

## The Analysis of Writing Tasks in High School English Textbooks: A Process-Genre Based Approach

Eon-sung Na and Hye-won Lee \*

Na, Eon-sung, & Lee, Hye-won. (2019). The analysis of writing tasks in high school English textbooks: A process-genre based approach. *English Teaching*, 74(4), 105-129.

The present study examined how writing tasks in high school English textbooks under the revised national curriculum reflected the key writing elements (process, genre, and context) of process-genre based approach. Concerning the latter, the focus was narrowed to audience since it was relatively neglected in writing instruction compared with other contextual factors. For this study, we analyzed 335 writing tasks in ten English textbooks for 1st- and 2nd-year high school students. Results showed that writing tasks largely incorporated the process-genre based approach. However, pre-writing activities mostly scaffolded the organization of ideas, rather than generated them. In the post-writing phase, editing was not targeted in some writing tasks. Both the diversity of genres/subgenres and genre awareness activities were also lacking. In addition, few writing tasks targeted the development of audience awareness through explicit activities. These findings provide pedagogical implications for writing task and curriculum development for material writers, curriculum designers, and practitioners.

**Key words:** process-genre based approach, genre, process, context, audience, writing task, writing sections, pre-writing, post-writing

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Due to the advancement of technology, the needs for written communication in the second language (L2) as well as the first language (L1) have been increasing not only in academic or professional fields but also in daily lives. To meet the needs, English language education in Korea where writing had not been a priority has started to change, especially

---

\* First Author: **Eon-sung Na**, Teacher, Baekseok Middle School

Corresponding Author: **Hye-won Lee**, Senior Research Manager, Cambridge Assessment English

in high school settings. The 2015 Revised National Curriculum emphasizes writing skills by increasing the portion of achievement standards for reading and writing from 51% to 58% compared with the previous curriculum (Ministry of Education, MOE, 2015), and teachers are asked to include writing as a construct of performance assessment which leads to higher motivation toward writing among high school students (Kim, 2014).

However, L2 writing is a very sophisticated skill that requires much cognitive process and linguistic knowledge (Raimes, 1983). It is especially challenging for learners who use English as a foreign language (EFL) where exposure to the target language is limited. Kim (2014) found out that Korean high school learners have high anxiety and low confidence in writing and need linguistic support the most. Lee's (2008) research showed that Korean learners tend to produce texts similar to model texts with little creative thinking and suggested the development of writing tasks that facilitates students' own ideas. Teachers of secondary school in Korea also reported that they feel teaching writing demanding and pinpointed the lack of diverse writing tasks and materials as one of the reasons (Lee, 2011).

Thus, to facilitate writing instruction in high school, well-designed tasks grounded in theory and the results of research are necessary. Tasks are fundamental elements of writing instruction; therefore, an analysis of tasks will help practitioners plan and adapt their lessons effectively while also providing implications for materials writers and curriculum developers. Writing pedagogy that can provide a framework for such analyses is the process-genre based approach, which is being touted by many researchers (Badger & White, 2000; Brown & Lee, 2015; Hyland, 2004). It is our view that this approach can benefit Korean learners who are facing challenges of L2 writing to meet their communicative needs. It is a blending approach that views process- and genre-based pedagogy as complementary (Hyland, 2003). The former helps students develop strategies to draw their own ideas with control of their writing process, and the latter deals with socio-cultural aspect of writing such as purpose and audience, featuring explicit instruction and input on language and rhetorical stages of genre. Many researchers report that genre pedagogy has positive effects not only on writing competency but also on affective factors (Bae, 2012; Han & Hiver, 2018; Lee, 2006; Lee, 2012). The process-genre approach draws on the best of the two. Badger and White (2000) proposed an instructional framework that students first explore the social context of writing and its purpose before following writing process (i.e., pre-writing, drafting, editing). Many practitioners added empirical evidence that it helps EFL learners develop L2 writing ability by providing explicit input and scaffolding, without sacrificing opportunities to experience the writing process (Bae, 2017; Csizér & Tankó, 2015; Kim & Kim, 2005; Lee & Wong, 2014; Racelis & Matsuda, 2013).

Now that the 2015 revised curriculum and new textbooks are being implemented and used, we believe that it is timely to examine the extent to which these changes reflect current understanding of L2 writing pedagogy and promote more supported learning by

analyzing writing tasks in the new textbooks on the basis that in Korea, MOE-authorized English textbooks, developed in line with changes in the national curriculum, are the main source of teaching materials (Lee, 2011). Thus, the present study focuses on analyzing to what extent the newly introduced writing tasks in high school English textbooks in Korea are based on research-based principles of process-genre pedagogy, including process, genre, and context. The following section will describe each element in detail.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Three Key Elements of Process-Genre Based Approach

A process-genre approach encompasses the advantages of both process- and genre-based pedagogy to effectively deal with diverse aspects of writing. Thus, the key concepts from the two approaches—the knowledge about process, genre, and context—are the cornerstones of the process-genre approach (Badger & White, 2000; Hyland, 2004).

#### 2.1.1. Process knowledge

With the advent of cognitive theories, researchers started to focus on students' thinking processes during writing and a process model consisting of pre-writing, drafting, revising, and editing was suggested (Tribble, 1996). In the model, the pre-writing stage, which helps students discover ideas, is considered critical (White & Arndt, 1991), and many techniques have been devised such as brainstorming, freewriting, or clustering. Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) categorized them into unstructured and structured depending on the primary purpose. The former (e.g. brainstorming, listing, and freewriting) facilitates as many ideas as possible in unmonitored conditions, and the latter (e.g. clustering, cubing, questioning, and outlining) provides more systemic support to organize texts, which may be especially beneficial in preparing more formal texts (Hyland, 2003). Each activity has its own advantages. Clustering makes it easy to identify relationships with ideas visually (Williams, 2005), and cubing fosters critical thinking by helping writers view an issue from multiple perspectives (White & Arndt, 1991). Thus, it is necessary to offer students a range of planning activities.

After drafting, writers revise and edit in the post-writing stage. Revising is to review their texts in terms of coherence, clear expression, and the relevance of information, and editing focuses on mechanics and grammatical errors. Revising is often neglected by novice EFL writers who are more sensitive to surface-level errors and tend to resist attention to the skill due to its cognitive burden (Williams, 2005). Editing is also least

avored by adherents of the process approach, who advocate for fluent process mastery over product accuracy. However, both are important to achieve successful communication (Hedge, 2005) and need more attention when designing L2 writing tasks. Since novice students do not have a clear idea about what to focus on in the revision and editing stage (Seow, 2002), it is suggested that checklists for the stages entail questions by topics, lesson goals, or proficiency levels of the students (Tribble, 1996). Going through these stages recursively, students develop metacognitive ability by reflecting on their cognitive process and deciding when and how to use such skills, and high school years are known as one of the best times to train this metacognition (Piaget, 1976; Weil et al., 2013).

