

Between the Keys

A Publication of the JALT Materials Writers SIG ©2015

Spring 2015
Volume XXIII, Number 1

From the Publication Chair

James Essex

Time has certainly flown since the last JALT National, during which I was elected as Publications Chair. I would therefore like to begin with a humble apology for having taken so long to get this issue of *Between the Keys* to you. However, I hope its contents more than make up for the delay. In addition to the Co-ordinator's column, Richard Walker and Loran Edwards write about the trials and tribulations of writing a textbook. Loran takes us on her personal journey of publishing her own textbook with a major publisher, something I am sure many members of this SIG have thought about as they search for a 'best fit' for their own classes. Likewise, Richard's article looks at the writing of an in-house textbook for an academic speaking class in his university, perhaps also suggesting that if the 'best fit' cannot be found, create it. If you too have not yet found the best fit, and you have yet to embark upon the writing of your own textbook, then Jim Smiley's article, which introduces us to differentiated instruction through tiered rubrics will no doubt provide food for thought as we embark upon the new academic year, entering into the unknown when it comes to unstreamed classes.

Finally, I would like to end by echoing the words of our co-ordinator in that the SIG is in danger of being swallowed up by another SIG or falling into a sink hole and disappearing forever. With that in mind, I would like to encourage you to submit an article for publication. Full submission guidelines can be found on our website, and articles do not have to be research articles. We also welcome personal accounts like those in this issue, reviews of textbooks or other materials and so on. Also, if you would like to volunteer for a role specifically on BtK such as shadow publications chair, reviews editor, proofreader at large etc., please do get in touch. I would love to hear from you.

With that in mind, I wish you luck for the start of the academic year.

Co-ordinator's Column

Jim Smiley, Tohoku Bunka Gakuen University

Last November at our AGM, the guard here at the MW-SIG changed. Our past Co-ordinator, Nate French, was elected to the JALT National Board of Directors as Director of Records. Congratulations, Nate. My sincere best wishes for your tenure there. Nate is staying on our board as Member-at-Large to offer his experience and wisdom. We have a new Publications Chair. James Essex has stepped up to take over this role. Welcome, James. Travis Holtzclaw and Scott Petersen remain as Member-

ship and Treasury Chairs respectively. I'm keeping my role as Programmes Chair concurrently with being the Co-ordinator. Overall, it's good to see new blood in the organisation, and our continuity is well-served at the same time. Still—as always—we would appreciate more involvement from our 'ordinary' members. This is YOUR group. We can live long and prosper only if you make it so. We have a large enough member base, but perennially, the same problem of lack of participation mean that only a very few keep our activities running.

I want to reiterate that last point. I was asked by Nate to cover his position while he does his stint on the BoD. If I hadn't agreed, the chances of our group being dissolved was on the agenda for a while. Of course, I'm happy to help where and when I can, but without more involvement from you, the future of the MW-SIG is not secure. Already JALT has 27 SIGs, and many of their interests overlap somewhat. For example, Teacher Education could easily incorporate materials creation, as that is an element in the lives of most teachers. Two SIGs actually did amalgamate at the past Osaka Executive Board Meeting in February. The Junior Senior High School SIG and Teaching Children SIG have joined to create the new "Teaching Younger Learners SIG". JALT hasn't increased its membership rates for 18 years, making us one of the cheapest professional teacher organisations around. Yet, the increase of the numbers of SIGs and the

cost of living over that time has risen significantly. JALT is bleeding and wounds have to be cauterised. One proposal was that SIGs need to have more officers, ideally ten people covering at least five roles. Having a 'main' officer and a 'shadow', or 'co-position' helps maintain stability and long-term security in the SIG. An implication for MW is that if we continue to struggle to find even the five basic positions (currently we have four and I'm doubling), we are not going to fulfil our mission as a SIG. I fear that our demise may be on the horizon.

Yet the membership comprises a whole bunch of energetic and productive people. Come forward. Show yourselves, and become active. Being an officer in a SIG is a rewarding experience, looks great on a CV, and gives you the chance to put back into your society as much as you take from it.

You will be aware that the JALT membership dues are set to increase in September. For that, you will also get a 'free' SIG. Many of you are a member of MW only and will probably just continue. Others need to know that the SIG rates will also increase to 2000 yen per year. If the MW is your 'second' SIG, don't let the extra 500 yen stop you from renewing.

Let me don my Programme Chair hat now and tell you about our plans for the year to the National. We have a 90-minute workshop at the Pan-SIG. Greg Goodmacher's presentation will be highly motivational and interesting

Between the Keys is published by the JALT Materials Writers Special Interest Group (MW-SIG). The editors welcome contributions in the following areas: publishing issues, classroom activities, page layout or desktop publishing, experiences in publishing or materials design, announcements of materials-related meetings or newly published materials, or any other articles focusing on aspects of materials writing or publishing. For information about reprinting articles, please contact the editor. All articles contained in *Between the Keys* ©2015 by their respective authors. This newsletter ©2015 by Materials Writers SIG.

for materials writers looking to develop their creativity in writing. (May 16-17, see Pan-SIG 2015 website for details: <https://sites.google.com/site/jaltpan-sig/>.) I'll let the abstract speak for itself.

Creativity with Teaching Materials

The presenter will facilitate workshop-style discussions about creativity and teaching materials. Accomplished materials writers will learn some new tricks from each other, and novices will gain much knowledge from their more experienced peers. The presentation will cover ways to make the average mass-produced textbook more affectively engaging, intellectually stimulating, and pedagogically effective. For example, the presenter will show how to turn reading sections into cooperative reading texts that involve oral communication and challenging tasks. Another topic is the creation of learning games that use the content of standard textbooks. Making and adapting teaching materials so that they appeal to students with differing learning styles will be discussed. We will also examine realia (maps, catalogs, newspapers, YouTube videos, government documents, etc.) and share our ideas on adapting them for our classes. The presenter will show some examples of his work and ask the audience to critically analyze them. All participants will actively work together while sharing their ideas and experiences in creating teaching materials. The presenter has written typical textbooks published by Japanese publishers and has published and created materials that are too extreme (yet very effective) to be accepted by most book publishers. He believes that teaching materials are never really finished. They can and should be revised to better fit class needs and augmented to create more enriching learning and teaching experiences.

Events

As a part of our JALT Chapter co-sponsoring programme, we have a number of events lined up throughout the country (Honshu, with apologies to the other islands—if you live outside Honshu and want to co-sponsor or otherwise have an MW event with your chapter, please contact me). MW members can attend all of these events free of charge. Where the exact details are not specified, we'll put them on the MW-members mailing list when they become known. Otherwise, check with the local chapter involved.

•**In April**, Cameron Romney and John Campbell-Larsen will give a joint talk in conjunction with Nara JALT.

