foreign speakers' children learning to write in English. The difference is centered on previous knowledge of both young learners: while native-speaking children start to learn writing with sufficient vocabulary items and grammar control, second/foreign speakers' children need to develop vocabulary items and grammar control within writing practices (Brown, 2001; Mackey, 2006).

Consequently, this distinction between native and non-native language repertoires of young children makes the pedagogy of writing in a mother tongue context and second/foreign language context different. The techniques used to teach writing for young native speakers are largely focused on meaning-making compared to techniques used to teach writing to non-native speakers of English that focus on phonological awareness and increasing learners' vocabulary repertoire. Although the distinction between these two pedagogies seems reasonable, it has been challenged by research which promotes meaning focused pedagogy in the EFL context bearing in mind that writing is not acquired naturally by both native and non native speakers children (Cameron, 2001; Myhill, 2009)[See more discussions in the chapter II of this study].

In summary, my earlier writing challenges, my observation of teachers teaching English with textbooks produced outside Rwanda as well as literature about teaching textbooks motivated me to conduct this research.

1.3 Study objectives

This study aims to analyze and compare the content of textbooks for teaching writing in the three approved grade 4 textbooks.

The following specific objectives will be the focus of the study:

- Exploring how writing pedagogies are embedded in English language teaching textbooks in Rwandan upper primary education.
- Developing recommendations on how textbooks can be improved as a pedagogical aid for teaching writing in Rwandan primary education.

The study anticipates that there should be similarities and differences in the conceptualization of the teaching of writing across the three textbooks. As the selected textbooks have been published by British publishing houses, this study will examine to what extent the socio-cultural identities and prior knowledge/experiences of learners have been appropriately reflected.

1.4 Research questions

This study will be guided by the following main questions:

1. What approaches to teaching writing are embedded in the ELT textbooks used in grade 4 classes in Rwanda?
2. How, if at all, do the designers of the textbooks attempt to assist grade 4 learners in their development as writers?
3. What are the implications, if any, for Rwandan primary school teachers and learners of the following:
    (i) The approaches to writing pedagogy embedded in the three ELT textbooks.
    (ii) The fact that the textbooks were designed and produced by the UK publishing houses.

In addition the study aims to answer the following sub-questions in detail:

1. What kinds of writing tasks are presented in the three textbooks?
2. How are the writing tasks presented in relation to the learners' socio-cultural identities and prior knowledge/experiences?
3. How is grammar taught in relation to writing development?
4. How are the writing activities linked to reading, speaking, and listening activities?
5. What are the roles of teachers and learners? What is the learner expected to do and with whom?
6. What are the similarities and differences among the three approved textbooks?
7. How is the teaching of writing scaffolded and how are the learning activities organised in the three textbooks?

1.5 Research context

The study focuses on Rwandan primary school, grade 4 English language teaching (ELT) textbooks. In 2010, the Ministry of Education approved a list of textbooks for use in Rwandan primary and secondary schools. As far as English language teaching is concerned, nine ELT textbooks have been approved for primary school level and three for lower secondary schools (junior secondary1-3). Moreover, the ministry published a list of additional books that primary and secondary schools could use for additional materials. Since 2010, those books have been used in primary and secondary schools in Rwanda.

In this research, I will focus on three English language teaching textbooks approved for upper primary grade 4. My choice is motivated by the recent language policy which stipulates that the medium of instruction is English from the fourth grade to university level (Ministry of Education, 2011). This implies that from the fourth grade learners and teachers are expected to use English for teaching and learning. Writing skills in English are needed for assessment from the fourth grade to cope with academic process and product (exercises, homework, exams). My study attempts to examine how textbooks mediate this process of teaching and learning writing.

1.5.1 Linguistic landscape of Rwanda

Rwanda is an unusual country in Sub-Saharan Africa as the whole population speaks one local language, Kinyarwanda. Kinyarwanda is a Bantu language belonging to the central branch of the Niger language family (Adekunle, 2007). In addition to Kinyarwanda, there are two more official languages of Rwanda, namely French and English (Republic of Rwanda, 2003). Swahili is also used as an unofficial language for business and religious purposes.

1.5.2 Educational system

Rwandan education operates under a 6-3-3-4 system: six years of primary school, three years of junior secondary school, three years of senior secondary school, and four years of university bachelor's degree (U.S. Embassy Kigali, 2011). Primary education is divided into two sections: First grade to third grade is called lower primary education and fourth grade to sixth grade is called upper primary education.

The government of Rwanda provides free education for six years in primary school plus three years in junior secondary school (MINEDUC, 2008). This correlates with a high rate of enrolment that increased from 93.5% in 2005 to 95.5% in 2011 in primary school and 9% to 25.7% in secondary school (NISR, 2012). But the completion rate of primary school was still low at 54% in 2008 (World Bank, 2011). According to the World Bank report (2011), the literacy rate for the county was 71% in 2009.

In lower primary education, learners are taught in their mother tongue, Kinyarwanda. Then, they shift to English from the fourth grade, which is the first year of upper primary education. As far as teaching writing in grade 4 classes is concerned, the National Curriculum outlines five specific goals (NCDC, 2010: 7):

1. Write with correct spelling words, phrases and sentences.
2. Appropriately use punctuation marks in sentences, paragraphs and texts.
3. Write logically and legibly in correct English.
4. Express ideas in written form.
5. Summarize texts and stories

My study will focus on the fourth year as the foundation of English language teaching in Rwanda. Through the fourth grade, learners and teachers use English for daily academic activities. I will analyze the kind of activities they are given to improve their writing skills in ELT textbooks.

Table 1. Education system and language of instruction

Level	*Language of instruction*	*Language(s) as subject*
Primary 1-3	Kinyarwanda	French & English
Primary 4-6	English	Kinyarwanda & French
Secondary 1-6	English	English, French or Swahili

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Approaches to teaching writing

Approaches to teaching writing pedagogy have evolved from an initial focus on first language (L1) pedagogy towards a broader range of pedagogies for L1, EFL and ESL contexts. Before the 1930s, the focus of teaching writing in Western countries (USA, UK) was primarily on first language (L1) writing approaches in native speakers' contexts. The rise of interest in teaching English as Second Language (ESL) writing started in the mid-twentieth century with the increase of the number of non-native speakers of English in the United States of America (USA) universities. Later on, the consideration of writing pedagogy for non-native speakers of English has been extended to the acquisition of English as a foreign language (EFL) considering that English use was growing tremendously (Matsuda, 2003).

The effort to create learning programmes for ESL and EFL students generated different approaches to teaching English as a foreign language. The audio-lingual method and oral approach, which were the main approaches to teaching English at the time, focused on the oral mastery of language but gave limited attention to writing (Bloomfield, 1942). The implications of these two approaches for writing, audio-lingual method and oral approach, made language teachers challenge them and propose other approaches specific to teaching writing namely controlled writing (which focuses on combining or substitution exercises), guided writing (which guides learners to write their sentences within a specific model to follow), and independent writing (which allows learners to write from in an independent perspective) (Matsuda, 2003).

EFL is distinct from ESL in terms of language use on a daily basis (Broughton et al. 1980). EFL refers to the use of English in school or other areas such as business and foreign relations where it (English) does not play an essential role in national or social life (for example the use of English in Japan, Spain, Brazil). ESL refers to the wide use of English by a local population for the purpose of living their daily life, and doing their daily social and professional activities (India, Nigeria, and South Africa). However, it is important to highlight that the distinction between EFL and ESL is not clear cut because of the complexity of the English language spread across the world/ globalization and political decisions that can change the EFL or the ESL situation at any time. Following this distinction between ESL and EFL, I will focus more on the

EFL context because the Rwandan linguistic landscape can be classified as an EFL context. The Rwandan primary school teachers and learners use Kinyarwanda as their common mother tongue and English does not play a central role in their social lives. This study examines how the approaches to teaching writing in EFL context enables development of writing for grade 4 learners.

Writing pedagogies in the EFL context have evolved since the World War II and can be grouped in the following periods:

1950s-1960s: During this period, writing was taught as a support skill for speaking activities because the *audio-lingual method*, which was the dominant method in EFL teaching, emphasized speech and not writing. Ellis (1997) states that behaviorism, the theory that audiolingualism is based on, views language as knowledge that involves habit formation and reinforcement. Habits are formed if the learner can respond to stimuli through positive reinforcements.

1970s-1980s: The dominant language teaching approach shifted from the imitation encouraged by behaviorism to the Communicative Language Teaching approach (CLT). This approach argues that language use involves negotiation of meaning and applies both to speech and writing. Therefore, teaching writing was intended to teach learners to communicate in real life by teaching them writing for real life such as letter writing, note taking, making lists, etc. (Scott, 1996).

1980s-1990s: The focus on proficiency oriented approaches to EFL teaching began with the publication of the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* in 1986. The guidelines rate proficiency in listening, speaking, reading and writing through four levels: Novice, Intermediate, Advanced and Superior. This document serves EFL assessment by establishing a grading system for evaluating students' proficiency (Scott, 1996). During this period, teachers in the EFL environment were focusing on developing students' command of grammar and syntax.

1990s-to present: Contrary to the proficiency-oriented practice that focuses on grammar, the 1990s approaches incorporate processes oriented to levels of proficiency (Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, and Superior). Hadley (1993) discusses activities that can help novice students to improve and achieve to an advanced level. The shift of focus was to

help students in their journey to move from the novice level to the advanced level. With regard to writing, some proposed activities are (1) making lists and completing open-ended sentences for the novice level students, (2) writing simple descriptions and narrations for the intermediate level students, (3) combining sentences and writing guided composition for the advanced-level students. Later on, free composition can be attained at the superior level. This process involves writing pedagogy that moves through controlled writing exercises, guided writing exercises to free production writing (Verster, 1996).

Apart from the above approaches, current studies suggest a method that takes account of various phenomena of the 21st century namely information technology and globalization. In their book, *Developing writers: Teaching and learning in the digital age,* Andrews & Smith (2011) discuss traditional theories/issues of writing pedagogy and changes in writing due to digital facilities. They suggest a new model of writing development that includes multimodal and digital age communication in the 21st century. Though the research focused on L1 writing issues and focused on developed countries where communication technology is advanced, this model is being considered in the EFL context. For instance, recent studies (Kramsch, 2013; Cook, 2013) argue that EFL teachers need to develop with the advent of globalization (media and global communication) and mobility of humans and goods that reflect the use of different codes, modes, culture, and style. They suggest building a model that can help EFL students develop local and global multilingual competence.

2.2 EFL writing pedagogy/development for children

Issues around developing writing pedagogy for young EFL learners are absent from many of the studies dealing with L2 writing. The reason the literature on L2 writing tends not to include reference to young EFL learners, in this case primary school children, is that many of the theories related to writing were judged too abstract for the learners (Elley, Barham, Lamb & Whyllie, 1976). According to Inhelder & Piaget (1958) the development of abstract thought and imagination begins at the age of 11 or 12 years. This concept gave rise to the recommendation by some researchers that abstract knowledge, such as grammatical knowledge and its implications for writing, should not be taught before the adolescent stage (Elley, Barham, Lamb & Whyllie, 1976). This was challenged by Vygotsky's theory of development, which acknowledges children's abilities to perform new things under adult guidance (Cole & Wertsch, 1996).

Empirical studies presented evidence that children can perform some cognitive tasks at earlier ages than Piaget suggested, including spatial reasoning (Blaut, 1991).

Earlier studies on children's writing in primary schools focused on distinguishing between the teaching/learning of first language writing skills (L1 writing) and the teaching/learning of second language writing skills (L2 writing). According to Brown (2001), writing was considered the same in L1 and L2 because writing requires specialized skills that neither native nor non-native speakers of English develop naturally. The fact that writing is not acquired naturally by L1 and L2 speakers would imply that both native speakers and non-native speakers of English share the same writing pedagogy process (Cameron, 2001). However, research in second language acquisition has illustrated the effect of mother tongue background on second language learning as the main factor for distinguishing L1 and L2 writing (Mackey, 2006). This was supported by evidence from empirical research on error analysis and identification in L2 writing. The findings indicated that most errors in L2 writing originate from mother tongue transfer to L2 composition (Ellis, 1997, Mackey, 2006).

The fact that the mother tongue of non-native speakers of English interferes in their L2 writing affected ESL/EFL writing pedagogy and made teachers adopt strategies to help eliminate mother tongue interference in L2 writing (Canagarajah, 2006). Various studies suggested controversial ways of attaining L2 writing proficiency for EFL learners. On the one hand, some suggested suppressing mother tongue grammar and discourse from the target language classroom (Yunlin & Xu, 2011). On the other hand, Kobayasha & Rinnert (2002), and later Dukin (2012) presented findings from an investigation of the effects of L1 background to second language writing (L2), which suggested that valuing children's home language does not affect L2 negatively but helps to improve writing and reading in the ESL/EFL classroom context.

Though this discussion of retaining or excluding L1 influence on L2 text production is currently ongoing, it does not respond specifically to the question of how teachers teach writing to young EFL learners. In order to answer this question, Hancock & McDonald (2000) have listed a number of strategies to improve the writing of young EFL learners:

- choosing topics that relate to learners' everyday life experience

- paying attention to the writing process by providing opportunities for learners to brainstorm, plan, draft and revise
- encouraging learners to consider their audience and share their written texts with the audience
- encouraging meaning making by paying attention to the language level of young learners (vocabulary, sentence structure, and discourse) and paying less attention to accuracy
- involving young learners in participating in writing processes, peer and self-editing, and considering ways of publishing, for instance on the wall, on the internet or in a magazine, thereby encouraging the development of their writing skills.