### 2.1.2. Genre knowledge

Among the various notions of genres, this study adopts the definition offered by Sydney School, which is grounded in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). It defines genre as “a staged, goal-oriented, social process” (Martin, 1992, p.505), which relates to a text’s move structure through a series of steps in order to fulfill a communicative purpose. With the rising interest in genre since the 1990s (Pelaez-Morales, 2017), various ways of classifying genres have been put forward. Hedge (2005) identified six types of writing based on purpose and audience; personal, study, creative, social, public, and institutional writing. Sydney School selected genre types which are critical in Australian educational contexts. Table 1 presents the classification of genres and their sub-genres in Derewianka (2003) from Sydney School.

**TABLE 1**

**The Basic Educational Genres and Their Subgenres**

Social Purpose	Genre	Sub-types
To provide information about a topic	Description	Objective/Literary
To provide information about a class of things	Information report	Descriptive/Taxonomic Compare & contrast/Historical
To tell someone how to do something	Procedure	Instructions/Experiment /Directions/Regulations
To tell what happened	Recount	Personal /Factual (Auto)Biographical/Historical
To explain how or why a phenomenon takes place	Explanation	Sequential /Causal/ Factorial Consequential/Exploration
To explore the human condition through storytelling	Story genres	Narrative/Moral tale /Fable/Anecdote
To respond to a literary text or artistic work	Response	Personal response Review/Interpretation
To mount an argument	Exposition	Critical response/ Persuasion/Discussion

As shown above, the genres are classified based on their communicative purpose and further divided into subtypes based on their rhetorical stages and language forms. The genres in the classification are also called elemental genres (Martin, 1992) because they are combined to make genres in social locations such as scientific lab reports or newspaper articles. For example, a scientific lab report is composed of at least two elemental genres: description and procedure (Hyland, 2004). It is important to teach a variety of genres (Feez, 1998) since even native-speaking children often fail to choose an appropriate genre to accomplish a specific social purpose due to the lack of genre resources (Hyland, 2004), not to mention EFL learners. In addition, the opportunities to learn a range of sub-genres which share the same purpose but have distinctive rhetorical stages and language features should also be provided since it cannot be assumed that being able to produce a certain subgenre leads to the ability to compose other sub-genres in the same genre (Derewianka, 2003). Genre knowledge, which is culture-specific, is hard to acquire subconsciously for EFL learners who have little access to the target genres outside the classroom (Hyland, 2003). These disadvantages create a necessity for explicit instruction, or activities, to address the relationship between forms in each genre and their functions.

One notable point is that Sydney School scholars started this genre analysis from primary and secondary school settings (to help disadvantaged students). For students with low proficiency, it offers systemic scaffoldings with detailed descriptions of rhetorical structures and language points of each genre, which should be also beneficial for L2 learners and teachers to understand the features of each genre clearly (Hyland, 2004). Additionally, as mentioned above, the knowledge of these elemental genres can be applied to many other genres that students will need to write in the future. For these reasons, we adopted genre categorization by Sydney School in this study because it is the one most relevant to and useful in the educational context of high school in Korea where many students have low proficiency and need scaffolding.

### 2.1.3. Context knowledge

Context refers to the elements involved in where and how a text is encoded and decoded. From the Sydney School's perspective, context encompasses field, the topic of the text, tenor, the relationship between the writer and reader, and the mode, the role of language (Hyland, 2004). Among these variables, we focus on tenor in this study because it receives scant attention in language teaching compared with field, and in terms of the mode, the written mode, which this study covers, is generally taken into consideration in genre pedagogy compared with oral or other modes (Derewianka, 2003).

For this reason, we narrowed down the concept of context to the tenor, audience in this study. An understanding of audience involves intimacy, power status, or shared knowledge,

and it greatly influences content, lexicogrammar, and discourse type (Hyland, 2015). Grabe and Kaplan (1996) suggested five parameters to identify audience influence: the number of readers, the degree to which readers are known or unknown, the status of readers, shared background knowledge with readers, and shared specific topic-related knowledge. Addressing different audiences is a skill of many expert writers which leads to a higher possibility of fulfilling a communicative purpose (Johns, 1995). Thus, writing tasks should specify a range of audiences besides teachers or peers in order to cultivate the ability to write appropriately in various contexts (Chen & Brown, 2012; Hyland, 2004). However, providing audience itself is not sufficient to raise audience awareness and like genre knowledge, explicit activities or instructions should be accompanied (Hyland, 2003). White and Arndt (1991) proposed an audience heuristic asking students to anticipate what readers know and do not know, and what readers' attitudes are. Hedge (2005) also recommended that before writing, students think of a series of questions about reader identity, how to establish a relationship with readers, and the writing style. Despite its impact on texts, many EFL writing tasks do not provide audience or authentic context, or ask only peers and the teacher to read texts (Williams, 2005). Hyland (2004) also argued that many L2 writers often fail to create contextually appropriate texts since they still do not have an adequate understanding of target readers. Therefore, more attention needs to be paid to a sense of audience when designing writing tasks (Hedge, 2005).

## 2.2. Analysis of L2 Writing Tasks in EFL Context

Despite the importance of three factors in writing mentioned above, there are not many studies that looked into writing tasks in Korean English textbooks based on these key elements. A number of studies examined the tasks to see if they meet the standards of the national curriculum (Choi & Lee, 2010; Kim, 2008; Kim & Rha, 2017; Park & Suh, 2003). It is from the late 2000s that attempts to incorporate multiple aspects of writing tasks such as topic, genre, task types, or authenticity started to appear (Ahn, 2012; Choi & Yu, 2010; Jwa, 2007; Lee & Rha, 2013). The results showed that the range of genres was skewed to a few genres and little attention was paid to 'exposition' (Ahn, 2012; Choi & Yu, 2010; Jwa, 2007). They also pointed out that activities to understand the features of the genres were not found. The absence of audience and authentic context was also identified as a point to be improved (Ahn, 2012; Choi & Yu, 2010). Regarding writing process, Ahn (2012) found out that writing tasks in middle school textbooks included the pre-writing stage but not post-writing. In the Asian context, recent research on writing tasks has used genre classification by Sydney School as an analytical framework (Watanabe, 2017; Yu & Reynolds, 2018). The findings indicated that the writing tasks in Japanese high school offered a range of genres according to the guidelines of the Japanese national curriculum

(Watanabe, 2017). In Chinese high school textbooks, writing tasks are based on genre approach but need more support in building strategies of writing process (Yu & Reynolds, 2018).