Creating supplements that increase opportunities for spoken interaction

Many teachers have little or no say in coursebook selection (Byrd, 2001; Islam & Mares, 2003) and despite publisher claims that coursebooks, especially four-skills coursebooks, provide everything a teacher requires (McGrath, 2002), no coursebook can actually satisfy all student and teacher needs (Tomlinson, 2006). In Japan, many teachers feel their students need extra speaking practice and make their own materials to be used as supplements for their textbook.

But how do teachers go about creating supplements that focus on speaking? How do they decide what types of speaking activities to use? How can they determine where their textbook is deficient and what their students need extra practice with?

This presentation will introduce a systematic approach developed by the presenter over the last several years called ACoPE (Analyze, Consult, Produce and Evaluate) to help teachers create supplementary materials that focus on speaking. First, teachers will be

shown how to ANALYZE textbooks to breakdown the text's "multi-component construction" (McDonough, Shaw & Masaharu, 2013:296) to determine the theme, linguistic features and the communicative functions of the coursebook. Then, teachers will be shown how to CONSULT reference and other teaching materials to find alternatives to their current textbook. Next, the presenter will discuss some key factors for PRODUCING supplementary materials including how to make materials that are engaging and relevant. Finally, the presentation will conclude by discussing ways teachers can EVALUATE the effectiveness of their new materials. Participants should come away with a better understanding of how to create supplementary materials that work hand-in-hand with their textbooks to better suit their student's needs.

•**This is followed in May** the week before the Pan-SIG with a presentation with the Hiroshima JALT by Diane Nagatomo-Hawley whom you will remember as JALT2014's Conference Chair.

Hiroshima on May 10 from 2-4.

Eigo and Eikaiwa: Creating EFL Materials for Different Goals and Purposes

This presentation will be divided into two halves. The first half will examine two competing ideologies that surround English language education in Japan: eigo and eikaiwa. In order to understand how these two ideologies work, we will take a brief trip in the "Foreign-language-in-Japan-time-machine" to see how language study has wavered between that for communicative purposes and that for examination purposes.

The second half of the presentation will be a workshop. Keeping in mind the ideologies of eigo and eikaiwai, covered earlier in the afternoon, the participants will discuss issues that are important to

consider while writing EFL textbooks for the Japanese university market. I will also describe how I got my foot in the EFL textbook writing door in 1994 and the challenges I am facing with my current project.

•**Hiroshima JALT** have a nice system whereby they invite speakers to answer four questions about their presentation. The answers give a valuable insight into the presentation and into the presenter herself. Here is the Q&A.

Question 1: How did you get involved in this area? What attracted you to this topic?

I've been writing EFL materials in Japan since the 1980s in one form or another. First I started writing short essays for the Mainichi Weekly and then I wrote my first textbook for Kinseido in 1993. Since then I have written a number of books for university students and for the general public. I have always enjoyed writing.

Question 2: Who should come to your presentation? Who is your target? Who would most benefit?

Of course I think everyone should come to my presentation, but perhaps those who would benefit the most would be those who are interested in writing EFL materials for the Japanese market, which is quite different from writing for Western academic publishers.

Since I will also be talking about issues that pertain to Japanese students and Japanese teachers in my presentation, I think that anyone interested in English education at the university level in Japan would also be interested.

Question 3: Why is your topic important to English teaching/learning in Japan? Or teaching/learning in general?

I think my talk might inspire some attendees to take concrete steps toward getting his or her own materials into publishable form. If better materials

become available for Japanese students (and Japanese teachers to use) then perhaps students will become more motivated to study English and perhaps they will improve their English skills as well.

Question 4: Any recommendations for further reading on your topic?

It really isn't necessary to prepare in advance for my talk, but some insight into what Japanese university teachers think and believe about English language teaching might be useful. Therefore, I recommend my book *Exploring Japanese University English Teachers' Professional Identity* (2012). I'll bring a copy of this book with me to give away to an attendee (perhaps in a drawing).

•**Also in May** as a part of the MWSIG outreach programme, we are supporting the Iwate Chapter's involvement in the 2015 Michinoku English Education Summit by providing the funds for John Campbell-Larsen as a plenary speaker. And John will pop over to the Akita Chapter the next day. Although his talks are not of direct relevance to materials writing, John's discussion of how pragmatics can inform language pedagogy and ultimately materials is of deep interest to all writers.

Akita Chapter meeting: 30th May 2015

John Campbell-Larsen has taught English in Japan for 20 years and currently holds the position of Associate Professor at Kyoto Women's University, Kyoto Japan. He gained his M.A in TESOL from the University of Birmingham and his research interests include conversation analysis, semantics and teaching the spoken form of the language.

Title: Teaching the spoken language Abstract As language teachers, it is essential that we base our teaching on robust and verifiable descriptions

of what spoken language is rather than relying on intuition or purely written forms. The advent of computerized corpora and availability of digital recording technology has enabled researchers to gain new insights as to how language is actually used by speakers in the real world. Findings from Corpus Linguistics (CL) (E.g. O'Keeffe, McCarthy, Carter, 2007) have shown that spoken language differs markedly from written language and displays features such as marking and purposeful vagueness that are not readily available to the intuition. Similarly, Conversation Analysis (CA) (E.g. Schegloff, 2007) has uncovered orderly ways in which speakers use language to align with one another and co-construct meaning within and across speaker turns.

In this presentation, the presenter will describe some central findings from CL and CA, covering the topics of discourse marking, vague expressions for time and amount, reported speech, and spoken narrative conventions. The presenter will argue that these aspects of language are not to be taught as stand-alone topics, but should be woven into the fabric of language teaching classes on a longitudinal basis. The presenter will show how to teach these points in the classroom, based on the creation of a five point turn structure that is applicable to every lesson target. The presenter will illustrate consciousness-raising and practice activities with video of student interaction in peer-talk and show how recycling of key language in highly autonomous speaking activities can orient students towards the automatic use of naturalistic grammar and lexis, and the ability to structure turns in an orderly manner. The internalization of these key features of the spoken language can transform students from language learners to language users.

Talk 2 Title: Reported speech: Grammar, semantics, pragmatics

Abstract: There is general agreement (McCarthy 1998, Bakhtin 1981) that everyday conversation is suffused with references to others' speech. The ability to report what others have said is a key skill if one is to engage in naturalistic conversation. However, in ESL instruction the topic has a tendency to be under-taught. Despite its frequency, textbooks often treat reported speech in a minimalistic way. Focus is primarily given to backshifting of tenses, although corpus data (McCarthy 1998) suggests this is an overly reductive view, and little if any attention is paid to the semantics of the speech verbs. Widely-used textbooks will be referenced to illustrate these claims. This presentation will then examine the grammar and semantics of reported speech, at a level that is accessible to learners, and how these can be taught. The presentation will illustrate the points made with video data of student spoken interactions, showing initial hesitancy, omission or misuse of personal pronouns and deixis, and then show students using a wide variety of reporting strategies (say, speak, talk, tell, be like) to engage in naturalistic spoken interaction. The presentation concludes by suggesting that a familiarity with reported speech conventions is a central strand of conversational competence.