It is important to highlight that most of these strategies are equally applicable to L1 writing and seem to be drawn from process writing pedagogy. Also the idea of focusing on fluency rather than accuracy emerged from CLT.

As far as writing pedagogy for EFL young learners is concerned, scholars have adapted the 1980-1990s approaches to teaching writing (i.e teaching writing through levels: novice, intermediate, advanced and superior). This adaptation consists primarily of helping young learners to develop their writing gradually (Boscolo, 2008; Dahil & Farnan, 2008; Verster, 1996).Dahil & Farnan (2008) state that there are three grade levels that should inform writing pedagogy for young learners: primary, intermediate and middle schools. Then, they demonstrate that children's writing in school is "affected by the social and cultural contexts in which writing takes place and also by the classroom learning activities in which children participate" (Dahil & Farnan, 2008:23). This research provides an academic platform for understanding the development of young EFL learners' writing, which is the main focus of this study (grade 4 learners in Rwanda primary schools).

Furthermore, Dahil & Farnan (2008) recommend process writing approaches (providing learners with opportunities to draft and revise their writing) and teaching explicitly different text types (genre approach) that learners need to frame their ideas and experiences. Three dimensions have been suggested to respond to the challenge of the teaching of writing in primary school: continuity (with emphasis on making children progressively aware of their development steps as writers), complexity (that explains the cognitive complexity of writing through different levels of

processing capacity for a young learner), and social dimension (writing that relates to children's classroom and social life) (Boscolo, 2008).

From the same perspective, Cameron (2001) based her research on the notion of reading and writing as a social practice. She provides guidelines for making writing pedagogy effective such as, setting writing tasks with a clear audience and purpose in mind, giving authentic texts and supporting learners by using text from different genres, focusing on explaining text structure and its function in real life. She lists five steps to teaching young EFL learners:

1. Start from a meaningful context
2. Focus the pupils' attention on the unit and key features being taught
3. Give input: examples, rules, etc.
4. Provide varied practice
5. Give pupils opportunities to apply their new knowledge and skills in different, meaningful contexts.

These above steps are directed at English as foreign language learners and consider the literature on form focused work in context with meaningful practice exercises (Ellis. 1997). The literature on writing pedagogy for young EFL learners will be important in this study to answer the research question.

2.3 Debating writing pedagogy

In the late 1950s, debate on writing pedagogies was fiercely exchanged between form based teaching and meaning orientation. In 1957, B.F. Skinner introduced the behaviorist approach, arguing that learning is "habit formation". This influenced and resulted in viewing the teaching of writing as written product focused teaching. The product approach focused on mastery of the correct form and structures in writing. In the 1970s, scholars [Emig (1971); Murray (1978), Perl (1980) and Brutton (1978)] debated the value of a process approach versus a product approach to writing. Vivian Zamel (1976) argued that viewing writing as reproduction of correct form does not take account of the writing process itself and is based on a belief that a teaching methodology focused on correct form would improve writing. She, therefore, proposed that the emphasis should be on writing as a process of developing organization and meaning i.e writing as a process of developing ideas and meaning.

Larsen-Freeman (2003) recommends building a bridge between form and meaning so that students can see the connection between them. She found that most grammatical rules are memorized by learners and are not applied in writing, a phenomenon she calls the "inert knowledge problem". This is obvious when grammar teachers emphasise rules believing that knowledge of these will improve language use. The idea of linking grammar teaching to its use in the real world is central to the work of M.A.K. Haliday (1985b) and Debra Myhill (2009). According to Myhill (2009, 2005, 2010), explicit grammar should be taught for writing pedagogy in a meaningful way. She identifies three main principles: First, writing should be taught in a practical way such as through genres i.e structure and function of a text. Second, writing should be taught in classroom discussions to discover motivation for the use of grammatical structures. Third, writing should be taught considering language, culture, social context, values and beliefs of learners.

As far as writing pedagogy approaches are concerned, Mendelowitz (2005) integrated the process, socio-cultural and genre approaches to writing into one framework (memoir writing approach). It is worth noting that different approaches to writing pedagogy should be considered in relation to one another rather than representing them as opposed to each other. Moreover, Canagarajah (2006) has argued that writing pedagogies should be integrated and adapted to fit the sociocultural milieu of learners.

At present, the debate has shifted on writing pedagogy for Second/Foreign language. Almost all of the pedagogies were borrowed from monolingual contexts that are quite different from second/foreign language contexts (Canagarajah, 2007). These borrowed methodologies ignore second/foreign language social cultural contexts. Much research on writing in English in foreign contexts has revealed that teaching writing in EFL classes has inherited form focused approaches (You, 2005; Li, 2011; Makalela, 2009). Some scholars have found that these borrowed methodologies do not work in EFL contexts (Sapp, 2001; Canagarajah, 2007; You, 2005, Heugh, 2013).

Heugh (2013) claims that the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, which is a popular teaching approach nowadays, has failed to increase literacy in ESL/EFL learning

because its use does not consider the local context. To solve the problem, multilingual practices (code-mixing/code-switching and translanguaging) have been proposed to develop reading and writing (Garcio, 2009; Makalela, 2013; Heugh, 2013). On the other hand, Kumaradivelu (2003) insists that contextualisation is the core solution for language education. He argued in a detailed statement as follows:

> That is to say, language pedagogy, to be relevant, must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in sociocultural milieu. At its core, the idea of pedagogic particularity is consistent with the hermeneutic perspective of situational understanding, which claims that a meaningful pedagogy cannot be constructed without a holistic interpretation of particular situations and that it cannot be improved without a general improvement of those particular situations (pg.538-539).

Based on the above statements, it seems likely that the success of writing pedagogy depends on a range of factors, one of them being the contextualisation of the language teaching purpose in terms of learners' prior knowledge.

2.4 Hegemonic practices in the EFL textbooks

Over the past decades, many researchers (Chakava, 1992; Albtbach et al., 1991) have analysed textbooks to discover the relationship between developed countries, in which textbooks are produced, and developing counties, which are recipients of those textbooks. Those studies explained the hegemonic practices in EFL textbooks. In this research, I will examine whether hegemonic practice is still an issue in the EFL textbooks used in Rwandan grade 4 and if it has implications for the pedagogy embedded in the textbooks.

Developing countries are recipients not only of methodologies but also of textbooks that contain knowledge from developed countries. According to Kachru's (1991) framework, the Inner Circle (IC) countries produce knowledge that Outer Circle (OC) countries and Expanded Circle (EC) countries consume. These circles are divided according to the "nativeness" of English speakers in their respective countries. Populations that speak English as a native language are in the IC (U.K, USA, Australia, and Canada); speakers that use English as a Second language are in the OC

(Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, India, Singapore, Zambia, Philippines, etc) and speakers that use English as a foreign language are in the EC, Egypt, China, Korea, Japan, Taiwan, etc.

The hegemonic relationship began during the colonization period when English was employed for the anglicization of African countries. Language was therefore used as an ideological tool of power through British imperial policies (Makalela, 2005). After independence, English became an official language of many nations in Africa and was used as the medium of instruction. Therefore, textbooks in Expanded Circle (EC) countries are selected according to the language policy in place and depend on Inner Circle (IC) countries. Albatch & Rathberger (1980) stated that in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the publishing companies that control the textbook production industry belong to the Inner Circle (IC) countries mainly UK and USA. It has been argued that the publication of textbooks by multinational companies for Outer Circle (OC) and Expanded Circle (IC) countries has enormous disadvantages for Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), namely limited relevance to the socio-cultural context and reflection of language use in Inner Circle (IC) countries (Chakava, 1992).

Kachru's (1992) framework has been used in various studies conducted in Africa. Okonkwo (1988), in analysing the content of TEFL textbooks used in Nigeria, found that imported textbooks position an African child at a disadvantage and tend to represent him/her to look like a European child. This is a result of misrepresentation of African culture (OC & EC) and beautification of European life style (IC) as a model for Africans. He, therefore, recommends the inclusion of indigenous texts that respond to the needs and interests of local communities.

Chakavu (1992) studied the Kenyan publishing industry and the content of their published textbooks. He found that imported books, which are printed by multinational publishing houses, reflect more western culture than African culture and have limited local social content. He concluded that those textbooks contribute to the realization of IC countries dominance over African countries (OC & EC) and stated: "Unknowingly, the country found itself producing a new breed of black Europeans" (pg 133). This is supported by the fact that educational material frequently reached a larger audience than newspapers and that those audiences represent the future generation of each country (Keith, 1985; Albtbach et al., 1991).

The debate about how western ideologies dominate EFL textbooks should not be limited only to debate about westernized texts but should also consider the pedagogies involved in teaching (Canagarajah, 2007).This means that the debate should have a critical view of imported pedagogies from Inner Circle countries (mostly concern with L1 context) and investigate the pedagogies that can work in the context of L2 contexts with the emphasis on local socio-cultural milieu of the Outer and Expanded Circle (OC&EC) (Heugh, 2013; Kumaradivelu, 2003).It is in this context that I believe that my studies of ELT textbooks used in Rwandan primary education in relation to writing pedagogy may contribute to better practice of ELT in Rwanda. Much of the existing research on writing in Rwanda emphasises writing at university level (Sibomana, 2010; Nyiratunga, 2007) and does not explore the foundation of writing issues. This study therefore has the potential to make a contribution to this under-researched area and to the development of more appropriate writing pedagogies in Rwandan textbooks used in the upper primary level. This study focuses on examining the writing pedagogies embedded in ELT textbooks in the framework of IC and EC relationships.

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH PROCEDURES

3.1 Introduction

Methods most commonly used to analyze textbooks are: impressionistic, checklist, and the in depth-method (MacGrath, 2002). Although each of these methods is used and is helpful for analysis, they all have limitations regarding textbook analysis as a pedagogic device which is the focus of this study. In terms of analyzing textbooks as a teaching aid, the in-depth method for analyzing language teaching materials is the only method that addresses both the content and methodology of teaching English. The in-depth methodology has been expanded and developed by Andrew Littlejohn (1998) to an analytical framework that provides a method of analysis of textbooks as an aid to teaching English as a foreign language. Out of the three methods mentioned so far (impressionistic, checklist, and in depth-method), I chose to use the in-depth methodology as an analytical framework. This analytical framework fits my research context because Rwanda is one of the African countries where English is used as a foreign language. In

addition, the framework works well with my intention to analyze writing pedagogy embedded in the three textbooks used in Rwanda.

However the analytical textbook developed by Andrew Littlejohn (1998) does not provide a research procedure for data collection, specifically sampling and coding. To overcome this limitation, qualitative content analysis will be used to collect data and determine a sample for this study. It will also help me to categorize content for analysis. The qualitative content analysis has been used widely to study the content of texts, which matches with the objectives of this study that include the writing content and methodology embedded in the three textbooks. This chapter begins with a brief description of each method for data collection and analysis; it will be followed by design steps and present findings of the study to be discussed in this chapter.

3.2 Methods to analyze textbooks

3.2.1 Impressionistic

The impressionistic method for analyzing a textbook focuses on general impressions of the textbook i.e the effect produced by the presentation and organization of the textbook. According to Stervick (cited in McGrath, 2002: 25-26) the impressionistic analysis includes checking the clarity of organization and presentation of a textbook, learnability, transparent opportunity for language use, use of images, and attractiveness of a text. The impressionistic method for analyzing textbooks is limited to the appearance of a textbook and never analyses the content. In addition, it is difficult to agree on an impression of a textbook because an impression in general depends on particular preference.

3.2.2 Checklist

The checklist method for analyzing a textbook consists of identification of a list of items that should be contained in the textbook, and examines the textbook to see if it contains the items required. The checklist method for analyzing a textbook includes two main parts: identification of elements required in the content of a textbook and the comparison of the content of a textbook with a checklist (Lee, 2003). This method is easy to do because a researcher checks and ticks elements present or absent in a given textbook while analyzing a textbook. However, the

checklist method does not analyze content in depth to discover the meaning of texts and the assumptions which lie behind them, which is very important in terms of textbook analysis.

3.2.3 In-depth method

The in-depth method for analyzing textbooks encompasses items such as aims, organization, content, learners' needs, teachers' needs, and teaching devices for English Language Teaching (ELT). In other words, the in-depth method deals with teaching and learning approaches contained in a textbook and considers the context in which learning and teaching is happening (Lee, 2003). This method was established due to criticisms of the impressionistic and checklist methods. Both impressionistic and checklist methods were criticized for making general "impressionistic judgments" on textbooks (in the case of the impressionistic method) or making assumptions about what a "desirable" textbook should look like (check list method) (Littlejohn, 1998). Contrary to the previous methods, the in-depth method covers the whole content of a textbook and examines its organization and presentation.

The in-depth method was used as an appropriate analytic framework as it facilitates a systematic and comprehensive analysis of the pedagogy of a textbook. The analytical framework focuses especially on the analysis of a textbook as a pedagogic device which is the main objectives of this study.

3.3 Analytical framework for textbook analysis

Andrew Littlejohn, in his chapter on the analysis of language teaching materials: "Inside the Trojan horse" published in *Materials Development in Language Teaching*, provides a specific use of his textbook analysis framework. Even though a number of frameworks existed before the establishment of the in-depth method (Cunningsworth, 1984; Nunan, 1991; Harmer, 1991, Richards & Rodgers, 1986), Littlejohn (1998) explains that those frameworks do not guide a researcher to analyze the content of a textbook and the way it is mediated through the pages of the textbook. Then, he provides a general framework for analyzing language teaching materials that specifies the aspect of teaching language materials to be examined and the way they can be analyzed.