Taken together, efforts to examine writing tasks using diverse lenses have been made in Korea, but they are all from writing tasks developed under the previous national curriculum which are not used any more. In addition, except Ahn (2012) and research in adjacent countries, most studies employed Hedge's (2005) genre typology which does not offer any description about distinctive features of each genre in the analysis and did not deal with process knowledge. To fill this gap, the present study analyzed writing tasks in newly developed high school textbooks, *English* and *English I*, for 1st -and 2nd-year high school students, in terms of the key notions of the process-genre approach, discussed in the current section. The research questions are as follows:

1. To what extent are the pre-writing and post-writing tasks in the textbooks *English* and *English I* designed to support learners' process knowledge?
2. To what extent are the final writing tasks and genre awareness activities in the textbooks *English* and *English I* designed to build learners' genre knowledge?
3. To what extent are the writing task prompts and contextual awareness activities in the textbooks *English* and *English I* designed to build learners' context knowledge?

### 3. METHOD

This section outlines the procedures of the present study from the selection of sample textbooks to the analytical frameworks and methods used in the task analysis.

#### 3.1. Writing Task Analysis

##### 3.1.1. Selection of sample textbooks

The 2015 Revised National Curriculum requires all 1st-year high school students to study a course called *English*, while in the 2nd and 3rd years, each school may choose from among a range of English courses depending on local contexts and needs (MOE, 2015). Regarding the writing tasks for the 2nd year, *English I* was selected for the current study since it is at the upper level of the course *English* and also the most recommended for the 1st semester of the 2nd year by Seoul Education Research & Information Institute (2018). Since there is no official data about the market share of the textbooks, the data

were collected by visiting the websites of high schools located in Seoul, South Korea. Seoul was chosen because its number of high schools is the second highest (Korean Educational Statistics Service, 2018) and includes more diverse types of high schools than any other city or province, such as specialized high schools, and autonomous high schools as well as general high schools; thus the samples of high schools in Seoul are assumed to reflect a wide variety of needs. Due to practical feasibility, 200 high schools were randomly selected out of 320. Investigating each textbook's popularity among the chosen high schools and considering the diversity of publishers, the top five textbooks were selected for the study and coded A to E. The textbook selection for the course *English I* followed the results of the textbook selection for *English*. This is because any series of books by a publisher has its distinctive features and formats; thus, it is assumed that if one publisher was chosen for one year, the same publisher would highly likely be selected again for another year. They are coded A-1 to E-1 to indicate the connectedness with the sample textbooks of *English*. The list of the selected textbooks is presented in Appendix A.

### 3.1.2. Scope of analysis

Definitions of task are varied and complex. Of special relevance to this study is one offered by Van den Branden (2006), which defines 'task' as a meaning-focused activity where language is used as a means to serve a communicative purpose. Thus, both writing a movie review and a letter of apology to a friend are considered 'tasks'. For the study, only the tasks in the writing sections of each textbook were chosen since writing activities in other sections such as grammar or reading are mainly directed at writing to learn at a sentence level. The numbers of units and tasks subject to analysis are outlined in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**  
**The Number of Sections Subject to Analysis for *English* and *English I***

	Textbook	No of Units	No of Tasks in Each Writing Section	Total
English	Textbook A	8	4	32
	Textbook B	8	5	40
	Textbook C	10	5	50
	Textbook D	8	5	40
	Textbook E	8	5	40
	Total	42	24	202
English I	Textbook A-1	5	5	25
	Textbook B-1	6	4	24
	Textbook C-1	6	5	30
	Textbook D-1	6	5	30
	Textbook E-1	6	4	24
	Total	29	23	133



## 3.2. Analytical Scheme

### 3.2.1. Process knowledge

The typology in Appendix B was developed for the categorization of the pre-writing and the post-writing activities based on Brown and Lee (2015) and Ferris and Hedgcock (1998). First, the pre-writing activities were broadly divided into two categories: unstructured and structured. The unstructured activities include brainstorming, listing, and freewriting, while the subcategories of the structured ones are clustering, cubing, questioning, and outlining. The definition of each category is described in Appendix B. The category “others” was added for tasks that were neither structured nor unstructured such as reading input materials or choosing topics from given options. For the categorization, the main features of the activity were considered, not the heading, since there are cases that a heading and an activity under the heading are inconsistent. For example, if an outline was provided under the heading “brainstorming,” it was grouped into “outlining,” not “brainstorming.” The types of the final writing tasks were also noted down to see whether the pre-writing tasks differed in relation to the features of the main writing tasks. Following the categorization, the number of activities in each category was counted, and the total number of activities in each category was summed to discern the general pattern across textbooks.

To see if writing sections in each unit afford skills training in the post-writing stage, the checklist in Appendix B was used to confirm the inclusion of revision and editing. If post-writing activities were found, it was further examined whether they provided guidance for each activity considering the features of texts students are expected to write.

### 3.2.2. Genre knowledge

The genres of the final writing tasks in each unit were analyzed according to the genre typology in Appendix C. This was adapted from Derewianka’s (2003) basic typology of educational genres. The list of genre and subgenre types were narrowed down considering the needs and the cognitive burden for secondary EFL learners. For example, “description” as a genre type in Derewianka’s (2003) typology was excluded from this study and incorporated into “information report.” In “explanation,” two subgenres were selected, sequential and causal, excluding consequential and exploration which require in-depth thinking. For tasks that did not address any specific characteristics of the genres, the category “others” was used, which focused on self-expression and fluency rather than genre knowledge such as filling in a cartoon’s speech bubbles. Such adaptations were discussed with a public secondary school teacher who has ten years of teaching experience and has a master’s degree in English Language Education, and the discussion continued

until the mutual agreement was reached. Following the categorization, the numbers of genres and subgenres of writing tasks in each textbook were counted. The total number of genres in each category was also calculated to examine the trends of genre choice across writing tasks in three semesters. Using the yes-no checklist in Appendix C, we checked whether two types of genre awareness activities related to organizational structure and language forms, respectively, were provided. If present, it was described what exactly students were required to do.