•Iwate JALT

2nd Annual Michinoku English Education Summit

Sunday, 31 May 2015 - 9:00am - 5:00pm

Teaching the spoken language: From research to classroom

The written form of the language has long served as the model for students

of a second/foreign language. However, with the onset of reliable, portable video and audio recording equipment and powerful computers that can analyze large amounts of data, it has become clear that the spoken form of English differs from the written form in many ways, many of them not immediately accessible to the intuition of native speakers or proficient L2 speakers. Data from the fields of Conversation Analysis and Corpus Linguistics have revealed that the way in which the spoken language is used is not chaotic and 'degenerate' as was asserted by the generative model, but deeply orderly and structured. This presentation will outline some of the research findings concerning such items as discourse markers, purposive vagueness, vague category markers, figures of speech, topic management, reported speech and turn structure. The presenter will go on to outline the application of these findings in classroom practice, illustrating with video of student conversations.

•Last and certainly not least, it is my utmost pleasure to announce that the MW-SIG will sponsor a Featured Speaker at the JALT National Conference in Shizuoka in November. Our past Co-ordinator, Cameron Romney, is well-known as an excellent speaker and a stalwart of research into pedagogic materials. He will give a 60-minute talk and conduct a 90-minute workshop for us at the conference.

Talk

Towards systematic materials design with ADDIE

Many teaching materials in the ELT field are not created in a systematic way, but based on a reworking of what was deemed to be successful in the past and the author's intuition about language learning (Tomlinson, 1998). Further-

more, ELT materials are often created to meet the selector's (teachers and/or administrators) beliefs about what materials should be (Tomlinson, 2003), a publisher's existing catalog (Amrani, 2011), or to be as widely appealing as possible (Bell & Gower, 2011). While many researchers have proposed the idea that ELT materials should be created in a more systematic, research based way (see Tomlinson, 2014 for example) few have offered any concrete suggestions for doing so.

Drawing from the relatively new field of Instructional Systems Design (ISD), this presentation will introduce a basic Instructional Design (ID) model called ADDIE (Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement and Evaluate) and how it can be applied to the creation of ELT materials. The presenter will take each step in the model and discuss how instructional designers use it to create traditional content learning activities and demonstrate how it can be applied to EFL/ESL learning situations.

Participants should come away with a better understanding of the challenges facing ELT materials writers and how ID models can be applied to meet those challenges to create materials in a more systematic way.

90-minute workshop

Harnessing the power of visual design to improve student learning

Making great teaching materials is not only about the content but also how it is presented. Research has shown that visual design influences both student comprehension and motivation. This workshop will offer some visual design best practices to improve student learning, and demonstrate how they can be applied to materials using word processing software. Participants are encouraged to bring copies of their own materials and/or their laptop to practice

with.

Abstract

Many teachers give handouts of some sort in the classroom. Whether these are syllabi, activities or homework, the content of the handout is only half of the document. The other half is the visual elements: graphics, page layout, typography, etc. While lots of thought and energy went into the creation of the content, often the visual elements of the document are ignored. Teachers should be concerned about these elements because research has shown that visual design affects both the comprehension and usability of teaching materials. This workshop will urge teachers to think about these elements, and offer some simple, concrete suggestions in the form of best practices for improving the visual design of classroom materials. It is intended for any teacher, at any level, who creates his or her own handouts.

The workshop will begin by reviewing some key concepts related to visual design and why they are important. Next the presenter will offer some best practices for teacher-writers to consider. Afterwards the presenter will demonstrate how these best practices can be applied to materials using common word processing software. Finally, participants will have the opportunity to apply these best practices to their own materials or sample materials provided by the presenter.

Participants are encouraged to bring copies of their own self-made materials and/or their laptop. Participants should come away from the workshop with a greater understanding of what the visual elements of a document are, how these visual elements affect usability, and how they can improve their own materials.

References

Amrani, F. (2011). The process of evaluation: the publishers view. In B. Tomlinson

(Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* Second edition (pp. 267-295). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bell, J. & Gower, R. (2011). Writing course materials for the world: a great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* Second edition (pp. 267-295). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (1998). Introduction. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2003). Materials evaluation. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 15-37). London: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (2014). Applied Linguistics and Materials Development. (Ed.) B. Tomlinson. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Starting from Scratch: A Beginner's Publishing Tale

Loran Edwards

In a recent issue of *Between the Keys*, Todd Jay Leonard wrote an article on publishing EFL textbooks. He stated that, "teachers often lament that there is no 'perfect' textbook on the market for their particular situation or need. So, one alternative to remedy this perennial problem is to write your own textbook" (2013). That was my problem exactly – and my solution!

I came to Japan in 2005 and right from the beginning had a hard time choosing a single textbook that worked well for my combined reading and writing classes. Either I would end up choosing a reading book and supplementing with my own writing materials or vice versa. It didn't take many semesters of this before I had enough original materials that I could forgo the commercial textbooks altogether. It was an easy mental step from, "Now this is MUCH better!" to, "Hey! This is good stuff! I should really try to get this published!" That thought started my foray into the world of academic publishing and kept me busy for about a year and a half until my textbook, *Working Together! Communicative Reading and Writing* was

finally published with Cengage Learning (Edwards, 2011).

Getting Started

Once I decided to try and publish my book, I began researching exactly how one got this done. My first step was to join the MW SIG and post a call for help on the message board. I received some very helpful feedback including a handout from an earlier JALT Panel Discussion, "Ten Tips for Getting Published" (see Appendix A), which lists ideas about what to do before you submit a proposal and also tips on how you should submit the proposal once you are ready.

The timing was right, so I was also able to attend another MW workshop at the 2008 JALT National Conference. At this presentation, some of the pro's and con's for different types of publishing/publishers were discussed. Big publishers often have a 5-year plan already in place, so it is difficult for a small writer to break in, but not impossible. Smaller publishers have more flexibility, but their audience and budget are also smaller. Of all commercial publishers, the author can expect to make approximately 10% of the sales price. Publishing a book independently,

9

Spring 2015 Vol. XXIII, No. 1

for example as an ebook or through a print-on-demand company, has the advantage of being more profitable – the author can keep all of the revenue – but they also have to do all of their own marketing. I left the conference with a two-pronged approach for moving forward: first, I needed to put together a working sample of my book and have some colleagues pilot it for me, then I needed to write a proposal.

Pilot studies

When publishers accept an idea for publication, they are taking a big risk, so it is useful if the writer can prove beforehand that the material works with the target audience. I had used my materials extensively in my own classes, but I needed to know if the material was effective for other teachers as well. Therefore, I put together a sample unit, which would cover three class periods, and wrote out a sample teacher's manual for those lessons. I then recruited two colleagues to test the material in their classes and provide me with both verbal and written feedback. The teachers liked the material and showed me some areas where instructions could be clearer or activities tweaked to make them more comprehensive.