Concerning the aspects of a textbook that should be examined, Littlejohn (1998), focuses on analyzing language teaching materials as a "pedagogic device" i.e an aid to teaching and learning a foreign language. Therefore, this analytical framework does not examine other aspects of language teaching materials such as layout, pricing, the quality of paper and binding, but instead, this analytical framework is limited to the content and methodology used in language teaching materials. This analytical framework will help me to focus on analyzing approaches to teaching writing in three ELT textbooks for grade 4 learners in Rwandan primary schools.

Littlejohn (1998) provides three steps for analyzing content and methodology used in language teaching materials: the published form of the language teaching material, the content design of the teaching material, and the implication of content and methodology for a particular teaching context.

Figure 1: Levels of analysis of language teaching materials (Littlejohn, 1998: 195)

1. 'WHAT IS THERE'
   - statements of descriptions
   - physical aspects of the materials
   - main steps instructional sections

2. 'WHAT IS REQUIRED OF USERS'
   - subdivision into constituent tasks
   - an analysis of tasks: what is the learner expected to do? with whom? with what content? who determines these things?

3. 'WHAT IS IMPLIED'
   - deducing aims, principles of selection and sequence
   - deducing teacher and learner roles
   - deducing demands on learner's process competence

The first step, the published form of a language teaching material, consists of examining the explicit nature of teaching materials including the publication date, the publication house, the organization of content, number of pages, content list, and type of material. The first step of analyzing language teaching materials responds to the question: What is there? (See figure 1 above). The question can be interpreted as what content is included in the language teaching material.

The second step refers to an analysis of tasks given to students considering the question: What is required of the users? In other words, the question is: What is a learner required to do with whom and with what content? The analysis of tasks entails three aspects: process, classroom participation (individual, pairs, and group work), and content focus (form or meaning). A look at the task requirement process allows a researcher to discover what a learner is required to do using language supplied or not supplied (content). For instance a learner can be requested to repeat or deduce from rules. In terms of analyzing approaches for teaching writing, I will be ascertaining whether a learner is asked to use content supplied by a textbook (e.g.: drills) or if he is required to initiate using language not supplied (e.g.: free production practice versus controlled writing). By means of literature pertaining to teaching writing approaches, I will be able to determine the writing approaches embedded in each textbook as well as the level of cognitive challenge.

The third step reviews the findings of the previous steps, namely the description of the explicit nature of the material (step 1) and the analysis of tasks (step 2) to reach a conclusion regarding the implication of the language teaching material. The third step makes an overall analysis of the apparent underlying principles of the material by examining the aim of the materials and the basis of selecting and sequencing both tasks and content (Littlejohn, 1998). At this stage, the learners' role as well as the teachers' role are examined focusing on the role of the materials as a whole in facilitating language learning and teaching. The analysis concludes with relating the findings to teaching contexts.

3.4 Data collection

Collection of data was done following a content analysis approach. According to Frey et al. (1999), the content analysis approach is a data gathering process in which a researcher collects recorded or visual messages in order to describe the content, structure, and functions of the messages contained in a text. Weber (1985) defined content analysis as a research technique that uses a set of procedures for making valid inferences from text. As far as this study is concerned, the actual message of the textbooks is the subject of analysis, although senders (writers of the three textbook) and audience (learners and teachers) are discussed.

Content analysis is defined as the qualitative or quantitative perspective of data collection and analysis. Quantitative content analysis is defined by Berelson (1953) as the "quantitative description of the manifest content of a text" (34); and Holsti (1968) and Fry et al. (1999) define qualitative content analysis as an analysis of meaning characteristics embedded in a text. As far as this study is concerned, qualitative content analysis is used to collect and analyze data related to writing pedagogy embedded in ELT textbooks used in Rwandan grade 4 primary education.

Concerning the content analysis method, it helps to select texts which are related to the research questions and the nature of the research. Thus, texts to be analyzed are selected according to their relevance to textbooks that will generate insight to research questions. In that regard, Scott (2009) outlines guidelines for selecting relevant corpus through the content analysis approach as follows:

> In content analysis, texts inform analysts' questions and so must be sampled from the population of texts that can be informative in this sense. A text is relevant if there is evidence for or assumptions of stable correlations between that text and answers to the research question. (pg.347)

In this study, texts are selected following the research questions indicated in chapter one, which focus on the analysis of approaches to teaching writing in three English Language Teaching (ELT) textbooks designed for grade 4 learners in Rwandan primary schools.

3.4.1 Selection of textbooks for analysis

This study is based on a purposive selection of textbooks that have been approved by the Ministry of Education of the government of Rwanda, and which are currently used in public as well as private primary schools in Rwanda. Three English Language Teaching (ELT) textbooks for grade 4 learners used in Rwandan primary schools are the subjects to be examined throughout this study. Those textbooks are: *New progressive Primary English 4*, published by Oxford University Press (OUP) in 2010; *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* published by Longman in 2010; and *Keynote English primary 4*, published by Longhorn publishers in 2010. However, it is worth noting that more textbooks are available for teaching English in Rwanda but only three

textbooks are recommended for learning and teaching English in Rwandan primary schools. More details about the three aforementioned textbooks and their organization are explained below.

3.4.2 Organization of the textbooks

a) New progressive Primary English 4

New Progressive Primary English 4 is a 92 page textbook published in 2010 by the Oxford University Press (OUP), which operates under the University of Oxford in the United Kingdom (UK). This textbook was written by Gaburiyeli Ibambasi and Ben Rutsinga; unfortunately, the biographies of the writers are not mentioned and it is difficult to judge their expertise in textbook writing or teaching English as a second/foreign language as far as audiences are concerned. It is also difficult to tell whether they are local Rwandans or not. The textbook uses six colours (green, yellow, white, red, pink, and black); chapter headings, titles and subtitles are in one of the six colours with the main text in black. Pictures and illustrations are in colour. In terms of organizing principle, this textbook is organized thematically i.e each chapter has a specific theme/ topic such as a thief in the ward, Uwanziga's birthday (see appendix 2).

The *New Progressive Primary English 4* is divided into 21 sections; each section is subdivided into the following 6 units:

1. Listening and speaking: consisting of a set of pre-reading activities
2. Reading: a text followed by comprehension questions
3. Word power: a set of vocabulary items, exercises such as word games, crosswords, substitution exercises, matching words, multiple questions, and a word puzzle.
4. Language practices: consisting of grammar teaching focusing on form followed by exercises.
5. Fun spot: a compilation of jokes and fun stories.
6. Write on: writing tasks which are connected to a reading theme.

b) New primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)

New primary English (pupils' book for grade 4) is a 132 page textbook published in 2010 by Longman. Longman is a United Kingdom publishing company owned by Pearson Education Limited. Thus, Longman is mentioned as a part of Pearson. The textbook was written by Emmanuel Murenzi and James Lyagoba. As with the previous textbook, a biography of the writers is not mentioned; this makes it difficult to examine their expertise in textbook writing and

teaching English as a second/foreign language. It is a book which uses nine colours; chapter headings (blue, white, black, dark, green, red, orange, pink, and grey), titles and sub-titles are highlighted in one of the nine colours with the main text in black. The pictures and illustrations are in colour too.

Content of the *New primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* is divided into 22 units following grammatical aspects as the content organization principle. Each unit is subdivided into various sections which focus on the form and structure of parts of speech. This is then followed by a text illustrating the practice of one part of speech introduced previously and concludes with a writing task. The writing tasks consist of the practice of a grammatical aspect learned and practised in that unit.

c) Keynote English primary 4

Keynote English primary 4 is a textbook of 103 pages published in 2010 by Longhorn publishers. Longhorn publishers is a Kenyan publishing house originally from the United Kingdom (UK). Two writers, Alice Ariho and Olivia Abigaba, are mentioned as experienced and qualified teachers of English but no details about their expertise are provided. It is a book which uses eight colours (yellow, white, orange, black, purple, red, blue, and khaki); chapter headings, titles and sub-titles are in red with the main text in black. The pictures and illustrations are in colour.

The *Keynote English primary 4* content is divided into 7 units according to grammatical aspects (content organization principle). Those sections are subdivided, with each mini section incorporating the traditional teaching of grammar steps: introduction and explanation of a particular part of speech form with illustration. This is followed by exercises emphasizing testing the mastery of the structure of grammatical patterns; thereafter a text is provided for reading and the unit ends with writing exercises.

3.4.3 Sampling of pages and units of analysis

Due to excessive activities for teaching writing contained in the three textbooks and time constraints for this study, I selected specific pages/ sections from each textbook for analysis. The length of the three textbooks, 327 total pages, cannot be analyzed in-depth without a purposive

sampling considering time constraints and the nature of this study. Thus, I have found it useful to analyze 10% of the total pages from the three textbooks, as a number of authors have used 10% as a convenient sample for language teaching materials analysis (Wang, 1998; Littlejohn, 1998). A number of pages were selected from three units in each textbook (the first unit at the beginning of each textbook, the unit in the middle and the last unit). Concerning content analysis, once the choice of topic and definition of the research questions has been decided upon the next step is selecting appropriate content to be analyzed. The selected content was located and presented in detail (see 3.4.1).

Table 2: Calculation of 10% sample pages from the three textbooks

Textbook	**Total number of pages**	**10% sample pages**
New Progressive Primary English 4	92	9 pages
New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)	132	13 pages
Keynote English primary 4	103	10 pages
Total number of pages	**327**	**32 pages**

3.4.4 Developing content categories

Guided by the research questions and qualitative content analysis, I constructed categories in which "content [is] coded for analysis" (Prasad, 2008). According to Prasad (2008) developing categories to classify the body of a text is important because it helps a researcher to respond to the research question raised before considering data in place. In this study, content was classified in the following twelve different categories considering content with regard to teaching writing in the three textbooks:

- Teaching writing approaches
- Types of writing activities (guided writing, free production, gap filling)
- Sequencing activities (how activities are sequenced)
- Teacher's role as mediator of teaching writing activities
- Learners' role (active learning)
- Textbook's role (mediation of writing knowledge)

- Interaction (between learner and learner; learner and teacher, between learner and other stakeholders)
- Integration of skills (Reading and writing, grammar and writing, listening and writing, speaking and writing)
- Link between grammar and writing development
- Link between task presentation and socio-cultural identities (Teacher's/learners')
- Link between task presentation and learner prior knowledge
- Expectation regarding the learner (teacher).

After identification of the above content categories developed for this study, 32 pages which constitute 10% of the three textbooks were chosen as units of analysis because they contain information pertinent to this study and represent the rest of the pages in the three textbooks. In order to analyze a textbook as a pedagogical aid, categories were grouped following in-depth levels of analysis. Then the categories were analyzed following analytical framework set for this study.

3.5 Data analysis

After collecting data, which includes selecting relevant corpus using the qualitative content analysis method, I proceeded with data analysis which was guided by the in-depth method (Littlejohn, 1998) referred to above. It is relevant to note that the in-depth method consists of analyzing a textbook as a "pedagogic device" i.e. an aid to teaching and learning a foreign language (Littlejohn, 1998, Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Thus the analysis included content and methodology for teaching writing, entrenched in the ELT textbooks for grade 4, Rwandan primary school.

The in-depth method for analyzing textbooks includes 3 steps for analysis: presentation of the organization of a textbook and details on publication, analysis of tasks given to learners, and the implications for the teaching and learning context drawn from the findings (Littlejohn, 1998). The first step for the in-depth method consists of looking at content organization and physical aspects of a textbook such as subdivision into sections, accessibility (content lists, word lists, indexes), and form of materials (durable, consumable worksheets). The second step considers the design of a textbook - the tasks given to learners, content provided for accomplishing a given task, focus of the content, and the process competence involved in accomplishing a given task. This step also

considers participation suggested by a textbook (individual, peer work, in a group). The third step will draw on findings to discuss the implications of the textbooks for teaching writing in Rwandan primary schools. Finally I will review the research procedure to respond to research questions of this study.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the research results from analyzing the three textbooks and discusses findings in relation to literature on writing pedagogy with specific focus on the EFL context. This chapter is divided into five parts. The first part introduces a summary presentation of findings. Part two addresses teaching writing approaches embedded in the three textbooks. The third part discusses teaching grammar in relation to writing and part four presents the integration of skills into writing tasks. The last part concludes with assessing the implications for Rwandan primary school teachers and learners of the approaches to writing pedagogy embedded in the three ELT textbooks.

4.2 Summary presentation of findings

With the aim of responding to the research questions, writing activities in each book were selected for analysis. The writing activities were selected following the organization of the textbooks presented earlier in chapter III (data collection section) by focusing specifically on the content of the relevant tasks related to teaching writing plus the integration of the four language skills. Teaching writing activities were selected from the beginning, the middle and the end of each of the three ELT textbooks. This amounted to roughly 10% of the activities in each textbook. The analysis was done based on the three level analytical framework suggested by Littlejohn (1998). In the first stage, the analysis of the three textbooks revealed that two of the three, *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* and *Keynote English Primary 4*, are organised around grammatical aspects; but the remaining textbook, *New Progressive Primary English 4*, follows a thematic organisation principle. The textbooks are divided into chapters and units. All the three textbooks include reading, writing, listening skills and grammar. The description of the textbooks has pointed out also that the three textbooks use multiple colours to delineate information (green, blue, orange, red, white, pink, and yellow) with the main texts in black. (See details on 3.4.2). The following is the analysis of writing tasks and activities contained in the three textbooks.

4.2. 1 New Progressive Primary English 4

In this textbook, *New Progressive Primary English 4*, nine pages covering writing activities and content preceding the writing tasks are selected for analysis (see appendix 2). In the selected writing activities, learners were required to imitate and reproduce a text. Starting with the writing activity in unit 1 (Appendix 2), learners are required to imitate a given poster in the textbook and produce a similar text but with a different topic and they are requested to complete sentences by filling in gaps. Then, in the writing activity in unit 11 (Appendix 2), learners are required to tell a personal past experience and write it as a composition. This textbook links reading texts with the comprehension and writing task. Here oral storytelling is treated as pre-writing activity (oral task). Lastly in the writing activities on page 89: unit 20, learners are requested to write about their most interesting day in Grade 4 (which is Primary 4 in Rwandan education system).