### 3.2.3. Context knowledge

As discussed earlier, the term “context” refers only to audience in the current study considering its impact on texts (Hedge, 2005). The typology in Appendix D adapted from Ahn’s (2012) scheme and Grabe and Kaplan (1996) was used to examine how varied the audience of the writing tasks were. First, the writing tasks were examined to determine whether the audience was overtly specified. If the writing tasks designated a particular social location, such as a blog or school magazine, audience type was assumed and categorized as such. The category was divided into six sub-categories: self, one known other, one unknown other, one known group, one unknown group, and general audience or public. The distinction between “known” and “unknown” was based on the social intimacy and power relations with the intended reader. Specifically, “self” refers to the writer, “one known individual” to a familiar person, and “one unknown individual” to a person who is distant, requiring formality such as a service manager in a company. The categories of “one known group” and “one unknown group” share that they are both members of a discourse community with similar socio-cultural backgrounds. Typical examples of known groups are classmates; those of unknown groups are other teenagers or international visitors. General audience or public refers to website visitors or newspaper readers. Writing tasks without any reader-related information were grouped into “not specified.” After grouping types of audience, the number in each category was counted. When audience was present (or could be assumed), using the checklist in Appendix D, the corresponding writing sections were analyzed to uncover the type of audience-related activities present and the kinds of performance required for students.

The data of the task analysis based on these three elements were independently coded by the researcher and another public-school teacher who was trained according to the method of the analysis used in this study. Two textbooks were randomly chosen in *English* and *English I* respectively out of ten (40%). Both the personal agreement and Cohen’s kappa statistic were employed to investigate inter-rater reliability, and Cohen’s kappa was interpreted according to McHugh (2012). Concerning the type of pre-writing and post-writing activities, the percentage agreements were .91 and 1.00 respectively, and there

were “strong” and “almost perfect” agreements,  $k = .86$  (95% CI, .68 to 1.00) and  $k = 1.00$  (95% CI, 1.00 to 1.00). With regard to both the type of genres/subgenres and audience, the percentage agreements were .87 and .91 respectively, and both showed “strong” agreements,  $k = .84$  (95% CI, .68 to 1.00) and  $k = .87$  (95% CI, .64 to 1.00). There were also “almost perfect” agreements between the two raters,  $k = 1.00$  (95% CI, 1.00 to 1.00), in the checklist of genre and audience awareness activities. The results mean that the data analysis was performed consistently, thus reliable.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### 4.1. Process Knowledge

To examine how activities in the writing sections support to build process competency, the type of pre-writing activities was first analyzed, and the results are shown in Table 3.

**TABLE 3**

**The Types of Prewriting Activities in the Writing Sections of Textbook *English* and *English I***

	A	A-1	B	B-1	C	C-1	D	D-1	E	E-1	Total
Unstructured											
Brainstorming	6	3	4		2	3	5		2		25
Listing					1	2	2		1		6
Free writing											0
Structured											
Clustering			2		4	1					7
Cubing											0
Questioning	4	3	3	4	8	4	2	2	3		33
Outlining	2		2		2	2	3	3	1	2	17
Others	2	2	3	7	2		4	1	7	5	33
Total	14	8	14	11	19	12	16	6	14	7	121

Except for Textbooks A, A-1 and D, the number of structured activities is higher than that of unstructured ones in most textbooks. In particular, Textbooks B and C offered much more structured activities than unstructured, and there were no unstructured techniques in Textbooks B-1, D-1, and E-1. This suggests that the pre-writing tasks were more focused on scaffolding content organization in the texts than idea generation and creativity. With regard to the diversity of subtypes, the distribution is not well-balanced. In the case of Textbooks A and A-1, brainstorming and questioning are most frequent which is related to the uniform format of the sequencing of the pre-writing activities across units, brainstorming followed by questioning. While this provides consistency, it does not help students build the competence to prepare for different writing tasks. Textbooks C and C-1 provided two activities before

drafting. The first activities were diverse, but the second activity was invariably questioning in all units as a means of organizing ideas. Unlike Textbook D which covers four pre-writing skills, Textbook D-1 presented only structured ones, questioning and outlining. Overall, in the unstructured area, brainstorming was predominant with no freewriting, and in the structured area, questioning was the most commonly used followed by outlining. A few examples of clustering found in only three textbooks, and cubing was not discovered at all.

This overreliance on a few techniques may be due to concerns that other activities such as freewriting are challenging for many L2 writers, but if carefully prepared, it is a valuable technique to facilitate unconscious ideas by adjusting the difficulty level such as making it a group activity or applying it to an easy topic. As noted, each strategy has its own advantages, and the ability to use them expands the choice of how to prepare for different writing tasks. For example, when writing about a favorite place, cubing provides students with a chance to see the topic from angles that they have not thought about (White & Arndt, 1991). The shortage of diversity in prewriting activities could also be related to the result that they were often offered with little regard to the specific features of each writing task. In Textbooks C and C-1, for writing a compare and contrast report, outlining would have been helpful to set out the rhetorical structure of the formal text (Hyland, 2003). For tasks that require creativity such as making an advertisement for a product, it would be more beneficial if brainstorming or freewriting were provided rather than just filling in a partially completed outline. Textbooks B, D, and D-1 showed good examples of customizing the type of pre-writing activities depending on the kinds of texts to be produced. They employed listing for writing an advice column and offered outlining for writing an exposition on using drones, where a logical flow is critical.

The pre-writing activities in the “others” section mostly asked students to write based on the given information such as graphs or interview scripts, not on the students’ own ideas. In Textbooks E and E-1, a high number of activities were grouped in the category “others,” and they were related to content input to perform the task such as reading a text or matching sentences on the topic, which appears more language practice-like than writing practice. It may be intended to lessen the burden for students to generate ideas of their own, but it likely deprives them of the chance to discover their voices and build strategies for it. Taken all together, the pre-writing activities do not seem to provide sufficient support to develop a variety of strategies to prepare for different types of writing tasks.

Concerning post-writing, whether both revision and editing activities were included, and whether they varied the questions by the final writing task types, were investigated. The results showed that each textbook provided revision at a post-writing stage (71 tasks in total), which is a positive change from earlier efforts because this phase was largely omitted in Korean MOE-authorized English textbooks under the previous curriculum (Ahn, 2012). This will help students recognize it as an integral part of writing. However, three

textbooks, B-1, C, and C-1, did not offer editing at all. It may be a reflection of the belief in process writing, which puts more emphasis on process than the accuracy of the product, but it is important to balance both process and product; thus, editing should also be considered when designing writing tasks (Badger & White, 2000; Brown & Lee, 2015).