Most publishers will not require authors to submit a full manuscript with their proposal, a unit or two is sufficient. However, I was close to having a complete manuscript already, so I used the feedback I received from my colleagues and revised my materials into a complete, 5-unit textbook that I could submit with my proposal when the time came.

Proposal Writing

A couple of months after the 2008 JALT conference, as I was gearing up to write a proposal and contact publishers, a textbook representative for Cengage

visited our campus. One of the colleagues who had piloted my materials, told her about my book. Luckily, I was in my office when the rep knocked on my door and I was able to give her a copy of my completed manuscript and talk to her about why I had written the book, the process that had gone through writing it and why I thought it should be published. Amazingly, she said, "Write up a proposal. Send it to me. And I will share it with the editors at our next publishing meeting."

So, I jumped on Google and tried to figure out how to write a proposal. This was by far the hardest part of my entire publishing experience. The Ten Tips worksheet was very helpful in letting me know what I needed to include, but I still didn't really know how to do it. Through my online searches, I found a few more guidelines from different publishers, but I could not find an example anywhere. Finally, I just decided to go with what I had and write a "proposal" that included: a summary of my book, a rationale for why it should be published, a comparison of my book to others already on the market, and a reason why my book would be a great addition to the Cengage catalogue (see appendix B).

Publication!

I mailed off my proposal, along with a copy of my manuscript to the Cengage representative and waited for my rejection letter to arrive. It never did. Instead, I got an email stating that they liked my book and wanted to meet at the 2009 JALT National Conference so that I could pitch it to them in more detail.

A couple of weeks after that meeting, in which I not only presented the feedback from my colleagues, but also the results of a survey I had given my students, I received the final announcement that my book had been accepted

for publication. As I had presented the publisher with a fairly complete manuscript already, from that point on, most of the work involved writing the teacher's manual, tweaking activities and working on the layout of the student book.

The finished textbook was published in 2011 with a second printing coming out this year. It has not been a great cash cow for me, but it is very satisfying to have a book in print. Also, I have been able to use it in my classes, which in and of itself is a great reward.

References

Edwards, L. (2011) *Working together: Communicative reading and writing*. Tokyo: Cengage.

Leonard, T.J. (2013). So you want to publish an EFL textbook? Four points of view to consider when writing a proposal: The myths and realities of EFL publishing in Japan. *Between the Keys*, 21(2). Retrieved from <http://materialswriters.org/between-thekeys/archives/>

Appendix A

Ten Tips for Getting Published

Sean Bermingham

Before sending your manuscript to a publisher

1. Find out what the publisher needs.

Write to the publisher asking for their author guidelines. If possible, try to meet with a Publisher, e.g. at a conference, to get initial feedback on your idea.

2. Check what the publisher already has.

Get a copy of the publisher's catalog and compare your proposal to existing titles. Make sure the publisher hasn't published something similar already. Consider how your product will fit with the publisher's current list.

3. Research the market. Decide what

types of users the book is most suitable for and try to get an idea of the market size. Consider the international market - find out what you should include, and avoid, to make it marketable in other countries. Don't just write for your own teaching situation.

4. Decide what's special about your book.

Make sure your book is distinct from what's already on the market, BUT at the same time, beware of being too different from what's available. Publishers are generally cautious - they may be willing to push the envelope a little, but they're unlikely to go for something very niche, or totally new/different if the market isn't ready.

5. Make your proposal appear cost-effective.

Avoid relying on copyrighted materials requiring expensive permissions, e.g. a reading series based on articles from Time magazine. International publishers may be large corporations but they won't spend large amounts of money unnecessarily.

When sending your manuscript

6. Send your material to the right person.

Check the guidelines if it's 'the Acquisitions Editor', 'Publisher', 'Editorial Manager', or 'Commissioning Editor'. Find out the person's name, if possible.

7. Submit the right material.

What you need to provide will vary according to Publisher, but generally you'll need to send at least:

- A rationale. This outlines the product's target market, organization, approach, components key features/benefits (for teacher and students), and why it's better than

what's available.

- A scope and sequence (S&S) for the entire book. If your book has more than one level, provide at least a S&S for the lowest and highest levels, and an outline of the other levels.
- A sample unit. If it's a series, provide a unit for at least the lowest and highest levels. You should also provide an answer key, tapescripts and teacher notes for the unit(s).
- A resume listing your main achievements and why you are a suitable author. Include any publishing experience, books you've reviewed, or conference presentations you've given.

8. Submit the material in the right way. Send as an email attachment (the Acq Ed may need to forward the material to colleagues, e.g. sales and marketing (S&M) staff, for internal review.) Don't send hard copy (no ring binders!), and don't over-design your proposal, e.g. using lots of clip art or Word text boxes - just use basic formatting and indicate

where any art/photos will be included. Explain who you are and what you're sending in the body of the email.

9. Check your spelling. Don't assume spelling, grammar, punctuation is just the job of the editor. Remember that first impressions do matter!

Following up

10. Don't be afraid to follow up. The publisher should reply within a few weeks to acknowledge receipt of the proposal; if you haven't received anything, email or call to check they received it. Find out how long the publisher will need to evaluate your proposal (e.g. 2 months), and contact them if you haven't heard anything at the end of that time. If they turn it down, ask for feedback.

JALT Materials Writers Panel Discussion 2005. This was first published in *Between the Keys* 8, 2.

Sean Bermingham (sean.bermingham@thomson.com) © Thomson 2005

*PanSIG 2015 Conference
of the Japan Association of Language Teachers
May 16-17
Kobe City University of Foreign Studies*

Appendix B

Manuscript Proposal

Read and Write Together! is a combined reading and writing textbook that incorporates cooperative learning. It is designed for primarily EFL students, but could also be used with ESL students in non-intensive or exchange programs. The pilot textbook has been written for students at an intermediate level, but I have successfully used many of these methods with high beginning through advanced level EFL students and feel a three-level series would be appropriate.

Most reading and writing textbooks offer between ten and twelve units, however, as a teacher, I find that I can only teach four or five. If I attempt to cover more, the activities are rushed or I have to pick and choose parts of each unit to focus on. Therefore, Read and Write Together! is a five-unit textbook, which provides instructors with enough material for a one-semester course, yet leaves the students time to really grasp the materials and methods being taught.

Unit one is an introductory unit that begins with several group development activities. These are designed to help the students speak English as much as possible in the classroom and build a strong working relationship with their teacher and classmates. At the end of this unit, students are introduced to a four-step writing process, which is used throughout the rest of the book.

Unit two is also partially an introductory unit. It begins with a writing task using the four-step process learned in unit one, but then introduces an innovative reading process that will also be used in all of the subsequent units.