The narratives presented in this textbook are illustrated by visual images and photographs. The visual images presented in this textbook can be classified in two groups: the narrative presentation and the conceptual images. This categorization of images is based on Kress and Van Leeuwen's (1996) *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design.* According to them there are two types of representational structure, the narrative and the conceptual. The narrative representation consists of images that show participants in movement position and the conceptual representation show participants in stable position. In this textbook, the narrative presentation was used to illustrate narratives (contained in this textbook) and conceptual presentation was used to display some vocabulary items (example in appendix 2).

As far as photographs are concerned, the *New Progressive Primary English 4* containsa number of photographs which are difficult to analyze. Photographs are normally difficult to analyze because they are assumed by viewers to be the true representation of the whole truth (Janks et al., 2014). However, studies on visual literacy (Janks et al., 2014) urge viewers to question photographs, considering their context, the way they are presented and the way they position viewers. In this textbook, photographs were taken to emphasise local context as they display local practices such as local ways of dressing and local ways of doing/being (Appendix 2). As is required, all photographs were taken with permission of the owners. Most of the activities were about asking learners to look at the photographs and produce a text describing people or activities shown in the photographs.

These writing activities require learners to produce a text by imitating a given model or respecting the indicated writing genre such as letter writing or composition. But learners are not coached in understanding the affordances, requirements, or social uses of the various writing genres that they are asked to write in. For instance, the textbook does neither explain the structure of the advertisement, nor the language that an advertisement, as genre, foregrounds. This may lead to students copying the given model rather than producing a new advertisement as they do not have access to a language and a structure needed for advertisement. It is interesting to mention that completing sentences by filling gaps is the most frequent type of exercise through the whole textbook (see appendix 2). As far as participation is concerned, learners are requested to complete the writing task alone and collaboration is only utilized for oral narration as a pre-writing activity. Although this textbook is thematic, more engaging and holistic than the other two, the focus is still mainly on gap filling.

4.2.2 New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)

New primary English (pupils' book for grade 4) is designed following various grammatical aspects and writing is treated as evaluation for grammatical structure to be mastered. Through 13 pages covering writing activities (see appendix 4) learners are required to write sentences which prove that they have understood grammatical patterns introduced earlier. Sometimes learners are given patterns to follow; for example, they are asked to write what they do during a weekend using subordinate clauses of time (Unit 22: pg. 123) or to fill in blanks for uncompleted sentences that introduce a certain aspect of grammar (Unit 1: pg. 6 and Unit 11: pg. 66). All the writing activities focus on grammatical form and request learners to memorize rules for later application. In this textbook, writing action is treated as an individual task because learners are not invited to collaborate with peers or in groups (see appendix 4).

This textbook uses narrative and reading texts to illustrate the use of a particular part of speech and its grammatical application in an extended written passage. For instance, on page 11 the reading is about the description of two houses, one traditional and one modern. The text is full of nouns to illustrate different types of nouns. As the textbook is organized around grammatical aspects, most of the texts are made to illustrate a particular grammatical form. Thus, all texts are made up for grammar teaching purposes. This helps writers to illustrate the use of grammatical forms in a text but makes reading boring and unrelated to any real life context.

The visual images used in this textbook fall into the same two categories (narrative and conceptual images) as those in the previous textbook. However, narrative images (participants in movement position) are used more than conceptual images (participants in stable position). A possible reason this textbook does not use more conceptual images might be that it does not place emphasis on teaching vocabulary items. In addition very few photographs are used in this textbook. This might indicate that the textbook does not have much variety in terms of the use of visual images which might make their presentation boring.

4.2.3 Keynote English Primary 4

Writing activities that are designed in *Keynote English Primary 4* are mainly focused on applying grammatical rules to composition. Writing activities (see appendix 6) request learners to focus on grammatical form while filling in gaps in uncompleted sentences (Unit 1 and Unit 7) or making correct sentences from the unstructured given sentences (Unit 4 and Unit 7). Once a learner has mastered grammatical patterns, it is easier to copy and paste words for making sentences or filling in blanks. This textbook requires learners to perform writing activities alone.

The *keynote English Primary 4* is organized around grammatical aspects (Nouns, Pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, connectives, verbs, and clauses). It sacrifices storytelling and visual images for illustration of grammatical forms only and other language skills are not integrated in the textbook. Compared to the previous textbooks, the reading texts contained in this textbook are dull because they are made only to illustrate grammatical forms. The reading texts are de-contextualized from the real world as they are artificially constructed for illustrating a certain part of speech. Most of the visual images are static (conceptual images) and they represent rural images which imply the exclusion of the urban context. No photographs are included in this textbook which makes it limited as far as variety is concerned. This textbook treats writing as an afterthought with only brief instruction and without any scaffolding. The implications of considering writing as such in such a way will be discussed further in the following sections.

4.2.4 Teachers' guides of each of the three pupils' textbooks

Though the analysis of the teacher's guide is not the focus of this study, a look at it provides insight into the underlying pedagogical beliefs and values of the authors and the publishers. A teacher's guide is expected to help teachers to mediate knowledge they find in pupils' textbooks to learners. This section provides a summary of the analytical description of the teachers' guide and their comparison.

The format and arrangement of materials in the pupils' textbook conform to that of the teacher's guide. Each of the three textbooks has a teacher's guide with the same title and publishers. They provide more explanation to teachers on how to teach every topic and activity in the pupils' textbooks. The learning objectives contained in the three teachers' guides relate to the mastery of grammatical aspects and the overall objectives are to use correct English (see appendix 7). The teachers' guides refer a teacher to the pupil's textbook in order to help the learner to accomplish writing tasks. All three teachers' guides are organized in the same units as the pupils' textbooks but the teachers' guide contain only the guidance that a teacher should provide to learners. This makes the teachers' guide shorter in terms of pages compared to the pupils' textbooks.

The difference between the three teachers' guides is an introductory part which is present in each. For instance, the introductory part of the teacher's guide of *the New Progressive Primary English 4* focuses on explaining the teaching of each of the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) plus grammar. The teacher's guide of the *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* extends the teaching of the four language skills to the general teaching procedures, classroom organisation, types of assessment and lesson plan templates (see appendix 7). Lastly, the introductory part of the teacher's guide of the *Keynote English Primary 4* provides general objectives emphasising the use of correct English (See appendix 7); assessment guidelines, and advice on classroom arrangement.

In addition, it is important to highlight that the above observation of the teachers' guide, while analysing pupils' textbooks, helps to provide a clear pedagogical basis for examining the treatment of writing pedagogy in the three textbooks. This is supported by the role of teachers' guide which is to provide pedagogical guidance for the users of the textbooks (teachers in this

context). Moreover, this helps the analysis to be fair to the authors/publishers of the textbooks because it considers bothavailable textbooks as well as pedagogical guidance, while using the textbooks, provided by the publishers.

4.3 Teaching writing approaches embedded in the three textbooks

The analysis of the three textbooks' writing tasks revealed that the product approach to writing is a common approach embedded into the three textbooks; however it is worth noting that writing pedagogy is addressed differently in the three ELT textbooks used in Rwandan primary schools. The three textbooks' writing activities encompass writing activities which focus on grammatically correct forms as the end product; activities in classroom are mainly copying and imitation, filling in gaps and expanding sentences to paragraphs following given models. These activities match with the characteristics Zamel (1976), Nunan (1989) and Li (2005) ascribe to the product approach to writing. Analysis of the three textbooks' writing tasks shows that even though the three textbooks promote writing as a product nevertheless writing in each textbook has been addressed differently.

Starting from *New Progressive Primary English 4*, writing tasks are based on three main activities: completing sentences by filling in gaps, imitation of a given model and writing a composition about past experiences. These types of activities focus on the correct form of words, sentences and texts because instructions given in the textbook emphasize the use of provided model. For instance, most writing instructions contain sentences such as "use the correct form", "replace with the correct word", "match A and B to form correct sentences" and many more that show the emphasis on the correct form (see appendix 2).

Writing tasks covered in this textbook (*New Progressive Primary English 4*) reflect three approaches to teaching writing in the English as Foreign Language (EFL) context: controlled writing exercises, guided writing exercises, and free production writing. According to Verster (1996) the controlled writing exercises include writing exercises that help learners to manipulate what has been written or chosen from a number of options which have been given to them according to a given pattern. In this textbook, the controlled writing exercises are mainly covered

from the first unit to the last unit: jumbled sentences (see appendix 2) jumbled paragraphs, passages with missing words. On the other hand, this textbook offers few guided writing exercises, compared to the many controlled writing exercises, namely using pictures, answering questions and reporting on a given topic following a specific pattern (see appendix 2).

Moreover, the textbook provides very few free production texts such as telling about past experiences, and writing about their memories (see appendix 2). The idea of giving learners the opportunity to tell their stories, and their past experiences is important according to existing literature on writing development (Hidi & Boscolo, 2006). Mendelowitz (2005), in examining the relevance of students' memoirs on the process of writing development in South Africa, demonstrated that the writing of memoirs enhances writing skills. Though the context was different from this study but the idea is relevant.

However, this textbook explores the writing of past experiences but in limited steps. The textbook requires learners to draw on past experiences that relate mainly to school contexts, in other words, it does not creates space for the learners' out of school/home experiences and linguistic resources in the classroom. Thus, learners should be given the opportunity to express themselves through writing. For instance Swain et al. (2011) reiterate that one of the ways to help non-native speakers of English to practice writing is to let them tell stories in their home language and then translate them into English. More arguments on this point are developed in section 4.6.2.

The *New Progressive Primary English 4* contains writing exercises that match with types of writing tasks recommended by researchers (Hadley, 1993; Matsuda, 2003) to help learners in a foreign language learning environment such as Rwanda, to develop writing skills. The textbook is organized according to thematic content and writing tasks are gradually presented (see appendix 1). However, although the exercises are logically sequenced, they are not well scaffolded to teach learners how to write specific genres.

I consider the writing exercises covered in this textbook coherent because the themes and writing tasks are logically connected by shared themes. Yet, they are not scaffolded because they are not

provided with a coherent framework (genre convention) that offers learners step by step guidance in developing their writing skills. For instance, on page 17, learners were requested to write a letter without any introduction to letter writing such as an explanation of the letter writing genre, formal or informal use of language used in letter writing. Similarly, learners are requested to write minutes and write a story by interpreting pictures without adequate preparation in the relevant genre. Wessels (2007) suggests that in order to develop young learners' writing, you need to provide step by step guidance because the process of learning to write needs to be scaffolded.

The writing activities of the second textbook, *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)*, have been analyzed and the findings reveal that it also focuses on writing as product. The material in which the product approach to writing is embedded requires learners to produce an end product free from grammatical errors and provides tasks that involve expanding sentences following a given model (Nunan, 1989). This textbook illustrates a product approach to writing through the following writing activities: filling in gaps, completing uncompleted sentences, writing a sentence following grammatical patterns, answering questions by constructing a sentence or by filling gaps in the answered sentences.

The above writing activities can be classified into two EFL writing approaches: Controlled writing and guided writing. On the one hand, controlled and guided writing is advocated to help learners make fewer mistakes and master certain models such as sentence structures and text organization. On the other hand, controlled writing exercises are criticized for dis-empowering learners because they do not own the ideas they write about and view writing as a mechanical activity. In addition, controlled writing and guided writing tasks do not relate to real life written communication and learners find them boring and meaningless in terms of communication (Verster, 1996). This textbook promotes the kind of writing pedagogy that trains a learner to follow a given model in controlled writing or to develop a certain topic with some hints (Andrews, 2005) rather than training a learner to make meaning while writing (Myhill, 2010).

This paradigm focusing on form/structure versus meaning making raises an issue of what is appropriate for learners (the focus on form/structure versus meaning making) studying English as

a Foreign Language (EFL). More discussion about form/structure versus meaning making in writing will be considered in section 4.4. In this discussion, I support the arguments that both the focus on form/structure and meaning making are necessary to develop writing in EFL context (Larseen-Freeman, 2003, Myhill, 2010) and a textbook for teaching English in a foreign language environment should help learners to realize the link between the patterns of English language and meaning in real world communication. Concerning the three textbooks analysed in this study, I would say that the *New Progressive Primary English 4* has the best balance (in this regard) compared to the other two textbooks (New primary English, pupils 'book for grade 4 and Keynote English primary 4).

The third textbook, *Keynote English Primary 4*, focuses mostly on the controlled writing approach which is characterized mainly by passages with missing words. The controlled writing exercises covered in this textbooks focus on grammatical patterns, namely identifying the right word to fill gaps according to the required part of speech, and forming correct sentences following a given pattern. The writing exercises covered in this textbook suggest that teaching grammatical patterns is enough for developing younger learners of EFL as writers. However, this has been dismissed by empirical research conducted by Larsen-Freeman (2003). She found that learners who have been taught to focus on correct form do not apply those rules in writing, because they do not see the connection between form and meaning (see more discussions on teaching grammar in relation to writing in section 2.4).

Moreover, as discussed in the literature section, the controlled writing exercises are designed for EFL novice writers (Hadley, 1993; Scott, 1996; Boscolo, 2008) which is appropriate for the Rwandan primary schools context. These basic writing exercises are supportive for younger EFL learners because they help learners to make fewer mistakes and also they probably do not have yet enough knowledge of the structure of sentences to generate extended writing. However, if younger EFL learners are not given opportunities to generate their own writing and their own ideas, not only for grammatical patterns memorization but also for meaning making, this will prohibit their sense of writing as a medium of expression and communication. According to Verster (1996), teachers (or textbooks in this case) should move their learners from controlled to guided and free writing as soon as possible. What is absent in this text book is movement from

controlled to free writing, progress from novice to intermediate level, and from manipulating other people's writing to generating one's own writing.