As for the checklist items, except for Textbooks E and E-1, all the textbooks provided various types of questions for revision, making it possible for students to concentrate on distinctive features of the text. For example, in Textbooks A and A-1, for an exposition task, the checklist asked whether the topic sentence was included and the supporting sentences are convincing, and for a descriptive report, the inclusion of detailed information was asked. However, all the editing checklists were uniform across all types of writing tasks in the textbooks. This is more helpful than offering no editing practice, but for inexperienced writers, it may be more effective if editing checklists make clear which specific aspect of grammar or mechanics to focus on.

#### 4.2. Genre Knowledge

To see how the writing tasks are designed to build genre knowledge, it was first examined which genres/subgenres were included and how they were distributed in the 1st and 2nd year of high school. The results are set out in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**  
**The Type of Genres of Writing Tasks in Textbooks *English* and *English I***

	A	A-1	B	B-1	C	C-1	D	D-1	E	E-1	Total
Recount											
Personal			1	1	2				1		5
Factual											
(Auto)Biographical								1	1		2
Procedure				1			1			2	4
Information report											
Descriptive	2	3	2		3	1		2	3		16
Taxonomic											
Compare/contrast					1				1		2
Historical						1					1
Explanation											
Casual											
Sequential											
Story genres											
Narrative	1	1									2
Fable									1		1
Response (Review)	1				2	1		1			5
Exposition											
Persuasion	2		1	1			1				5
Discussions							1				1
Others	2	1	4	3	2	3	5	2	1	4	27
Total	8	5	8	6	10	6	8	6	8	6	71

As the data indicate, in most textbook sets, 44 out of 71 writing tasks required genre knowledge, which suggests that the publishers took a genre-based view of writing to some degree. In the case of Textbooks A and A-1, ten tasks out of 13, and in Textbooks C and C-1, 11 tasks out of 16 are categorized into one of the genres in the typology. However, genre diversity was lacking across each set of textbooks. According to the findings of this study, the most popular genre was information report, which was covered at least twice in all the sets of textbooks, whereas the other genres were not fully covered or ignored. For example, recount, the second most popular genre, appeared only seven times, while story genre was dealt with only three times in total writing tasks. In particular, explanation was not found at all, which is a key genre at school and found in many social locations such as newspaper reports, textbooks, and science websites (Hyland, 2004).

Moreover, there were few newly added genre types as the year progresses. In Textbooks B and B-1, and E and E-1, only one new genre, procedure, was introduced in the second year. It is only Textbooks D and D-1 that tried to introduce diverse genres, with no major overlaps of types between the textbooks, so students are able to expand their repertoire of genres as they progress from year to year. This lack of genre diversity is consistent with the results of Ahn (2012) and Jwa (2007), both of which analyzed the genres of writing tasks for Korean secondary school students.

The diversity of subgenres was also insufficient. In the genre of information report, description was predominant, while other subgenres, taxonomic, compare/contrast, and historical, were mostly neglected. Within recount, personal recount accounted for most. The imbalance of the distribution of subgenres is against Derewianka's (2003) suggestions which advised not to assume that learning to write one subgenre would transfer to other subgenres since despite sharing the same purpose, they require different rhetorical moves and language features.

It is understandable that including all genres and subgenres in less than two years is a challenge. However, the genre and subgenre distributions across the three semesters seem widely unequal, so it is unlikely that students will increase their genre repertoire. It could be due to the consideration that certain genres and subgenres are too difficult for EFL students without having high levels of proficiency. For example, explanation is often thought to be difficult because it involves more complex structures and languages to express sequential, causal, or conditional relations about abstract topics (Hyland, 2004). If that is the case, it is possible to adjust difficulty levels by teaching the genres/subgenres with familiar topics or increasing the amount of scaffolding. Students could be asked to write an explanation about what they already know, such as how a caterpillar turns into a moth, or they could be offered additional support through writing frames or visuals.

Another point to mention is that the range of genre types was varied from textbook to textbook. For instance, students who study Textbooks B and B-1 do not learn how to write

a narrative or a review, which are provided in Textbooks A and A-1. Students who study with Textbooks C and C-1 or E and E-1 do not have a chance to write expositions at all, despite its importance to academic success (Hyland, 2004). In other words, students learn different numbers and kinds of genres depending on the textbooks chosen.

Along with the identification of genre types, it was examined whether explicit genre awareness activities were provided (Appendix C). Most textbooks, with the exception of Textbooks B-1 and E, provided model texts and explicitly presented their rhetorical stages (57 tasks in total), which shows an attempt to raise consciousness on the notion of genres in writing tasks. For instance, Textbooks A and A-1 opened the writing sections with the name of the genres and a brief explanation. However, only three textbooks (A-1, D-1, and E-1) further provided tasks to deconstruct or manipulate the model text. They have students read the sample texts and match the names of the stages, but it was the only kind of activity provided to raise students' understanding of rhetorical moves. The matching activity was useful and easy to design and complete, but if not accompanied by the teacher's effort to help students grasp how the stages emerge and function to achieve the purpose of the text, it may become just another item to memorize.

Language forms are another important element of genre knowledge, but this area was generally underdeveloped. Only a few writing sections in four textbooks (A-1, B, B-1, and E) presented linguistic expressions, and most were topic-specific and not connected to the genre; thus, they were not easily transferable to other texts of the same genre type. Even in the case that language input was presented related to the genres, no explanations or activities were offered about how language features function to serve the purpose of the genre. For example, in Textbook A-1, two units just provided adjectives to write a descriptive report and a book review, but there were no language-related tasks and it may not be helpful for students to see how the linguistic choice was made to fulfill the purpose of the text.

The lack of genre awareness activities was consistent with the writing task analysis of textbooks designed under the earlier national curricula (Ahn, 2012; Choi & Yu, 2010; Jwa, 2007). As noted earlier, genre knowledge is challenging to acquire for outsiders of a discourse community if not overtly taught (Martin, 2009; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). It is probable that although students are exposed to descriptive reports several times, without clear explanations, they will not have a clear understanding of its distinctive rhetorical development or the use of the present tense to achieve the purpose of the genre. There are some doubts about the teachability of genre, and genre knowledge may be acquired implicitly. However, considering the EFL context, practice with explicit instruction can be more effective to build genre knowledge (Hyland, 2003).