Units two through five all follow the same basic outline and consist of three writing assignments and two reading assignments each, which use the reading

and writing techniques presented in the beginning of the book. First, students are introduced to the theme of the unit through three pre-writing activities, which are free-writing, brainstorming and interviewing a partner. Students then use their pre-writing to write a first-draft and complete a peer-editing activity before writing a final draft. Next, students begin pre-reading activities for a non-fiction essay, which includes a vocabulary study that has students work with a partner to write original definitions and sentences for key words from the essay. After reading the essay aloud with their partner, students complete a reading outline. This leads into the second writing assignment, which is a summary paragraph of the essay. Finally, students read a fictional short story, which is either an entire short story or an excerpt from a longer story from the Cengage Graded Reader libraries that fits the theme of the unit. This reading leads into a creative writing assignment, which concludes the unit. At the end of each story, students are directed to other titles within the Penguin Graded Reader library for extensive reading practice.

Finally, there are several appendices which include: an Extensive Reading Log where students can document their extensive reading, a 5-minute writing warm-up section that teachers can use to begin each class or simply to provide additional writing practice, and peer-editing guides for both the interview and summary type paragraphs

Along with the student book, I would like to offer an instructor's manual that provides a few additional activities and guidelines for the teacher on how to set-up the classroom effectively, as well as how to present the various activities. I feel it would also be beneficial to provide some photocopiable material, such as unit quizzes, in the instructor's manual.

Rationale

Many EFL and ESL programs around the world offer courses such as Reading and Writing I or Intermediate Reading and Writing, but there are few textbooks that teach both reading and writing skills together. As an EFL teacher in Japan, I have often had to make tough choices between choosing a writing textbook and supplementing with outside reading materials, or choosing a reading textbook and preparing my own writing handouts. Another challenge I have faced is finding activities that both engage the students and provide them with opportunities to work with their peers in order to communicate about what they are learning. Especially in EFL environments, where students have few chances to use English outside the classroom, it is important to provide as many communicative and cooperative learning opportunities as possible in the classroom. These two challenges led to the creation of Read and Write Together!, which teaches both reading and writing skills through a cooperative learning approach.

First, Read and Write Together! is designed to allow teachers and students to create an all-English environment in the classroom so that students become comfortable communicating in English and can make the most of their classroom experience. Unit one begins with several activities that help students bond with their classmates and gain some tools to help them work only in English. The activities are designed to be simple, so that students can focus not so much on learning new language at this point, but on building relationships with their teacher and classmates so that they will work well together as a class.

Also, Read and Write Together! is based on a cooperative learning approach, which I feel is unique amongst reading and writing textbooks. Cooperative learning allows students to communicate

and work together in order to achieve an end. I feel this is especially important for building reading comprehension skills. Unfortunately, because reading is often done alone, weak readers are more apt to fall behind. However, when working with a partner, weaker students can benefit from the knowledge of their peers and the stronger students benefit from “teaching” their classmates. Also, cooperative learning, communicating and learning together, is much more fun for the students, which leads to a successful, comfortable learning environment. Therefore, almost every activity in Read and Write Together! is designed to be completed in class while working with a partner. For example, every unit begins with a brainstorming activity which includes an interview of a classmate. Students enjoy learning about their classmates and also talking about their own interests and experiences. Students then write a paragraph based on the interview and work with the same partner to peer-review and edit their paragraph. Later in the unit, students read an essay out-loud with a partner and complete a reading outline. By working with a partner, the students are more apt to talk about the essay and the main ideas, which helps them to review and understand the main ideas of the reading. I have been using both the reading and writing activities presented in this book for several years and know that they are all successful activities. Not only do the students enjoy doing the activities, but they are able to write successful paragraphs and are able to demonstrate that they understand what they are reading.

Comparison to currently available texts and market analysis

While writing Read and Write Together!, I researched other reading and writing textbooks and found very few that combine the two skills of reading and writing fairly equally. Three that I

did find are the Northstar Reading and Writing series (Boyd & Numrich, eds., 2009) from Longman, and the Weaving it Together series (Broukal, 2004) and Catalyst (Jones & Kalbach, 2008) from Thomson and Heinle (Cengage). Therefore, I feel there is still a need for a textbook that combines the two skills, and in comparing Read and Write Together! with other titles, I believe it offers several innovative approaches that set it apart from the competition.

As with the Northstar, Weaving it Together, and Catalyst textbooks, Read and Write Together! melds the two skills of reading and writing and is written to be progressive; all of the reading and writing assignments within each unit build on and lead into each other. However, unlike these textbooks, Read and Write Together! offers introductory lessons that provide students with some techniques and tools that help them build their reading and writing skills throughout the rest of the book. For example, in unit one, students are introduced to a four-step writing process, and in unit two they are introduced to an innovative reading process, in which students complete a reading outline. Subsequent units all follow the same basic outline, and the skills and activities learned in the beginning are re-used and recycled so that students obtain a strong grasp of these reading and writing methods by the end of the class. Other textbooks do not focus on skill-building and language production in this way.

Also, the focus of the existing reading and writing textbooks is more academic, which is appropriate for students who are looking to enter universities in English-speaking countries, but leaves many EFL and ESL exchange program students feeling dissatisfied. In my experience, these students are more interested in a fun, communicative language learning experience and, as a teacher, it is often

difficult to find reading and writing textbooks that appeal to them. Therefore, in order to cater to the interests of these students without sacrificing the academics, the topics and activities in Read and Write Together! are carefully designed to be academically challenging as well as fun and engaging. Many of the activities focus on the students themselves, which helps them connect with the text.

Also, unlike in other textbooks where each unit begins with a reading assignment, in Read and Write Together! each unit begins with a writing assignment. This helps familiarize students with the topic of the unit by linking it to experiences in their own lives. As a teacher, I have often observed that students find reading tedious. So, by putting the writing assignment first, students begin with a fun activity that gets them interested in the topic and leads to better comprehension of the reading assignment that follows.

Read and Write Together! **and Cengage**

In recent years, the benefits of extensive reading have been widely accepted, and most major publishers, including Cengage, offer extensive reading libraries. Recognizing the benefits of this, I have included an extensive reading component to Read and Write Together! Each unit features a short story or an excerpt from a longer story from the Cengage Graded Reader library. At the end of each reading, students are directed to other titles in the Cengage Graded Reader series that might interest them. Also, one of the book's appendices is an Extensive Reading Log, which makes it easy for instructors to build an extensive reading component into their course.

In conclusion, as part of the Cengage catalogue, *Read and Write Together!* would offer a complete reading and writing course alternative for EFL and

non-academically focused ESL students that is not only entertaining, but also educational. However, maybe more importantly, it offers teachers a well-balanced reading and writing course that provides them with a semester's worth of fun, engaging, in-class communicative reading and writing activities as well as homework assignments and quizzes

so that they can easily assess student progress without having to supplement the textbook with outside reading or writing materials.