The three textbooks promote writing as a product rather than a process which implies a focus on producing a correct text. This again raises the debate between teaching writing as product focused versus process focussed, two separate writing pedagogies, as mentioned in the previous literature review chapter. The product approach to writing has been criticized by those who advocate a process approach to writing, who suggest that making writing more mechanical does not contribute to real communication (Emig, 1971; Murray, 1978). The fact that the product approach to teaching writing is intense in the three textbooks used in Rwandan primary schools, confirms the previous claim that EFL teaching has inherited the correct form based approach which does not help EFL learners to develop their writing (You, 2005; Li, 2011; Makalela, 2009).

Recent research on this issue suggests synthesizing both product approach and processapproach to writing to maximize the advantages of both and with each redressing the limitations of the other (Myhill, 2010). However, the three textbooks focus mostly on teaching writing as a product and do neither enable nor encourage young EFL learners to make meaning (Zamel, 1976). Based on these findings, I would suggest that textbook writers should balance both approaches.

The fact that the three textbooks differ in their approach to the teaching of writing may raise an issue regarding selection of textbooks to be used in Rwandan primary schools and may result in unequal access to writing skills. For instance, if a teacher were to select the textbook *New Progressive Primary English 4*, which contains coherent writing exercises, from controlled writing to free writing, his/her writing lessons would be different to those of another teacher who selected the textbook *Keynote English Primary 4* (Which contains almost all controlled writing exercises and grammar related content). Thus, the three textbooks may be more/less suitable in specific contexts.

4.4 Teaching grammar in relation to writing

The three textbooks analyzed in this study reveal that the textbooks assume that grammar is the main focus element in English language teaching for young EFL learners. Two of the three textbooks' content, *Keynote English Primary 4* and *New Primary English,* is organized following grammatical parts of speech (see section 1.3.2). The remaining textbook, *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)*, also includes a grammar lesson section in each and every unit. It is clear that only grammar is taught explicitly in the three textbooks, compared to the teaching of other language skills. Each of the three textbooks provide definitions of each part of speech, explain form and structure and invite students to apply the given grammatical patterns in various exercises. This section discusses the teaching of grammar in relation to writing. It first assesses the kind of grammar teaching included in the three textbooks and evaluates whether or not it can help learners to develop their writing.

The organisation and content of the three textbooks illustrates that the teaching of grammar is central therein. The *Keynote English Primary 4* and *New Primary English* are organized according to parts of speech, namely nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions and verbs. The contents of the two textbooks are aimed at explaining and testing grammatical patterns. However, it is important to highlight that the two textbooks also cover content in reading and oral skills. In the remaining textbook, New Progressive Primary English 4, content is not organized around grammatical patterns (it is organized according to a number of themes) but the teaching of grammar is far more predominant than the teaching of other language skills (listening and speaking, reading, vocabulary and writing).

Given that the teaching of grammar is the main point in two of the textbooks, and grammar lessons are presented in the other textbook, this suggests that the writers of the three textbooks believe that teaching grammar plays an important role in teaching language in the /an EFL context (i.e the mastery of a language is about structure and meaning is not foregrounded). Makalela (2009) explains, the teaching of grammar is believed to be effective in teaching English in a context where English is taught as a second language (i.e the mastery of a language is about structure and meaning is not foregrounded enough). Other researchers, namely Ellis (1997), Halliday (1985b), Larseen- Freeman (2003), and Myhill, (2010) support the teaching of

grammar but raise the question of which grammar should be taught and also how it should be taught in order to benefit the development of writing.

The literature pertaining to how grammar ought to be taught falls into two different camps: traditional grammar teaching and teaching grammar in relation to meaning making. The traditional grammar camp consists of teaching grammar by explaining rules, parts of speech, word order and maintaining a correct form using drills (Hedge, 2000). On the other hand, teaching grammar in relation to meaning making relates to the teaching of explicit grammar in connection with its function in real life communication. This kind of grammar teaching connects form and meaning specifically in writing; where grammar teaching is connected to its use in designing a text (Janks, 2010). However, the main question here is to determine whether the explicit teaching of grammar can help learners to become better writers (Van Gelderen, 2010). In the context of foreign language learning, numerous amounts of empirical research (for example, Ellis & Laporte (1997); Andringa (2005), Ellis (2002) and Norris & Ortega (2000) have been conducted to evaluate the relevance of explicit teaching of grammar. These have found that the explicit teaching of grammar is effective in developing productive skills (written and spoken).

In the three textbooks analyzed, grammar is taught to explain the grammatical rules and the given exercises focus on keeping correct form. According to the literature presented above, and the analysis of tasks in the three textbooks, it shows that the three textbooks mediate traditional grammar, which is mainly aimed at enabling learners to produce a correct text. This reveals the assumption that initiating young learners into correct form will help learners to develop their writing skills (Li, 2011). However, this assumption was dismissed by various studies that found that focusing on traditional grammar implies that learning comprises of the memorization of patterns, getting feedback full of red ink and has a loose connection between grammar itself and its application in real communication (Larseen-Freeman 2003).

As I have already mentioned, recent studies support the idea that explicit grammar should be taught (for writing pedagogy i.e) in meaningful way (Andrews, 2010; Myhill, 2009; Van Gelderen, 2010). Myhill (2009) argues that it is necessary to change the misconception that equates grammar only to correct form, [standard form (UK)] versus non standard forms, and

mistake evaluation. She adds that in the past those misconceptions affected the use of grammar in teaching writing, because it was believed that the role of grammar was to avoid errors in (learning text and writing well) text production. Furthermore, she claims that grammar should be taught in context as a tool for designing a text. For this reason, I suggest that writers of EFL textbooks, in this case Rwandan primary schools' textbook writers, should consider research that suggests the link between the grammatical structure of language with meaning making (Halliday, 1985b; Larseen-Freeman, 2003; Myhill, 2009; Janks, 2010) in order to help the learners in the EFL context to see the connection between grammar and its use in writing.

4.5 Integration of Skills: teaching writing in relation to reading and oral skills

A relationship between writing and reading as well as writing and oral skills has been acknowledged to be an important aspect in language development by a number of researchers (Berninger 2000; Bishop & Snowling, 2004). According to Shanahan (2006) the four language skills are divided into two groups: receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing). He adds that receptive skills are the basic input for language skills and have a close connection with productive skills. Among the four language skills, writing comes late in "the language learning arc" (Vygotsky, 1978) which makes sense that the prior language skills (listening, speaking and reading) contribute to the development of writing (Shanahan, 2006). In this section, I am interested in analyzing the teaching of writing in relation to other skills (listening, speaking and reading) contained in the three textbooks. I will first analyze tasks related to reading, speaking and listening and then look at their mediation in helping learners to develop their writing skills; if at all the connection between skills is established in the three textbooks.

The use of texts for readings skills is a prominent task in the three textbooks used in primary education in Rwanda. This is shown by the fact that almost every unit in the three textbooks contains at least two passages to be read and considered in order to respond to comprehension questions. The three textbooks connect the readings to the teaching of writing but in different ways. Starting from *New progressive Primary English 4*, the titles of the texts for reading are also the titles of the units. This makes the textbook thematically organized. The textbook asks

learners to read a given text and after responding to the comprehension text, they are given a writing task related to the reading. This textbook combines controlled writing exercises and guided writing related to the given text. In the *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)*, learners are requested to write a text based on the given readings. The writing tasks concern either extending the stories or making similar stories. Conversely, the *Keynote English primary 4* relates its readings to grammatical rule applications. For instance, it requests learners to find one of the parts of speech (nouns, adverbs, verbs, adjectives, pronouns, conjunctions and prepositions) and write it or use it to fill in gaps.

The three textbooks differ on types of texts they provide for reading and writing exercises that connect writing to reading. For instance, the *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* includes short stories and interesting funny stories for children, topics that would interest learners and which are related to their personal lives, while *Keynote English primary 4* and *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* provides descriptive texts. What the three textbooks have in common is that they all link the idea of reading and writing while giving various writing exercises. However, it is important to note that none of the three textbooks provide authentic text for reading as all texts seem to be produced for textbooks, i.e no references for the stories are included, and the language level used is uneven. This lack of use of authentic text (Tomlinson, 1998) demonstrates that in the three textbooks the binary between the language of textbooks and real world is present. For instance, on page 51 of *the New Progressive Primary English 4* (see appendix 2) learners are asked to write a composition about the last time they moved from one house to another. This is a good exercise for learners who have moved from one house to another. But what about learners who have never moved? In addition, it is not clear whether the comprehension questions after each reading should be answered in writing or orally. This makes me unsure whether I may discuss the nature of comprehension questions whilst discussing the writing mode.

Concerning the integration of oral skills into writing exercises, the three textbooks treat speaking and listening as pre-writing activities. This correlates with the role of oral skills (speaking and listening) in teaching writing (Shanahan, 2006). However it is relevant to mention the debate on oral skills versus written language. Historically, oral and written language have been thought to

be binary distinguished and unrelated modes of communication ((Brown & Yule, 1983; Bell & Burnaby, 1984). For instance, Brown & Yule (1983) focus their language teaching discussion on distinguishing between spoken and written language.

On the other hand, empirical studies demonstrated the relationship between oral language, reading, and writing development (Shanahan, 2006). For instance, Berninger (2000: 66) demonstrated that the four language skills (Listening, speaking, reading and writing) develop in "overlapping and parallel waves rather than in discrete, sequential stages". The fact that writing comes late in the language acquisition process [in fact writing is not acquired, it is taught] (Vygotsky, 1978) caused Shanahan (2006) to conclude that oral skills affect and contribute to the development of writing skills.

Furthermore, in response to teachers 'complaints that learners write as they speak, Halliday (1985a) advised that teaching the difference between speech and writing by highlighting the difference between the grammar of speech (utterances) and the grammar of writing (clauses) will improve learners' writing skills. The distinction is based on the fact that speech is normally made up of long chained utterances, linear ordering. It has incomplete structure and lower density compared to written language. In contrast, writing is lexically dense, highly ordered, and uses subordination. Based on studies on writing, it has been found that Halliday's distinction between speech and written modes will help learners to choose which mode to use and realize that "*writing is not speech written down*" (Myhill, 2009).

However, the activities given in the three textbooks do not explore the opportunity of drawing the distinction between speech and written modes for developing writing skills. It is however interesting that they use oral skills to prepare learners for writing tasks. It is also relevant to mention that those three textbooks relate oral skills to writing skills differently. For instance, the new *Progressive Primary English 4* makes coherent the role of oral language skills through reading and writing skills. On the other hand, the *Keynote English primary 4* and the *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* asks learners to discuss the topic given before writing about it and the topic does not refer to the prior oral tasks (see appendix 4-6). The fact that the

three textbooks treat writing pedagogy differently raises the issue of selection which implies inequality of access to mediated knowledge between the users of the textbooks.

4.6 Implications, suggestions and pedagogical complexities in the three foreign language teaching textbooks cases

The previous sections of this chapter discussed how writing pedagogies are embedded in the three English language teaching textbooks in Rwandan upper primary education. The teaching writing approaches embedded in the three textbooks are the following: teaching grammar, reading and oral skills in relation to writing. These discussions helped to answer the first two research questions of this study, and this section will facilitate answering the last of the research questions. Building on data analysis, this section attempts to look into the implications for Rwandan primary school teachers and learners of the approaches to writing pedagogy embedded in the three ELT textbooks published by UK publishing houses. In this section, I discuss the effects of the embedded writing pedagogies in the three textbooks on the teaching of writing in the foreign language education context. I also explore the implications for local context education, considering the fact that the textbooks were designed and produced by UK publishing houses. Nevertheless, before I begin with detailed discussions on the pedagogical implications of the approaches to writing, it is important to firstly explain the assumed consequences of UK made textbooks on Rwandan education context.

4.6.1 Implications of the fact that the textbooks were designed and produced by UK publishing houses

At the beginning of this study, I considered the existing literature on English language teaching textbooks in a foreign context. The literature reiterates that ELT textbooks made from core English speaking countries are inappropriate to EFL learners because the textbook content is based on activities rooted in the socio-cultural references of western countries which are not accessible to EFL learners (Albtbach et al., 1991; Albatch & Rathberger, 1980). The literature which analysed EFL textbooks, further confirmed that there are hegemonic practices embedded in such EFL textbooks considering the relationship between developing countries, in which textbooks are produced, and developing counties, which are recipients of those textbooks. This was explained not only because ELT textbooks were imported from native speakers of English countries (mainly UK and USA) as the local governments including schools negotiate good deals

with large publishers such as Oxford, Macmillan or Cambridge (Wu & VanderBroek, 2008); but also because those publishing houses mediate values, ideologies and knowledge from developed countries through the EFL textbooks (Chakava, 1992; Okonkwo, 1988).

In the case of Rwanda, Muhayimana (2011) argues that Rwandan learners will not be able to learn from a textbook designed and published in the UK because it is made for a British schoolchild in a UK context. He supports his argument by giving examples of unshared contexts between UK and Rwanda as well as some assumptions of UK publishers. Firstly, the UK publishers ignore the fact that Rwandan children start learning through the medium of English in the fourth grade which is not the same as their counterparts in the UK for whom English is the mother tongue. This implies that Rwandan children will not be able to learn from a textbook designed for grade 4 UK learners because they do not have sufficient cognitive background in English. Secondly, Muhayimana (2011) reiterates that most vocabulary items (for example slush, sleet, flurry, blizzard, black ice, skating, sliding, or ice hockey) are linked to the British environment and totally absent in Rwanda. Thus Muhayimana (2011) suggest that textbooks should be made in Rwanda for remedial solutions.