### 4.3. Context Knowledge

To identify which, if any, specific contexts the writing tasks afforded, the type of audience was analyzed. The results are set out in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**  
**The Type of Audience in Writing Tasks in Textbooks *English* and *English I***

	A	A-1	B	B-1	C	C-1	D	D-1	E	E-1	Total
Specified/assumed											
Self			1						1		2
One known other	1	1					1			1	4
On unknown other	1		1	1	1	1		1			6
One known group			1	3			3			2	9
One unknown group							2	1			3
General audience/public		2		2		1		1			6
Not specified	6	2	5		9	4	2	3	7	3	41
Total	8	5	8	6	10	6	8	6	8	6	71

The number of tasks with audience specified and the diversity of audience were varied depending on textbooks. While Textbooks A and A-1 provided an audience in only five tasks out of 13, Textbooks B and B-1 had nine specified tasks out of 14. The writing task prompts in Textbook B-1 noted the social locations of all the writing tasks explicitly such as a blog post, a recruitment flyer, or a recommendation letter to a committee. It seems to try to include familiar contexts related to school activities or social work, such as volunteering or campaigning, and this encourages students to write with intended readers in mind. Textbooks C and C-1 provided the lowest number of tasks indicating an audience, but the tasks are designed to help students learn the influence of context on a text in relation to content and language. For example, writing a complaint letter to a service manager gives them a chance to learn how to use language delicately and politely to achieve the intended effect without causing offense. Textbooks D and D-1, with nine tasks specifying or assuming audience out of 14, covered various types of audience, such as writing a thank-you letter to a familiar person, language learning tips for Korean language learners, or an article about an environmental problem in a school magazine. Textbooks E and E-1 identified an audience in only a few writing tasks, and all were biased toward a known individual or a group such as a friend or a schoolmate.

Taken together, it was found that 41 out of a total of 71 writing tasks did not specify an audience. This is consistent with the results of previous research (Ahn, 2012; Choi & Yu, 2010), which reported that most writing tasks in Korean MOE-authorized textbooks under the earlier curriculum did not address the reader. In particular, Textbooks C and C-1 offered only three writing tasks with audience specified, which means students who study from these textbooks will have few opportunities to write considering audience for at least



three semesters. It may be that it is challenging to develop tasks with an audience beyond the classroom in EFL contexts. It may also be true that not all writing tasks need to take into account an audience. Writing an information report such as a graph description does not necessarily require a specific reader besides the teacher-evaluator since its main purpose is to display knowledge. However, in real-life cases, texts are produced to convey a message to a reader, whether known or unknown, a single person or an institution, and this greatly impacts style, content, and language (Hedge, 2005). Given this fact, the disparity seems wide between tasks with audience for social communication and tasks without audience for knowledge display. It would appear desirable to increase the number of tasks that provide students with a chance to write to an audience.

In the case of writing tasks which provide audience, the inclusion of audience awareness activities was examined through a yes-no checklist (Appendix D). Even in tasks with audience information, neither audience awareness activities nor explicit instructions on how to deal with the reader were found in the textbooks. Again, this is consistent with prior research on writing tasks designed under the previous national curricula (Ahn, 2012). This suggests that there has not been much development in terms of raising students' contextual awareness. For example, when writing a complaint letter to a customer service manager of a company, the use of modal verbs and formal language play a significant role in achieving the purpose of the letter, which is acknowledgment of the complaint. However, this kind of information is not provided, and students may be left unaware of the importance of modality in this situation, and they may not be able to write a successful complaint letter in English in the future. Without explicit instruction, it is unlikely that EFL students will learn how audience in context affects both content and language (Hyland, 2003).

## 5. CONCLUSION

### 5.1. Summary of the Major Findings

The study analyzed the writing tasks developed for high school students in *English* and *English I* in light of the process-genre approach. The results showed that writing tasks embraced key concepts of the writing pedagogy by including both pre-writing and post-writing stage and demanding the production of a genre with a model text. However, it may be better if pre-writing activities and the questions in the revision and editing checklists are offered with regard to the features of the final writing task types. Moreover, they did not encompass a wide range of genres and subgenres, and the spectrum of genre types differed from textbook to textbook. More explicit guidelines or activities on rhetorical stages and language input related to the target genre need to be supplemented. There is much room for

improvement concerning raising contextual awareness. More than half of all the writing tasks we analyzed did not specify audience in the prompts, and the range of audience types differed by textbook and was insufficiently wide to provide students' practice writing in various contexts.

## 5.2. Pedagogical Implications

Based on the results of the study, material writers need to design and provide a variety of pre-writing strategies and checklist items for revision and editing in accordance with the features of different task types. Developing and incorporating effective genre awareness activities are also needed since, without explicit instruction on generic features, students may not develop genre knowledge (Martin, 2009). It might be an option to link grammar sections to writing sections in each unit where grammar items presented are often divorced from the genre of the task. It will help students to understand how language functions to achieve the purpose of the genres. In terms of context, it is important to include reader information specifically in more writing prompts and to expand the range of audience types by varying the degree of social intimacy and social status of the reader, to build the ability to respond appropriately in diverse communicative settings. In addition, audience awareness activities or explanations should follow because EFL learners have limited access to authentic contexts to acquire this knowledge implicitly.

To ensure genre diversity, curriculum developers need to design a comprehensive English national curriculum for secondary students around different genres in order that it can be reflected in the writing task design in the textbook. This should start by investigating the core genres and their subgenres which are especially useful for EFL learners and highly applicable to many types of texts and contexts or which have distinctive textual properties from that of Korean texts. The selected genres need to be distributed across the secondary school curriculum, with care to prevent a certain genre from being excluded or from overlapping many times. It would be also beneficial to consider the degree of complexity of the rhetorical moves or language forms of the genre when deciding which genres to include in each year. For example, relatively simple texts such as personal recounts, procedures, or descriptive information reports may be included in the middle school curriculum, while narrative, explanation, or discussion, which requires rather complex rhetorical patterns and language forms, can be introduced in high school. The recycling of genre types is also necessary to reinforce genre knowledge, but it would be effective to accompany this with an expansion of scope in terms of topics (from personal to general) or the inclusion of optional stages. For example, the genre "procedure" may be first introduced with a series of steps with imperative sentences about an activity of everyday life and may be reintroduced with more complex forms including the

consequences of the steps at the end of a text using modal verbs and conditional clauses. In this way, students will systematically increase their control over different genres as they progress through the school years. In addition, this systematic curriculum can help ensure that students have similar learning experiences related to genre type regardless of which textbooks they use.

Practitioners are also better able to adapt writing tasks to help students write with more support based on the findings of the study. For example, they may adapt the questions for revision and editing according to the final task types and genres. If editing is absent, they need to guide students to view their output in light of accuracy. Last but not least, teachers' understanding of process-genre based instruction is critical. Even if genre knowledge is taught but presented as fixed knowledge, it will be just another item to be memorized and demotivate students. Rather, it should be understood as a means to an end that occurs naturally in the social purpose of the text. Thus, efforts to raise awareness of the pedagogy and providing teaching aids for practitioners should be made a priority, such as developing teachers' guidebooks or offering workshops.