Confessions of a collaborator – part 1

Richard Walker, Reitaku University

In the last edition of *Between The Keys*, Miles Craven asked us to reflect and think on the question: “What kind of writer are you?” At different times of my career, I have been every one of his seven listed types. Right now though, two of them take precedence:

- i) I have to create course materials for students in my school/college, and
- ii) I want to be part of a team of authors working on a big project

The big project that I am participating in is for a proposed in-house textbook for a once-weekly course entitled Speaking for Academic Purposes (SAP). I'll call myself participant 3 as I teach the middle level; the course co-ordinators teach the top two levels, with participants 4 and 5 presently teaching the lower levels. SAP started in 2009 as a course for 3rd year English Language majors to focus on oral communication skills for academic discussion. Teaching of discussion phrases and presentation practice have naturally been a key part of the course.

Whilst the aim of SAP was never difficult to discern, the choice of an agreed-upon set of materials has been a point of ongoing discussion since its inception.

Initially, the course coordinator took the sensible view that, providing that lessons promoted oral communication skills for academic discussions, teachers could have the freedom to choose their own direction – and textbook. Happily, this allowed teachers to pursue their own interests (e.g. Addison & Walker, 2011) but the lack of a standardised text caused minor headaches for administrative staff and students. The happiness of moving to a more suitable level can be tempered when having to purchase a new textbook, from which only half of the content will be used: an eventuality which of course is preventable when all teachers use the same material.

A few years ago I wouldn't have supported the pull towards standardisation within this course but discussion with fellow participants, and reflection on the real ability of students, have made me realise that my choice of textbooks was too ambitious within our shared working context. The textbooks I used (e.g. Kehe & Kehe, 2005; Stapleton, 2007) made for efficient courses, but there was always the suspicion that I was focusing on the extra-motivated and somewhat neglecting those who desired an easy-to-use text that required minimal preparation. Focused upon academia the course may

be, the sizeable number of students who only expect to do more than the minimum cannot be ignored. They need to be engaged – and hooked into the course.

This reluctant truth dawned upon me after I gravitated to the standardised textbook that other participants were using (McMahon 2003). Initially appearing to be less engaging than other alternatives, the text fulfilled the *raison d'être* of the course and provided readings that supplied the comprehensible input the majority required. But no commercial textbook can satisfy the needs of a specific context and this one didn't include the discussion strategies that we used – as inspired by the Kehe and Kehe text. Other participants explained that large parts of each unit were never used and that some topics bore insufficient relevance to the conceptual world of the students: Wouldn't it be better to update the topics with more relevant themes of our time? After the course coordinators called for a meeting about next year's course in December 2014, it came as no surprise that participants warmed to the possibility of writing one for ourselves – provisionally for the academic year starting April 2016. We would continue with McMahon's successful text for one more year while working on a text of our own.

By now, we had taken the first step (identification of need) from Jolly and Bolitho's (1998) framework of activities for materials writing: we had identified a broad need to write a textbook that better catered for the interest and proficiency level of the range of students within our context. As Table 1 shows, Jolly and Bolitho listed four other steps that need to be performed before material

is used in the classroom, but having a standardised curriculum in place we had already progressed far into them: the non-linear fashion of materials creation being far more dynamic than such a table can represent.

We had now agreed upon the broad area of language function within the text. For the exploration of language stage we had to discuss how and when to introduce the discourse strategies. We also explored the possible use of themes that were not covered in our present textbook, ways to control the teaching

Table 1: Jolly and Bolitho's 6 Step Framework in Materials Design

1. Identification of Need
2. Exploration of Language
3. Contextual Realisation
4. Pedagogical Realisation
5. Physical Production
6. Use/Evaluation

of academic vocabulary and discussed activities that would promote critical thinking skills.

The course coordinators then arranged a meeting for January 30th 2015 where we would write up a coordinated syllabus (for the forthcoming academic year), finalise the choice of topics for the proposed textbook and divide-up the task of creating material for our proposed textbook. Participants agreed upon six themes for the text (Education, Technology, Environment, Media, Society, and Work) – each to be subdivided into three topics. It was decided that each participant would write a short reading passage of between 350-450 words for three or four of the topics. These pieces of writing would then be uploaded into a Dropbox account

created by a coordinator, from which participants would also download three or four readings from other participants to edit. By this point, we were well into the stage of creating readings that could be realised in our context (contextual realisation) and now were ready to plan accompanying activities, the possible use of artwork and engaging classroom activities that would increase the possibility of our project becoming a success (pedagogical realisation).

Being my first foray into co-creating a textbook, I have found the experience a rewarding one. Each participant has a different writing style and we have all found ways to accommodate and exploit this. We have all voiced wishes for variations on agreed-upon themes but have accepted other opinions as better fitting our shared goals. My desire to include references to contemporary events such as the Charlie Hebdo massacre and what I thought were adroitly chosen quotations were considered but ultimately rejected - later discussion led to my agreement and understanding that writings with a broader focus were preferable and would have a longer-lasting shelf life.

Overall, the two meetings we have had about this text have resulted in a much clearer vision of the project. So far, our units will include vocabulary activities, a short reading and comprehension questions: all of which students will work upon in preparation for class; class time will be dedicated to a focus upon

discourse strategies, controlled discussion, and freer discussion to promote critical thinking. For our writings, we now have an agreed-upon style guide: to help us in a further round of drafts. Our editing is – as I type – between the keys, and in progress.

This short piece acts as a summarisation of one participant's perception of the first three months of our collaboration. He is not the main engine of the project but has contributed a similar amount of time as the four other participants. Should time and interest be available for other participants, perhaps a follow-up to this short piece will follow in due course.

References

- Addison, N.M., & Walker, R.J. (2011). A qualitative study of mixed level students' attitudes towards studying English discursive communication with the use of an instructional blogsite. *Reitaku Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 19(1), 59-73.
- Craven, M. (2014). What type of writer are you? *Between the Keys*. Volume 22 [1], pp.15-16.
- Jolly, D. and Bolitho R. (1998). A framework for materials writing. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 90-115.
- Kehe, D., Kehe, P. (2005) *Discussion Strategies*. Vermont: Pro Lingua Associates.
- McMahon, R. (2003). *Presenting Different Opinions*. Tokyo: Nan'Un'Do
- Stapleton, P. (2007). *Newsflash: Japan 2020*. Tokyo: MacMillan.

JALT2015: Focus on the Learner

Shizuoka Convention & Arts Center “GRANSHIP”

Shizuoka City, Shizuoka Prefecture, Japan

November 20th - 23rd, 2015

Differentiated Instruction through Tiered Rubrics

Jim Smiley, Tohoku Bunka Gakuen University

Abstract

Differentiated instruction is well established as a method of regulating educational content. Teachers employ various methods of altering lesson plans to meet the varying needs of the diverse members in their classrooms. As such, differentiated instruction is typically a function of either lesson preparation or of classroom action. The creation of multiple educational materials for each individual lesson would be impractical for many reasons, including the expense and perceived waste of, for example, having unused pages in a printed textbook. However, this articles argues that differentiated instruction in materials is possible with the inclusion of tiered rubrics.