In this study, the analysis of narratives and visual images revealed that the UK publishing houses had designed the three textbooks drawing on local context (Rwandan context in this case) and that the hegemonic practice based on borrowed western context is no longer an issue in the three EFL textbooks. The reason why the UK publishers have paid attention to local context might be that the past studies have strongly criticised their textbooks specifically on a one size fits all basis. In the three textbooks, most of names, games and sports terms used in narratives are from the Rwandan context. This is different to the past textbooks (before 2010) where foreign names and vocabulary items (Eurocentric) made it difficult for Rwandan teachers to understand and explain them to learners as they were absent from Rwandan environment (Muhayimana, 2011, Amini Ngabonziza, 2011).

The three textbooks use local based activities to mediate the teaching of writing content. For instance, the *New Progressive Primary English 4* uses local photographs to emphasise local environment in order to motivate learners to write about their local context. Photographs were

taken of well known places in Rwanda such as Amahoro stadium, Kigali capital city, Rwandan primary schools, urban and rural areas in Rwanda. The other two textbooks [*Keynote English primary 4* and *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)*] used Rwandan names of people/places (Ndizeye, Mahoro,Baganizi, Kigali, Uwimana, Uwanziga, Teta, Kiboko,Bizimana, Nyiramana, Nsinda hospital, Mugabo, Kibeho,etc.) in their narratives as well as visual images featuring Rwandan students wearing uniforms, men and women wearing traditional, local dresses, images displaying Rwandan traditional dance and daily activities in rural areas such as farming and small businesses.

Despite the fact that the three textbooks' design context are not linked to the British environment and their designs draw on local context, a closer look at them reveals that the three textbooks do not include local stories and local poetry (i.e local literature in English).This is shown by the fact that all reading texts found in the three textbooks are made up in order to fit in with the particular pedagogical purpose of a specific unit within the textbook. For instance, the narratives in the *Keynote English primary 4* and the *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* are constructed to illustrate grammatical formssuch as nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, verbs and clauses. Similarly, thereading texts in the *New Progressive Primary English 4* are made to a theme as the textbook is structured thematically. In this textbook, the name of the theme is also the title of a text (e.g. theme one is "A thief in the ward" and the title of the text is "A thief in the ward"). Consequently the three textbooks do not use authentic materials and this may have many implications for learning a foreign language such as a lack of understanding of the functions of language in real world communication and the limited use of learners' prior knowledge (socio-cultural and historical background knowledge).

Furthermore, it is strange to notice that the three textbooks do not include the socio-cultural and historical background of Rwandan learners. For instance, all the three textbooks ignore the issue of ethnic conflict which led to the genocide against Tutsi in 1994 and its consequences. Some may think that learners in grade 4 are not concerned with these big issues (grand narratives) such as genocide ideology. Nevertheless, in 2008, the parliament of Rwanda reported the problem of persisting genocide ideology in primary and secondary schools and it highlighted cases where students were made to wear different uniforms according to their ethnic groups. The report was

followed by news that two grade six pupils were jailed after 'they threatened to kill their Tutsi schoolmate, calling her a cockroach' (Ngabonziza, 2008). These big (national) issues filter down and drastically affect children in Rwanda, for example children from genocide survivor's parents without extended family who may be concerned with why they do not have grandparents or uncles and aunts. The three textbooks neither incorporate the idea of the ongoing unity and reconciliation process nor the socio-economic recovery plan such as Rwanda's Vision 2020 and its Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2008-2012).

To address these issues, I would suggest that textbooks designers include cultural, social, historical, and economic context. It might seem that incorporating the concept of unity and reconciliation processes as well as the socio-economic recovery of Rwanda is inappropriate for textbooks whose main purpose is to teach English. It could be argued that the topic of reconciliation should be dealt with in Social Study textbooks, not English textbooks that focus on teaching writing. However, this supposition is based on the assumption that writing is a set of skills to produce a text and not a social practice. This kind of understanding of writing pedagogy reflects the traditional literacy that defines literacy as acquired skills that are universal and can happen in isolation of the local context. This study supports a new perspective of teaching writing in a real context as a social practice that changes according to context and socio-economic differences through space and time (Janks, 2010). This new perspective of teaching writing is based on Freirean sense of writing which is more than a set of skills but a social practice that considers writing activity as writing the world and help learners to produce meaning through the texts that matter to them in their context (Janks at.al, 2014).

In the same perspective, it should be emphasised that textbooks are never neutral but are often used as a vehicle of a certain kind of ideology (Muhayimana, 2011). Therefore, authors of textbooks should select a kind of ideology that advocates social justice and positive identity transformation. In this sense learners of writing will be able to produce texts that enable them to act on the world and then their writing can contribute to "the social and identity transformation that Freire's work advocates" (Janks, 2010:156). This is indispensable for post-genocide Rwandan society that was characterised by ethnic division that led to the genocide against Tutsi 1994.This means that reading texts should be selected from real world context and carry local

issues and concepts. Texts are never neutral but are used as a vehicle of a certain ideology (Janks, 2010).

Moreover textbooks should incorporate indigenous knowledge developed by the original people of a certain area, in order to realise an equitable teaching and learning environment where learners'/community' ways of knowing are valued and respected (Wilson, 2004), such as Rwanda's rich indigenous knowledge, its traditional narratives, proverbs, legends, myths, words of wisdom, etc. However, this does not mean textbooks should completely ignore western ways of knowing as young learners need to meet the communication challenge of the 21st century, which is around world globalisation. The issues pertaining to local based education as well as globalisation requirements relate to the EFL pedagogy of writing embedded in the three ELT textbooks which will be discussed in detail in the following section.

4.6.2 Implications of the approaches to writing pedagogy embedded in the three ELT textbooks

The product approach to writing is a dominant approach embedded in the three ELT textbooks analysed in this study and has many implication in teaching writing in the EFL context. The product approach to writing, on one hand, is believed to raise learners' awareness of correct language, grammatical structures, error-free text, and coherence of the final product. In this context, the role of textbooks or teachers is to provide models which learners are asked to initiate, copy and transform' (Nunan, 1999). On the other hand, the product approach to writing was criticised for making writing a mechanical activity and limiting learners' creativity. This approach infers a number of ideologies in EFL writing pedagogy: (1) the assumption that teaching traditional grammar improves the quality and accuracy of writing (2) the promotion of form focused instruction versus meaning making.

First, the product approach towards writing promotes the teaching of traditional grammar in order to improve writing. As defined earlier, the traditional grammar approach views Standard English grammar as the sole correct grammar as opposed to dialect grammar which is considered wrong. Despite the fact that this prescriptivism (correct) grammar ideology has been challenged due to language variations (see section 4.4), the three textbooks analysed in this study embrace

the product approach which promotes the error-free product text. This has a negative impact on teaching writing to young EFL learners. According to Andrews & Smith (2011) the product approach towards writing assumes that writing development for young learners means that sentences increase in complexity as studying continues. Learners start by mastering simple sentences, progressing to compound sentences, and then complex sentences. Andrews & Smith (2011) argue that this assumption is wrong because it assumes that learning to write follows a grammatical linear process. They conclude, after analysing the written product of learners over a certain period of time, that the product approach does not help young learners to develop their writing as it ignores complex multiple components of writing, such as audience, the environment of the writer, the writing process, and practices and interrelationships between those components.

Viewing writing development as the sum of sentence development (Standard English) has also influenced attitudes towards foreign language pedagogy which suggest that teaching writing is teaching correct grammar (Makalela, 2009). The three textbooks for grade 4 focus on teaching correct grammar and ask learners to produce a correct text. However, it has been shown that despite much time spent on teaching grammar, texts produced by foreign/second language learners of English are frequently ungrammatical according to the Standard English grammar (Zamel 1985; Miller, 1996).

Thus, it is important to note the fact that the three textbooks analysed in this study promote the use of correct grammar, and this correlates with the attitude which views the current English language variation in Rwanda as deficit in language learning by considering it as an inferior dialect. This can be demonstrated by current debate between the ministry of education in Rwanda and Rwandan language teachers about the use of Standard English. Since Rwandan speakers of English use English as a foreign language in Rwanda, similar to the Japanese context, local teachers have started to use indigenized English language that includes the accent of Kinyarwanda phonology. But the ministry of Education and the national curriculum for English language teaching in Rwandan primary schools (2010) have opposed the unconscious use of this language variation and urge all teachers to imitate the Standard English in order to teach it at schools.

This was emphasized by the minister of state in the ministry of education (Rwanda) speech during teacher training: "*Those teachers who use non grammatical English, the English that sounds as Kinyarwanda inferior dialect called "Igikiga" which is difficult to explain, should stop their behaviour"*. {Translation from Kinyarwanda into English is mine}(Nkurunziza, 2012). From a sociolinguistics point of view, the objective of the ministry of Education, to teach and preserve Standard English, cannot be achieved as far as sociolinguistic mobility is concerned (Makalela, 2013). However, this does not suggest that British Standard English should be excluded in language teaching in EFL context. It should be considered as one of many varieties of English within the world Englishes, neither an inferior nor superior dialect, (Kachru, 1990) considering that all dialects are equal, all are grammatical and harmonious (Janks, 2014).

The debate on considering Standard English as the desired dialect to be learned also raises the issue of using vernacular and indigenous language in English classroom. The analysis of the three textbooks shows that they reflect monolingual ideology by including only English and ignoring the multilingual context of Rwanda. The constitution of the government of Rwanda (2003) stipulates that Kinyarwanda, French and English are official languages in Rwanda. In addition, Swahili is also used as an unofficial language by some religious people, the business community and people living close to the border with Tanzania and Democratic Republic of Congo. Despite this multilingual context of Rwanda, the three textbooks do not include any of the multiple languages used in Rwanda.

The three textbooks stick to the use of one language, English, which can disadvantage both learners and teachers as English is not their mother tongue. One of the greatest disadvantages of using a monolingual textbook in the EFL environment is that learners do not see their own "ways with words" (Heath, 1983) i.e their mother tongue and the language used by learners' community, are not welcomed and valued at school. To exclude the mother tongue in language education amounts to excluding learners' identities. Janks (2014) explains that language is not only semiotic signs but also it is an expression of identity, it connects people with their life histories and it is highly embodied in their native speakers. In a similar way, Shelton (2007) clarified, "you will never teach a child a new language by scorning and ridiculing and forcibly erasing his first language" (p.67). By maintaining English as the only language, the three

textbooks' designers fail to understand the advantage of using the real language context of their recipient, which is multilingual.

The advantages of including vernacular and indigenous languages in the multilingual classroom in the Second/Foreign language education context have been advocated by a number of researchers. Pedagogically speaking, the use of local varieties in the English classroom incorporates the benefits of code-switching, code-meshing and translanguaging (Garcia, 2009; Canagarajah, 2006, Makalela, 2013). For instance, Fu & Matoush (2006) found out that using code-switching in a second language writing class has many benefits such as facilitating transitional steps from first language to the second language. Code-switching differs from code-meshing in that the code-switching refers to the use of two or more languages (local language and English) in the draft copy of a written text, with the purpose of eliminating the local language in the final copy. Code-meshing refers to the use of both local language and English in the draft and keeping them both in the final copy. Furthermore, Ruddy (2007) states that a contrastive study between first and second language, by focusing on linguistic differences and similarities, assists learners to integrate and develop second language accuracy. Furthermore, he added that the use of local languages is important because they are effective input for the second language and create a more comfortable atmosphere which encourages learners' participation in the classroom.

Considering learning in a friendlier atmosphere raises the issue of a teacher centered approach which is present in the three textbooks. This may lead to a threatening environment for the learners. This is shown by the fact that the three textbooks neither give notes to learners, to explain to them what they are expected to learn from the textbook, nor provide aims or objective of what learners are expected to learn in each unit. They treat most of the writing tasks as individual and stand alone exercises. To be fair to textbooks designers, I have looked at the teachers' guides of the three textbooks. Fortunately, the teachers' guides explain the learning objectives of each of the three textbooks and provide the process of teaching each unit. However, if only teachers have information on what they are expected to teach learners, and learners do not have the information of what they are required to achieve at the beginning of each lesson, this

confirms that the three textbooks impose a teacher centered approach on the EFL language classroom rather than a learner centered approach.

To address the teacher centered issue in the EFL language education in Rwanda through the three ELT textbooks, I would suggest that publishers should include notes to the learners and learning objectives in their textbooks. I would also recommend using vernacular language, as said earlier, as they are demonstrated to increase learner centeredness and promote a positive environment (Fu & Matoush, 2006; Rubdy, 2007). Thus, the use of vernacular as well as indigenous languages in EFL classroom helps learners to better participate in their lessons. The textbook publishers should accommodate the goal of teaching English as a foreign language through textbooks; as Cook (2013) states that the goal of teaching language is to develop multilingual competence that enables learners to activate a diverse linguistic repertoire and not to imitate native speaker's fluency.

Another crucial benefit that textbooks might explore is to use local language for mediation maximization. The mediation concepts originate from Vygotsky' socio-cultural theory that defines that knowledge is mediated by physical tools (Vygotsky, 1987): in this case it is mediation through means of the textbook. By mediating local languages, the textbooks, would help learners to be able to achieve what they cannot do with English only. Shor (2009) argues that the use of local languages creates a space for scaffolding to realize the Zone of Proximal development (ZPD). In the ZPD a young learner is guided by an adult to accomplish what he could not achieve alone (Vygotsky, 1987). In this context the local language will help learners to express themselves through writing (Code-switching process which will explained later) and design meaning that he could not design with English alone.