### 5.3. Limitations and Suggestions

Despite the implications, it is not without limitations that should be addressed in future research. First, the present study analyzed writing tasks from a subset of the 22 textbooks currently in use. It will provide a fuller picture if the whole set is considered in analysis. In addition, it may not be the case that students learn from textbooks by the same publishers for Year 1 and Year 2 of high school. Next, considering the Korean EFL context, the genre typology used in this study, although it was adapted from that of Sydney School, is not fully grounded in the needs of EFL learners. As noted in the previous section, it is necessary to develop core genre categories for EFL learners and examine writing tasks through the new, more context-appropriate typology in future studies. It is self-evident that teachers are free to choose tasks outside their textbooks and adapt existing ones depending on their teaching contexts. Furthermore, providing well-designed tasks may not be sufficient to build students' writing competence. This should be accompanied by efforts to support teachers, for example, offering teaching aids or assessment tools in line with principled pedagogy. Nevertheless, textbooks currently play a significant role in many Korean high schools, and tasks are fundamental in writing instruction. Under these circumstances, principled textbook tasks are influential in learning how to write well. Although it is not easy to develop tasks incorporating the many aspects of the process-genre based approach, it is worthwhile to research with it to equip students with the knowledge they will need to participate in written communication within English speaking communities and to help them achieve personal and academic success in the future. The

findings and pedagogical suggestions in this study will contribute to writing task and curriculum design in order to support high school students learn to write in English with fluency, accuracy, and appropriacy.

## REFERENCES

- Ahn, H.-K. (2012). *An analysis of writing sections in middle school English textbooks and activity books: Teachers' perceptions of writing instruction*. Unpublished master's thesis, International Graduate School of English, Seoul, South Korea.
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.
- Bae, H.-J. (2012). The effectiveness of genre-based L2 writing instruction on Korean middle school students' writing ability. *English Teaching*, 67(3), 147-180.
- Bae, J.-Y. (2017). The effects of the process-genre approach on Korean EFL university students' writing abilities. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, 16(1), 1-25.
- Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Chen, J. C., & Brown, K. L. (2012). The effects of authentic audience on English as a second language (ESL) writers: A task-based, computer-mediated approach. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 25(5), 435-454.
- Choi, S., & Yu, H.-J. (2010). An analysis of the writing tasks in high school English textbooks: Focusing on genre, rhetorical structure, task types, and authenticity. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 16(4), 267-290.
- Choi, S.-H., & Lee, H.-K. (2010). Analysis of the task difficulty of level-based English activity books for freshmen in high school. *English Teaching*, 26(2), 257-277.
- Csizér, K., & Tankó, G. (2015). English majors' self-regulatory control strategy use in academic writing and its relation to L2 motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(3), 386-404.
- Derewianka, B. (2003). Trends and issues in genre-based approaches. *RELC Journal*, 34, 133-154.
- Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. Sydney: Macquarie University/AMES.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

- Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 40*, 44-59.
- Hedge, T. (2005). *Writing* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K. (2015). *Teaching and researching writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Johns, A. M. (1995). Genre and pedagogical purposes. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*(2), 181-190.
- Jwa, S.-M. (2007). An analysis of the writing sections in EFL English textbooks in Korea using a process approach. *English Teaching, 64*(2), 117-144.
- Kim, H.-J. (2008). A comparative study on Korean and Chinese high school English textbooks: Focus on writing activities. *Foreign Languages Education, 15*(1), 245-279.
- Kim, G.-O., & Rha, K.-H. (2017). An analysis of writing activities of middle school English textbooks based on the 2009 Revised National Curriculum. *Journal of the English Language and Literature, 59*(4), 407-434.
- Kim, S.-Y. (2014). Korean high school students' attitudes toward English writing and English writing instruction. *Studies in English Education, 19*(1), 77-102.
- Kim, Y., & Kim, J. (2005). Teaching Korean university writing class: Balancing the process and the genre approach. *The Asian EFL Journal, 7*(2), 68-89.
- Korean Educational Statistics Service (KESS). (2018). *The number of students by city/province size*. Retrieved on June 05, 2019, from the World Wide Web: [https://kess.kedi.re.kr/stats/school?menuCd=0101&cd=4206&survSeq=2018&itemCode=01&menuId=m\\_010108&uppCd1=010108&uppCd2=010108&flag=B](https://kess.kedi.re.kr/stats/school?menuCd=0101&cd=4206&survSeq=2018&itemCode=01&menuId=m_010108&uppCd1=010108&uppCd2=010108&flag=B)
- Lee, I. (2012). Genre-based teaching and assessment in secondary English classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 11*(4), 120-136.
- Lee, I., & Wong, K. (2014). Bringing innovation to EFL writing: The case of a primary school in Hong Kong. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 23*(1), 159-163.
- Lee, K.-L. (2006). The effect of genre-based instruction: Improving English writing ability in the classroom. *English Teaching, 61*(1), 257-281.
- Lee, M.-B. (2011). *The development of English speaking and writing instruction models* (RRI 2011-7-1), Seoul: Korean Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE).
- Lee, S., & Rha, K.-H. (2013). Analysis of middle school English textbook writing activities based on genre-based approach. *Foreign Languages Education, 20*(1), 45-71.
- Lee, Y.-H. (2008). Voice, practices, and products: Accounting for writing teacher and

- students. *English Teaching*, 63(3), 179-203.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 10-21.
- McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochemia medica*, 22(3), 276-282.
- Ministry of Education (MOE). (2015). *English curriculum (MOE Publication No. 2015-74)*. Retrieved on June 05, 2019, from the World Wide Web: <http://ncic.go.kr/mobile.dwn.ogf.inventoryList.do#>
- Park, M.-R., & Suh, K.-O. (2003). An analysis of Korean high school English textbooks under the 7<sup>th</sup> curriculum. *English Teaching*, 58(4), 319-347.
- Pelaez-Morales, C. (2017). L2 writing scholarship in JSLW: An updated report of research published between 1992 and 2015. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 38, 9-19.
- Piaget, J. (1976). Piaget's theory. In B. Inhelder, H. H. Chipman & C. Zwingmann (Eds.), *Piaget and his school* (pp. 45-63). New York: Springer.
- Racelis, J. V., & Matsuda, P. K. (2013). Integrating process and genre into the second language writing classroom: Research into practice. *Language Teaching*, 46(3), 382-393.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students expository writing. *Language Learning*, 46, 137-174.
- Seoul Education Research & Information Institute. (2018). *A guidebook for elective subjects based on the 2017 revised national curriculum*. Retrieved on June 05, 2019, from the World Wide Web: from <http://sen.go.kr/web/services/bbs/bbsView.action?bbsBean.bbsCd=44&bbsBean.bbsSeq=997>
- Seow, A. (2002). The writing process and process writing. In J. Richards & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, (pp. 315-320). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University press.
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Van den Branden, K. (2006). *Task based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Watanabe, H. (2017). An examination of written genres in English language textbooks in Japan. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(1), 64-80.
- Weil, L. G., Fleming, S. M., Dumontheil, I., Kilford, E. J., Weil, R. S., Rees, G., Dolan, R.J., & Blakemore, S. J. (2013). The development of metacognitive ability in adolescence. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 22(1), 264-271.
- White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process writing*. London, UK: Longman.