1 Introduction and Differentiated Instruction

Many differences exist between the printed textbook and differentiated instruction (DI) (Tomlinson, 2012). One is fixed and the other is flexible. One is chosen ahead of time and the other is a measured response in real time. One is a single answer to a multivariate environment. Typically, textbook acquisition precedes the initial contact with the class group (Brown, 1995). Before selecting a course book, teachers visualise a class grouping based on experience and information about the class. They make assumptions about the levels in the class (including but not limited to language ability, motivation and motivation types, interests, age, and learning styles). Teachers also hold beliefs about the nature of learning, and they have their teaching style. Ultimately, they choose a textbook that best fits those assumptions. Given that textbooks represent a monolithic response to a highly variable learning environment, it is no wonder that other responses to the classroom situation have arisen over the years, for instance, like dogme, (Meddings and Thornbury, 2009) where there is a reversal of the traditional role

of materials.

Differentiated instruction aims to meet the needs of various learner types in a single classroom through the adaptation of 'content, process, or product' (Baecher, 2011). The selected texts students work on may be simplified, shortened, expanded upon to clarify meaning, and so on. Baecher suggests that images may be added to support the text, or that the genre of the original may be altered to a more realisable one. By 'process', DI understands that different during-activity cognitive processes are possible for the same exercise. These processes may be supported through teacher intervention when learners exhibit difficulty. For example, a memory recall process can be aided by offering prompts, or the holding of a deductive grammar rule in memory while applying it to a syntactic completion task can be supported by writing the rule on the blackboard. Alternately, a teacher can offer the option of a different product (i.e. student output) when it is evident that the original task completion assignment is beyond the reach of some students. Some students in a group may be required to complete an essay assignment in the given time while others only

19

Spring 2015 Vol. XXIII, No. 1

produce bullet points on the topic. Or on the same text, some students answer inference questions while others find concrete information in the text. Bloom's famous taxonomy finds itself utilised here often.

Tomlinson, one of the most powerful advocates of DI, frames her definition thus: 'At its most basic level, differentiating instruction means "shaking up" what goes on in the classroom so that students have multiple options for taking in information, making sense of ideas, and expressing what they learn' (Tomlinson, 2012, p. 1). This, she cautions, should not be taken to mean that the teacher's role is to provide individualised instruction for every member of the class. Such a role would be too onerous, impractical and stressful to the teacher. Rather, the levels in the classroom should be limited (Tomlinson, 2012, p. 2). Teachers need to alternate their mode from class level lecturer, to small group instructor, to individual tutor. Three modalities are workable, and it is to this number of levels that we shall return to later.

DI draws upon a number of concepts, all based on learner-centred constructivist philosophies. Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development requires the presence of an adult mentor around the child for cognitive and emotional progress to occur (Vygotsky, 1980, p. 86). Accordingly, DI places a demand on the classroom teacher to be that mentor (Tomlinson et al., 2003, p. 126). Classroom monitoring for student ability and 'student readiness' for development is a key action in DI. Likewise is the awareness of different learning styles (Subban, 2006). As well as showing that instruction that is sensitive to learning styles produces better academic achievement, student motivation is also improved (Fine, 2003, cited in Subban 2006). Although research into the brain is still in its infancy and only tentative

claims are possible, DI uses research findings in brain research to justify methodological assertions. At its heart, DI aims for fairness in mass education in that the appropriate content is delivered to the appropriate student.

Recently DI, as a named methodology, has gained prominence in general education. Now more L2 educators are utilising its ethos. Wilkinson draws upon Watson's and Agawa's assertion that DI prioritises product and that lesson objectives should be based on that principle (Wilkinson, 2012). He uses this argument to justify his selection of L2 reading activities. Chen is another of many rationalising L2 education on DI grounds (Chien, 2012).

A differentiated L2 classroom, not dissimilar to a general education one, finds an expression for the Vygotskian ethos. Swain and Lapkin devote much space to many Vygotskian concepts in their discussion on L1/L2 immersion programmes (Swain and Lapkin, 2013). De Guerro and Villamil focus only on the zone of proximal development and the technique of scaffolding in their treatment of L2 writing. (De Guerro and Villamil, 2000). Teachers are ideally placed firstly to be aware of each students' interlanguage level and then to sense their learning readiness. They can use questions or other DI techniques to lead students from their current state into a higher one. Patently, a textbook is never designed to do this. In a similar vein, Subban evokes not only learning styles, as mentioned earlier, but also findings from recent research into the brain and the older writings on multiple intelligences (Subban, 2006, p. 939).

Returning to the apparent dichotomy between printed materials and DI, Wilkinson is not alone in noting the difficulty of satisfying the variable needs of a class with a single textbook,

‘...a one-book-fits-all approach is often then adopted in the classroom where all students are required to work at the same pace from the same textbook’ (Wilkinson, 2012, p. 626). Spencer-Waterman, writing about general education, comments on the necessity for teachers to supplement because, ‘too often teachers feel limited by their textbooks, which in most cases are written for on-grade level students; however, because all students are not on grade level, teachers must find resources to differentiate

their materials so that all students may learn to access information through print’ (Spencer-Waterman, 2014, p. 73). Spencer focusses on the potential mismatch between the textbook and the students’ grade level, but there are many other possible differences between students. At the purely linguistic level Bachman (as cited in Skehan, 1998, p. 160), language competence can be understood as components of fourteen smaller scope competencies. Student A may have a different level of vocabulary

Table 1: Skehan’s Division of Task Difficulty

Code complexity	linguistic complexity and variety	
	vocabulary load and variety	
	redundancy and density	
Cognitive complexity	cognitive complexity	familiarity of topic and its predictability
		familiarity of discourse genre
		familiarity of task
	cognitive processing	information organisation
		amount of computation
		clarity and sufficiency of information given
		information type
Communicative stress	time limits and pressure	
	speed of presentation	
	number of participants	
	length of texts used	
	type of response	
	opportunities to control interaction	

control than Student B. Student C's sensitivity to naturalness in speech may be more refined than Student D's. Student E may have a better illocutary competence than Student F, and so on. Teachers monitoring for linguistic ability will find ample scope for difference in a so-called equal level class group. Other types of difference that may form the basis for a differentiated class include, preferences in learning style, levels of motivation and engagement on task, raw intelligence and the ability to understand cognitive demands more quickly, gender differences (as well as those beyond the standardly enforced two), and prior experience of language learning.

The role of the textbook seems at odds with a sensitively conducted class. Yet, I will argue that with a few minor modifications to page layout and an awareness of the continuum of task complexity implicit in any activity, differentiated materials are not unthinkable. Of course, the higher the degree of abstraction, the more assumptions need to be made, the less responsive materials become. Finding that sweet spot where differentiated materials are appropriate to more class groups is the writers job.