However, multilingualism pedagogy (including code-switching) has been assumed to be impossible to implement in such classes where learners and teachers do not share the same mother tongue. Bonacina-Pugh (2013), however, from studying the possibility of immigrant multilingual classrooms, argues that multilingualism is possible even in a classroom where a teacher does not share a language repertoire with learners (Asymmetric multilingualism). The statement contributes to improve multilingualism practice regardless of the limit of the teacher's

language repertoire. Furthermore, the difficulties of implementing multilingual pedagogy cannot be an excuse for designers of the three textbooks because Rwandans speaks one local language, Kinyarwanda, which is a rare language phenomenon in Sub-Sahara Africa (Anderson et al.2012).

In this concern regarding the use of local language, Kinyarwanda is widely used and is functional in the national daily life of Rwandans. Muhayimana (2011) stated that Kinyarwanda imposes itself to be functional in the public and private life of Rwandans as it is spoken across the country and by almost all Rwandans. Foremost, it is a medium of instruction from grade 1 to grade 3; then it is taught through primary and secondary school and it constitutes one of the national entrance and exit exams in the secondary school. Moreover, Kinyarwanda is used in courtrooms, cabinet meetings, national parliament, public and private media (Radio, Television, newspapers). In addition, public statements, such as official gazette, president and ministers' speeches, and statements of the cabinet use Kinyarwanda along with the two official languages, French and English. . Considering the above details, there no ways (and it is unacceptable) that Kinyarwanda should not be included in the three textbooks. If there is no pedagogic and linguistic reason not to include local language, Kinyarwanda in this case, why would any publisher ignore the inclusion of the local language in the EFL context, considering the well documented benefits of so doing?

Secondly, the product approach to writing embedded in the three textbooks as well as more design details of the three textbooks (organization, integration of language skills, made up text [not authentic text], grammar focus) indicate the existence of the form focused approach. The three textbooks assume that teaching grammatical structure will help young learners to develop writing accuracy and quality. This assumption is based on a definition of literacy (reading and writing) as merely cognitive skills. This assumption is wrong because it rejects the notion of literacy as a social practice and ignores the contexts in which reading and writing happen. The New London Group (1996) argues that teaching reading and writing skills (old literacy which is followed in the three textbooks) does not help learners to live in the 21st century society because to consume and produce texts requires more than one linguistic mode. They recommend multiliteracies pedagogy that includes various modes of meaning making which give learners,

not only access to the evolving language of power, work, civic and public lives but also the available critical engagement to design their social justice in the future.

The three textbooks disempower young learners (grade 4) by limiting their writing and reading skills to one mode (linguistic model), which is not the only mode used in the real world. Nowadays, due to new technology development and globalization, communication includes complex modalities with different ways of communicating –visual, audio, and spatial semiotics systems (New London group, 1996; Kress, 2003). These changes in the communication landscape have challenged the traditional teaching of literacy that considers literacy as the ability to read and write (New London group, 1996). The New London group (1996) suggests that the traditional teaching of literacy should be replaced by a new pedagogy/framework that includes multimodal texts and recognizes multiple literacies. These textbooks would do better to mediate activities which are situated in concrete (and local) interaction and help learners to write as social practice and meet complex/multiple design (Myhill, 2010).

In order to develop grade 4 learners, I would suggest that the textbooks include multiple interaction dimensions of writing development in a situated context (Andrews and Smith, 2011) as well as teach grammar as a resource for writing (Myhill, 2010, Janks, 2010). Andrews and Smith (2011) use the human growth metaphor to explain how young learners' writing develops. As they explain, young learners' writing develops when pedagogy takes into account the multiple interaction dimension of growth: "emotional, physical, spiritual, intellectual, cognitive, moral, experiential, social and maturational" (pg.95). By including the multiple modes of writing, the linear progression set by the traditional grammar myth will disappear and young learners' writing will develop.

For this writing development of young EFL learners to happen, textbooks should mediate tasks that adopt language they need to function in the complex communication environment of the 21st century; i.e including multiliteracy pedagogy which includes multiple modes of designing a text and enhances learners' ability to apply learning in different contexts and in their own interests (New London group, 1996). In this sense, language does not only include linguistic forms but also the environment through which it is produced with various options which are available to

make meaning (Janks, 2010). This correlates with the Critical Language Awareness concept that looks at language as a system of options that demands the user to make choices in order to make meaning and position a reader. This offers the learner the linguistic forms through which he/she can make meaning. Thus, learners will be empowered to discover how many options and choices they have at their disposal to make or design a text and the effect they produce in doing so (Myhill, 2010; Janks, 2010, Kress, 2003). In this context, grammar pedagogy will be a powerful resource for writing development for young EFL learners.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

5.1 General conclusion

The literature on textbook design in foreign language teaching argues that textbooks designed and produced in developed countries (UK, USA) mediate western countries' knowledge and ignore local knowledge (Chakava, 1992; Okonkwo, 1988). The reviewed literature demonstrated also that children in countries where English is taught as a foreign language (EFL country' children) might not be able to learn from those imported textbooks because firstly, they contain vocabulary items which are not appropriate to the children's context, and secondly they include methodologies which are not applicable to the EFL context (Albtbach et al., 1991; Albatch & Rathberger, 1980). Muhayimana (2011) argues that these points are valid in the Rwandan context. He therefore concludes that materials designed and published in the UK would not be accessible to Rwandan primary learners because their exclusion of local knowledge. This study has drawn on the above existing literature and the recent Rwandan language policy change which saw the move from French to English as sole medium of instruction, and which forces local teachers to rely on textbooks produced in England while teaching writing and other linguistic skills as they have little linguistic background in English. Thus, this study aims to analyse the suitability of those textbooks in terms of teaching writing in relation to other linguistic skills (reading, speaking, and listening plus grammar skills).

Firstly this study has analysed approaches to teaching writing in relation to other linguistic skills in the three ELT textbooks for grade 4 learners in Rwandan primary schools. Secondly, it has examined the implications for Rwandan primary school teachers and learners of the approaches to writing pedagogy in the three ELT textbooks produced by UK publishing houses. The findings from the analysis of the three ELT textbooks for grade 4 learners in Rwandan primary schools indicate the following: first, the product approach to writing as a general approach embedded in the three textbooks and this implies the focus on grammar at the expense of meaning. This study has argued that form focused/ controlled production practice need to be springboards for

communicative tasks where learners are given opportunities to develop writing in a range of contexts for a range of purposes. Second, the western knowledge versus local knowledge debate, popular in literature pertaining to EFL textbook analysis, is no longer relevant in the EFL textbooks produced in the developed countries because publishers are aware of those issues and consequently they have included local names, places, and local ways of doing and being in the three textbooks.

The discussions about the findings have demonstrated that even though the three ELT textbooks embed the product approach to writing as a common approach, nevertheless, writing pedagogy is addressed differently in the three ELT textbooks. The analysis of the writing tasks showed that the three textbooks differ in the way they balance controlled writing exercises and free writing tasks. The three textbooks are still focusing much more on controlled writing tasks, but at a different level in each textbook, and offer few free production tasks. Consequently, the three textbooks' design focuses merely on teaching grammatical patterns as correct forms to apply in writing tasks, (traditional grammar theory), and do not include comprehensively the theory of teaching grammar in relation to meaning making. This study has discussed the fact that the form focused approach to language teaching, the inherited method for teaching writing, has been proved ineffective by a number of empirical studies (Heugh, 2013; Makalela, 2009; Canagarajah, 2007).

Furthermore, the analysis and discussion have pointed out that despite the fact that the textbooks use texts, topics and scenarios with local relevance, they do not capitalize sufficiently on local knowledge.This study has demonstrated that that the focus was put only on using local names and not on local authentic texts/tasks. The difference between using names and local knowledge is that names could be used without including contexts that constitutes local knowledge such as proverbs, myths, indigenous ways of doing and being. This study has discussed this phenomenon by showing that the textbooks' design has ignored the socio-cultural as well as the historic context that form the prior knowledge of Rwandan learners.

This analysis of the three textbooks revealed that despite that the three textbooks embed the form focused approach but they are different in terms of mediating writing tasks: the *New Progressive*

Primary English 4 contains coherent writing exercises (from controlled writing to free writing); the *New Primary English (pupils' book for grade 4)* contains Controlled writing and guided writing with limited scaffolding; and the *Keynote English Primary 4* (Which contains almost all controlled writing exercises and grammar related content). Thus, the three textbooks may be more/less suitable in specific contexts. The fact that the three textbooks mediate writing pedagogy differently (in terms of scaffolding and progression from controlled to free production of a text) and that they ignore the use of indigenous knowledge, including local languages, led to the conclusion that this has negative implications for Rwandan primary school learning and teaching writing, as well as other linguistic skills.

5.2 Recommendation

Based on the limited scope of this research report (See 5.3), it is ambitious to make recommendations. However, I would suggest some general recommendations that the findings of this research report have outlined, through its discussed implication for literature on textbook production and consumptions, which are relevant to the future research in the same areas.

Referring to the research results that the three textbook designers have tried to include local names and practices; this is a definite improvement on previous textbooks and challenge the literature that predicts that the textbooks made from the UK would impose the British environment. I would also suggest that publishers should push forward to include the local as well as global context, which would help learners to become effective communicators in the 21st century, as diverse and multiple modes of communication gain ground due to new technology. Cultural and linguistic diversity should be an integral part of these teaching developments.

In order to include the context and skills needed for developing young EFL learners' writing, as far as the three textbooks which were designed for grade 4 are concerned, the textbook publishers should shift their mindset from correct form based pedagogy to meaning making based pedagogy (New London Group, 1996). On the one hand, this will help learners to be aware of the choices they make in order to make meaning and their effects on communicating a message. In this sense learners will be empowered to use grammar as tools for meaning making rather than the memorisation of mechanical rules (Myhill, 2010). On the other hand, textbook's

designers need to be aware that language is not a neutral means of communication and as a result textbooks are never neutral but are often used as ideological vehicles (Janks, 2010). Specifically in the Rwandan case, the publishers are invited to include content that involves the historical, economical and socio-cultural background of learners which matches up with national or community goals (Muhayimana, 2011; Amini Ngabonziza et al., 2012). This should include indigenous knowledge as well as Rwandan learners' "ways with words" (Heath, 1983).

5.3 Limitations and further research

This study is limited in terms of content and time. The study content is placed in the context of Rwandan education and the sudden transition from French to English as the medium of instruction (teaching and learning) from grade 4. It covers only three ELT textbooks approved by the Ministry of Education for grade 4 learners and focuses on the analysis of writing tasks in relation to other linguistic skills (reading, speaking, listening plus grammar). With regard to time boundaries, this study is limited to the textbooks published in 2010 and used up to the present.

Research on how the ELT textbooks are actually used by teachers would be relevant, given the limited proficiency of both teachers and learners in English in Rwanda, and its implications for teaching and learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Furthermore, the following studies could be relevant in this context:

- ethnographic study on how teachers use these textbooks in rural and urban contexts. Or on how do the approaches embedded in the textbooks relate to the teachers' own beliefs and pedagogies.
- a comparative study on how Rwandan teachers understand teacher' guides and their attitude towards the use of these textbooks;
- an analysis of the disparity between English as a subject and English as the language of learning and teaching in Rwandan primary schools;
- a case study which examines the development and publication process of an English as Foreign Language textbook.
- An analysis of the relationship between Rwandan Grade 4 ELT textbooks and the national curriculum.

- How Halliday's distinction between speech and written modes could be made relevant to grade 4 writing class?

REFERENCES

Adekunle, J. O. (2007). *Culture and customs of Rwanda*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Altbach, P., Kelly, G., Petrie, H., &Weis, L. (1991). *Textbooks in American Society: Politics, policy and pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University Press.

Altbach, P.&Rathberger, E. (1980). *Publishing in the third world: Trend report and bibliography.* New York: Praeger.

Amini Ngabonziza, J. (2011). *The importance ofRwandan short story in teaching English as a foreignlanguage*.Unpublished bachelor's thesis.

Amini Ngabonziza, J., Furaha, J., Dwyer, E. (March 2012) "*Language and Literacy Lessons from Post-Genocide Rwanda*". (Conference presentation) TESOL. Philadelphia, USA.

Andersson, I., Kagwesage, A. M. and Rusanganwa, J. (2012). Negotiating meaning in multilingual goupwork: a case study of higher education in Rwanda. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-15. I First article. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.695771

Andrews, R. & Smith, A. (2011).*Developing writers: Teaching and learning in the digital age.* New York: McGraw Hill Open University Press.

Andrews, R. (2010). Teaching sentence-level grammar for writing: The evidence so far. In Locke T. *Beyond Grammar Wars: A resource for teaching and students on developing language knowledge in the English/literacy classroom.* New York: Routledge.

Andringa, S. (2005).*Form-focused instruction and the development of second language proficiency.* Groningen: Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics.

Bell, J. and Burnaby, B. (1984).*A handbook for ESL literacy*. Toronto: OISE.

Berelson, B. (1953). *Content analysis in communication research.* New York: The Free Press.

Berninger, V.W. (2000). Development of language by hand and its connection with language by ear, mouth, and eye.*Topic in Language Disorders*, 20(4), 65-84.

Bishop, D. V. M., &Snowling, M. J. (2004). Developmental dyslexia and specific language impairment: Same or different? Psychological Bulletin, 130 (6), 858–886.

Blaut, J. (1991). Natural mapping.*Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series,* 16 (1), 55-74.

Bonaciana-Pugh, F. (2013). Multilingual label quests: A practice for the 'asymmetrical" multilingual classroom. *The journal of linguistics and education*, 24, pg. 142-164.