- Williams, J. (2005). *Teaching writing in second and foreign language classrooms*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Yu, S., & Reynolds, B. L. (2018). Investigating writing tasks in English textbooks for Chinese secondary students. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(4), 1114-1121.

## APPENDIX A

### The List of Sample Textbooks

- Hong, M.-P., Ahn, H.-G., Park, Y.-M., Kim, J.-T., Jang, H.-W., Shin, J.-S.,... Pak, R. (2018). *High School English*. Seoul, Korea: Bisang Education
- Hong, M.-P., Ahn, H.-G., Park, Y.-M., Kim, J.-T., Jang, H.-W., Shin, J.-S.,... Pak, R. (2018). *High School English I*. Seoul, Korea: Bisang Education.
- Kim, S.-G., Yoon, J.-H., Koo, E.-Y., Cheon, H.-J., Seo, J.-H., Lee, H.-G.,... Shin, Y.-S. (2018). *High School English*. Seoul, Korea: Neungyule Education.
- Kim, S.-G., Yoon, J.-H., Koo, E.-Y., Cheon, H.-J., Seo, J.-H., Lee, H.-G.,... Baek, S.-J. (2018). *High School English I*. Seoul, Korea: Neungyule Education.
- Lee, J.-Y., Ahn, B.-G., Oh, J.-I., Moon, A.-N., Kim, C.-S., Kim, H.-J., & Manning, S. J. (2018). *High School English*. Seoul, Korea: Cheonjae Education.
- Lee, J.-Y., Moon, A.-N., Oh, Y.-I., Cho, S.-K., Lee, Y.-J., Kim, J.-H., & Manning, S. J. (2018). *High School English I*. Seoul, Korea: Cheonjae Education.
- Min, C.-G., Jung, H.-S., Lee, S.-G., Kim, Y.-G., Gwak, N.-J., Won, J.-H.,...Klinkner, R. (2018). *High School English*. Seoul, Korea: Jihak-sa.
- Min, C.-G., Jung, H.-S., Lee, S.-G., Kim, Y.-G., Na, W.-C., Ahn, H.-S.,...Klinkner, R. (2018). *High School English I*. Seoul, Korea: Jihak-sa.
- Park, J.-E., Yoon, B.-W., Kim, S.-H., Choi, S.-Y., Kim, J.-S., Choi, J.-Y.,...Kim, H.-Y. (2018). *High School English*. Seoul, Korea: YBM.
- Park, J.-E., Yoon, B.-W., Kim, S.-H., Choi, S.-Y., Kim, J.-S., Choi, J.-Y., & Kim, H.-Y. (2018). *High School English I*. Seoul, Korea: YBM.

## APPENDIX B

### The Types of Pre-writing and Post-writing Activities

Prewriting Stage		
Unstructured Activities	Units (Total)	The genre of the task
Brainstorming : free associations on a topic		
Listing : listing words or phrases on a topic to be categorized or prioritized		

Free-writing : writing whatever comes to mind nonstop ignoring accuracy		
Structured	Units (Total)	The genre of the task
Clustering : putting ideas about a topic in circles and connecting them with lines		
Cubing : six ways of exploring a topic (description, comparison, association, analysis, application, and argument)		
Questioning : idea generation by who, what, why, where, when, and how		
Outlining : organization of ideas coherently and hierarchically		
Others		
<b>Post-writing Stage</b>		
<b>Checklist Questions for Revision</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Units</b>
Is it provided in a post writing stage?	Y/N	
If so, are the questions for each writing task varied according to the lesson goals related to the features of the writing tasks?	Y/N	
<b>Checklist Questions for Editing</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Units</b>
Is it provided in a post writing stage?	Y/N	
If so, are the questions for each writing task varied according to the lesson goals related to the features of the writing tasks?	Y/N	

## APPENDIX C

### The Types of Genre and Subgenres and Checklist for Genre-Awareness Activities

<b>Types of Genres and Subgenres</b>				
Purpose	Genres	Subgenres	Units	Total
To tell what happened	Recount	Personal		
		Factual		
		(Auto)Biographical		
To tell how to do something	Procedure			
To provide information about a topic	Information Report	Descriptive		
		Taxonomic		
		Compare/contrast		
		Historical		
To explain how or why a phenomenon happens	Explanation	Casual		
To explore the human condition through storytelling	Story genres	Sequential		
		Narrative		
To respond to artistic work/text	Response (Review)	Fable		
To mount an argument	Exposition	Response (Review)		
		Persuasion		
		Discussion		
	Others			
<b>Genre Awareness Activities</b>				
Checklist Questions			Answer	
1. Does the writing section of this unit include genre awareness activities on rhetorical stages? If so, what does it require students to do?			Y/N	
2. Does the writing section of this unit include genre awareness activities on language forms? If so, what does it require students to do?			Y/N	



## APPENDIX D

## The Types of Audience and Checklist of Audience Awareness Activities

<b>The Types of Audience</b>			
Audience types		Units	Total
Specified /assumed	Self		
	One known other		
	One unknown other		
	One known group		
	One unknown group		
General audience/public			
Not specified			
<b>Audience Awareness Activities</b>			
Checklist Questions		Answer	Units
1. Does the writing section of this unit include an audience awareness activity?		Y/N	
2. If so, what does it require students to do?			

Applicable levels: Secondary

Eon-sung Na  
 Teacher  
 Baekseok Middle School  
 Yangjusansungro 574gil, 38  
 Baeksuk Yangju Gyeonggido  
 Email: onsongstar@gmail.com

Hye-won Lee  
 Senior Research Manager  
 Cambridge Assessment English  
 The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road  
 Cambridge, CB2 8EA, United Kingdom  
 Email: lee.h@cambridgeenglish.org

Received on September 30, 2019  
 Reviewed on November 21, 2019  
 Accepted on December 5, 2019