Boscolo, P. (2008). Writing in Primary School. In Bazerman, C. (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Writing: History, Society, School, Individual, Text*. New York/London: Lawrance Erlbaum Associates, 293-309.

Broughton, G. et al. (1980). *Teaching English as a foreign language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Brow, G., and Yule, G. (1983).*Teaching the spoken language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown , H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching language to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Plurazation continued. *CCC, 57*(4), 586-619.

Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language learning, *The Modern Language Journal*, 924-939

Chakava, H. (1992). Kenyan publishing: Independence and dependence. In P.Albach. (ed.). *Publishing in the third world.* New York: Hans Zeller.

Cole, M., &Wertsch, J.V. (1996). Beyond the individual: Social antimony in discussions of Piaget and Vygotsky. *Human Development*, 39(5), 250-256.

Cook, V. (2013). What are the goals of language teaching? *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research 1 (1), (Jan, 2013). pg. 44-56.*

Cunningsworth, A. (1994). *Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching materials*. London: Heinneman.

Dahl, K.L. &Farnan, N. (1998).*Children's writing: Perspectives from research*. Chicago/Delaware: National Reading Conference & International Reading Association.

Dakin, J. (2012). Writing bilingual stories: developing children's literacy through home languages. In Mallow, D. (Ed.) *Innovations in English language teaching for immigrants and refugees* (pp.13-21). London: British Council.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin&Y.S. Lincoln (eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oukes, CA: Sage.

Elley, W., Barham, I, H., &Whllie, M. (1976).The role of grammar in a secondary school English curriculum.*Research in the Teaching of English*, 10(1), 5-21.

Ellis, N., &Laporte , N. (1997). Contexts of acquisition: Effects of normal instruction and naturalistic exposure on second language acquisition. In A. De Groot & J. Kroll (Eds.), *Tutorials in bilingualism, Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp.53-83).Malwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A review of the research.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24,*223–236.

Emig, J. (1971). *The composition processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Frey, L., Botan, C., & Kreps, G. (1999).*Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods.*(2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn& Bacon.

Fu, D. &Matousha, M. (2006).Writing development and biliteracy.In K.P, Matsuda, C. Ortmeir-Hooper, &X.You. (Eds.), *The politics of second language writing. In search of the promised land*(pp.5-29). Indiana: Parlor Press LLC.

Garcia,O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In S.Kangas, et al. (eds.). *Social justice through education*. Bristol: Cromwell Press Group.

Hadley, O. (1993). *Teaching language in context*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.

Halliday, M. (1985a). *Spoken and Written language,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. (1985b). *An introduction to functional grammar* (1sted.). London: Edward Arnorld.

Harmer, J. (1991).*The practice of English Language Teaching*.2ndedn.Longman.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Heugh, K. (2013). *International disappointment in whole language literacy and communicative language teaching: Reconfiguring debates from the global south*. Retried May 25, 2013 from http://www.hsrc.ac.za/en/research-outputs/ktree-doc/11039

Hidi, S. and Boscolo, P. (2006).Motivation and Writing. In Charles, A., MacArthur, Graham, S., and Fitzgerald, J. (eds). *Handbook of Writing Research.* New York: The Guilford Press.
Holsti, O.R. (1968). Content analysis.In G.Lindzey&E.Aronson (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp.596-692), Vol.II, New Delhi: American Publishing Co.

Hutchinson, T. & Torres, E. (1994).The textbook as agent of change.*ELT Journal, 48*(4), 315-328.

Janks, at al. (2014).*Doing critical literacy: Texts and activities for students and teachers*. London, England: Routledge

Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and Power*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kachru, G. (1991). World Englishes and Applied Linguistics. ERIC (N°. ED 347-805).

Kaplan, R.B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language learning*. 16, 1-20.

Keith, S. (1985). United States publishers and textbooks in Latin America.In P.Altbach, A. Arboleda, & S. Zgopinathan. (Eds.).*Publishing in the third world: Knowledge and development.* (pp.175-186). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kobayashi, H., &Rinnert, C. (2002). High school student perception of first language literacy instruction: implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11,* 91-116.

Kramsch, C. (2012). *Why foreign language teachers need to have multilingual outlook and what that means for their teaching practice.*MuitasVozs, Ponta Grossa, VL 1, n.2, pg.181-188.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kress, G. and van Leeuwen, T. (1996) *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design* (London: Routledge).

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From Grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Heinle.

Lee, Y. (2003). A package for an English paragraph: An evaluation of the course book used in two EFL writing courses. *English Teaching* 58/3: 165 188.

Li, W. (2011) Moment analysis and translanguaging space: discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain.*Journal of pragmatics,* 43: 1222-1235.

Littlejohn, A. (1998). The analysis of language teaching materials: inside the Trojan Horse. In Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) *Materials development in language teaching* (pp.190-216).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacArthur, C.A, Graham, S. & Fitzgerald, J. (Editors) (2006).*The handbook of writing research.* New York: Guilford Press.

Makalela, L. (2005) We speak eleven tongues: Reconstructing multilingualism I SouthAfrica. In B. Brock-Utne and R Hopson (eds), *Languages of instruction for AfricanEmancipation: focus on*

postcolonial contexts and considerations, (pp. 147-174). Cape Town and Dar-es-salam: CASAS and Mkuki n Nyota Publishers.

Makalela, L. (2009) The role of feedback on L2 student writing: An experiment with form focused feedback. In Makalela (ed.), *Language Teacher Research in Africa*, (pp.51-66).Alexandria: TESOL Inc.

Makalela, L. (2013). Teaching indigenous African languages to speakers of other African languages: The effects of translanguaging for multilingual development.*Multilingual matters*. In Press.

Matsuda P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In Kroll (Ed.) *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials Evaluation and Design for language Teaching.* Edinburg University Press Ltd.

McGreal, C. (2009, January 16). Why Rwanda said adieu to French. *Guardian Weekly*.Retrieved from http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2009/jan/16/rwanda-english-genocide.

Mendelowitz, B. (2005). Representing shifting selves: Reflections on teaching memoir writing to pre-service teachers. *Perspective in Education*.Volume 23(1).

Mendelowitz, B. (2014). Permission to fly: classrooms of imaginative (im) possibilities. *English in Education* (fourtcoming).

Miller, L. J. (1996). Their names are Juan and Rosa: understanding and responding to nounnumber errors in ESL writing. *TESOL Journal*, vol.6 (2), 21-40.

MINEDUC (2008).*Nine years basic education implementation- first track strategies.* Retrieved January 15, 2013 fromhttp://mineduc.gov.rw/IMG/pdf/9_year_B_E.pdf

Ministry of Education, Youth &Culture.(2011). *Language education policy*.Retrieved January 12, 2011 from http://www.moec.gov.jm/policies/languagepolicy.pdf.

Muhayimana, T. (2011). *Language Policies Involving Teaching English in Postcolonial Contexts. A critical Look at Ghana, Pakistan, Rwanda and Singapore*. Berlin: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Murray, S (2009). Making sense of the new curriculum.In A. Ferreira, *Teaching language*. Northlands: Macmillan South Africa.

Myhill, D. (2009). From talking to writing: Linguistic development in writing. In *teaching and learning writing.Psychological aspects of Education-current trends.British Journal of Education Psychology Monograph Series II* (6). Leicester: British Psychological Sociaety.

Myhill, D. (2010). Ways of knowing: Grammar as a tool for Developing Writing. In Locke T. *Beyond Grammar Wars: A resource for teaching and students on developing language knowledge in the English/literacy classroom.* New York: Routledge.

Myhill,D. (2005). Ways of Knowing: Writing with Grammar in Mind, in *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2005, 77-96

National Curriculum Development Centre (2010) *Primary English Curriculum (P1-P6)*. Kigali: Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Scientific Research.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60-92

Ngabonziza, D. (2008, September 13). Two primary school girls jailed over genocide ideology. *The New Times.*Retrieved from http://www.newtimes.co.rw/news/index.php?i=13652&a=9478.

NISR (2012).Statistic year book.Retrieved May 10, 2013 from http://www.statistics.gov.rw/publications/statistical-yearbook-2012. pdf

Nkurunziza, F. (2012, April 17). *Hakwiyeamahugurwakubarimubigishanabiicyongereza* [there is a need of teacher training for teachers who teach (badly) English]. Igihe.com. Retrieved from http://www.igihe.com/amakuru/mu-rwanda/hakwiye-amahugurwa-ku-barimu-bigisha-nabi-icyongereza.html

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50,* 417–528.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. U.S.: Heinle&Heinle

Nyiratunga, R. (2007). *Assessment Practices in a First Year Academic Writing Module at the University of the Witwatersrand and the National University of Rwanda*.Unpublished Masters'research report, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Okonkwo, C. (1988). Language and the content of school texts: A Nigerian case. In P. Altbath&G.Kelly (Eds.).*Textbooks in the third world: Policy, content and context* (pp.203-227). New York: Garland.

Parliament (2008, April).Discussions on the program of teaching English language in schools.*Rwandan Parliament Official Website*. Retrieved from

http://www.parliament.gov.rw/re/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=194&Itemid=573

Pincas, A.(1962) Structural linguistics and systematic composition teaching to students of English as a foreign language.*Language Learning* 12(3): 185-194.

Prasad, B.D. (2008). Content analysis: A method in Social Science Research. In Las Das, D.K and V. Bhaskraran. (eds.). *Research methods for Social Work*. New Delhi: Rawat, pp. 173-193.

Republic of Rwanda (2003).*The Constitution of the Republic of Rwanda*. Retrieved February, 27, 2013 fromhttp://www.cjcr.gov.rw/eng/constitution_eng.doc

Richards, J. And T. Rodgers.(1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking*. New York: Oxford University

Rubdy, R. (2007). Singlish in the school: an impediment or a resource? *Journal of Multilingual and multicultural development,* 28 (4), 308-324.

Ruburika, S. (2009, April 10). Why turning to English makes sense. Retrieved from *allafrica.com*: http://focus.rw/content/view/782/32/

Ryan G.W. and Russel B. (2000).Data management and analysis method. In N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research, second edition* (pp 769-802). London: Sage Publications,Inc.

Sapp, D.A. (2001). *Globalization and just pedagogy: A description, interpretation, and critique of English composition pedagogy in China, Brazil, Spain.*PhD Thesis, New Mexico State University.

Scott, V.M. (1996). *Rethinking foreign language writing* (1st ed.). Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.

Scott, W. A. (2009). Reliability for nominal scale coding.In K. Krippendorff&M.A. Bock (Eds.), *Content analysis reader* (pp. 347-357). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Shanahan, T. (2006).Relations among Oral Language, Reading, and Writing Development.In C.A. MacArthur, S. Graham, and J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Shelton, L. (2007). Importing Canagarajah's global English theories.*English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(2), 58-71.

Shor, I. (2009). What is critical literacy? In A. Darder, M.P. Baltodano& R.D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp.282-304). New York: Routledge.

Sibomana, E. (2010). *Challenges faced by postgraduate French speaking students who are learning in English: a case study of Rwandan students in the school of education at the university of the Witwatersrand.*Masters' research report, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Silverman, D. (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Strauss, A. L. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publication Ltd.

Swain, M., Kinnear, P. & Steinman, L (2011).*Sociocultural theory in second language education.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Twagilimana, A. (2007). Historical dictionary of Rwanda *(*new ed.*). Historical dictionaries of Africa, no. 105*. Lanham, MD: Row man and Littlefield.

U.S. Embassy Kigali (2011).The educational system of Rwanda.Embassy of the United States. Retrieved April 20, 2013 from http://rwanda.usembassy.gov/rwanda_system_of_education.html

Van Gelderen, A. (2010). Does explicit teaching of grammar help students to become better writers? Insights from empirical research.In Locke T. (ed.) *Beyond Grammar Wars: A resource for teaching and students on developing language knowledge in the English/literacy classroom* (pp. 109-128) New York: Routledge.

Verster, C. (1996).*Teaching writing the communicative way: Higher primary level*. Durban: English Language Educational Trust.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in society: The development of the higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wang, H.A. (1998). *Science textbook study analysis: Teacher's friendly content analysis method?,* California.

Weber, R.P. (1985). *Basic content analysis*. New Delhi: Sage.

Wessels, M. (2007).*Practical guide for facilitating language learning*. South Africa: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, W.A. (2004). Indigenous knowledge recovery is indigenous empowerment. *American Indian Quarterly*, 28 (3&4): 359-372.

World Bank (2011).*Rwanda education country status report*. Retrieved May 14, 2013 from http://www-

wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2010/11/29/000350881_20101129112950/Rendered/PDF/579260SR0P11151353788B01PUBLIC10Web.pdf

Wu, S. &VanderBroek, L. (2008).The role of English and indigenous language in teacher education in Ghanaian context. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna& J. Hardman, (Eds.), *Global English teaching and teacher education: praxis and possibility* (pp. 41-57). Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL.

You, X. (2004). "The choice made from no choice": English writing instruction in a Chinese university. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13,97-110.*

You, X. (2005).*Writing in the "devil's"tongue: A historical of English writing instruction on Chinese colleges, 1862-present*. Ph.D dissertation, Purdue University, AAT 318553.

Young, Richard E. (1978). Paradigms and problems: Needed research in rhetorical invention. In C. Cooper and L. Odell (Eds.).*Research on composing.***.**Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Yunlin Muir, P. & Xu, P. (2011).Exploring pragmatic failure into the writing of young EFL learners: A critical analysis.*English Language Teaching, 4 (4), 254-261.* Toronto: Canadian center of science and education.

Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 10, 1:67-76.

Zamel, V. (1985).Responding to student writing.*TESOL Quarterly,* 19 (1), 79-101