2 Issues in Complexity

First, it is in order to have a look at those kinds of complexities of which writers need to be aware. Skehan's tripartite division of task difficulty provides a comprehensive list that may be adopted by materials writers for task and other types of writing (Skehan, 1998, p. 99).

A full discussion of each of these categories is beyond the scope of this article. Suffice to comment that Skehan's code-cognitive—communicative division and their subcategories provide the materials writer with ample scope for developing their sensitivity to complexity in their materials and with that, suggest methods of regulating complexity.

3 Support Methods

A useful notion is that of the support continuum which ranges from zero support to total support. The requirement for successful completion of an activity may have the expected student output described fully in the student's L1 on the same page. This is 'total support'. Its opposite is when nothing of the target student output is printed. Most language activities have their implied completion somewhere along this continuum.

The Support Continuum

Total-90-80-70-60-50-40-30-20-10-Zero

Writers instinctively know about support and have methods of controlling difficulty. However, the more precisely a writer understands the components of an activity's complexity and is aware of more possible levels of support, the better the writer can regulate their output.

Depending on the placement of an activity and its purpose, a writer can select any point and write with that in mind. A deductive grammar explanation may have an fully worked out example in L1 (total support) followed by question that has an L1 hint supplied. The L1 may be dropped in favour of an L2 hint, and finally, there may be no hints at all. In the following example, which is the first sentence of four;

1. Mark's CD player is ----- the window. (From Nunan's Expressions, Intro, p.62)

four prepositions are placed to the side from which the student selects their answer. As there are only four options and four sentences, the support may be said to be near 'total'. Yet, there is no L1 and the model sentences that these were based on was only presented aurally on the course CD. The other options are 'beside', 'under' and 'on'. Only 'on' appears earlier in the book, used as a preposition of time (i.e. with

‘on Friday’). For students to get the first item right, they need to store the aural representation in their medium-to-long term memories (depending on how much temporal space occurs between listening and the sentence completion), be able to translate that graphically, grasp the semantics, and be able to recognise the lexico-syntactic properties that limit the target term’s application within the gap sentence. Without the teacher deciding to supplement the textbook page prior to the activity, the support can be seen to be (perhaps) near the 50% mark. The exact judgement is a matter for the writer and their exploration of their assumptions regarding the target audience for the book. The point here is that what may seem like an easy call to make may in fact be much more troublesome than a *prima facie*.

3.1 Bias Tasks and Tiered Tasks

A bias task is one that has been altered to suit different ability levels in a class group (Bowler and Parminter, 2002). Bowler and Parminter give the example of a jigsaw gapfill using a song. Higher level students listen for more difficult gaps, while the lower ability students complete the lyrics on easier words. The activity is the of the same type, but the actual choice of lexis that was blanked out allows for a bias in levelling. Bias tasks are prepared prior to the class contact time. They also explain the concept of tiered tasks. In contrast to a bias task, these activities use the same base text but have different responses at different levels presented. An example of this (again from Bowler and Parminter) has the same reading passage presented. Three sets of comprehension questions are then given to three different ability levels of students. A skilful and quick-thinking teacher is able to adapt a task during the class when faced with issues caused by having multi-levels. It

is the concept of these tiered tasks that materials writers can draw upon when preparing classroom activities. Creating sets of bias tasks is also possible, but this would result in multiple versions of the same textbook. As the internet age allows for more flexible responses to materials, perhaps more bias task materials will become available.

3.2 Tiered Rubrics

The notion of dividing and simplifying tasks into those types that can have their content modified easily and those that can have variable responses still requires a significant amount of preparation by the teacher. Here I introduce the idea of a tiered rubric, a set of activity instructions that can be printed on the page with the activity itself. A tiered rubric offsets the liability to the teacher’s time and can offer a more flexible, multivariate utilisation of the activity. Publishers are aware of the mixed-ability classroom phenomenon and have responded by creating a lot of on-line support for teachers and printing many helpful suggestions in the teachers manuals. Whereas these go some way towards addressing the in-class problems, the preparation time needed is an issue that still remains.

Tiered rubrics can be placed on the page almost as unobtrusively as the original rubric, albeit with a little more space required. Done sensitively, presenting a range of rubrics allows both teachers and students to see implications that otherwise stay hidden. I suggest that three levels are used: the highest and most challenging response to an activity called ‘Challenge’; a middle level aimed at the primary consumer of the book called ‘Practice’; and a remedial level called ‘Review’. This nomenclature is part arbitrary, part pseudo-psychological, part motivational. In the case study, the level names are omitted.

4 Case Study

This section demonstrates how tiered rubrics can be used to differentiate instruction by creating tiered style tasks inline on the physical page. I use a some pages from my own *Therapy Care*. Like many books written for the Japanese tertiary market, most activities are characterised by the use of single correct answers for most of the questions. Open-ended questions form only a minor part of the overall unit structure. *Therapy Care* is written for first-year university students majoring in physical and occupational therapy. The syntax used falls in the third-year middle school to first-year high school level. This is done in order that students can concentrate on the specialist lexis without being too burdened by grammar. There are a number of therapy concepts introduced, so I felt that controlling the sentence length and range of grammar structures would keep the book more accessible. There is a bilingual vocabulary section for each unit at the back of the book and the activity rubrics are presented bilingually in English and in Japanese.

The first activity in the unit on Posture is called 'Odd-one-out'. Four lexical items are presented, and students need to decide on which of the four does not fit.

E.g. Circle the word in each group that does not fit.

a) cervical-pelvic-sacrum-thoracic

The answer is present in the question, so no novel language needs to be created. The bilingual vocabulary list, if used, offers more support. But even if all terms were in the L1, there needs to be the awareness that one item refers to a bone that is not a part of the spine. Such knowledge of anatomy may or may not be present in first-year students at this point, depending on whether they have studied that relevant part of anatomy

prior to this English lesson and if they can make the connection between the unstated concept of 'spine' and these bone names. In terms of the support continuum, more help can be offered by adding a hint, perhaps the word 'spine' in either the L1 or in English, or have a graphic of the spine and pelvic areas somewhere on the page. Tiered tasks can be created with the following rubrics: 1. *Challenge* Write an explanation why the word you chose is the odd one out. *Practice* Circle the word in each group that does not fit.

Review Look at the bilingual dictionary. Write the Japanese meanings next to the English words.

As the activity is a printed one, it can be made more complex by turning it into a closed book, aural and oral one via the rubrics. The teacher can read the four options. Alternatively, student pairs can be formed and students take turns in reading the four words to each other. And if a short time limit is set, the task becomes more challenging.

The second activity is a listening gap-fill task.

E.g. These patients talk about their posture. Listen and fill the gaps.

Speaker 1: Because of (-----), I got a lot of health problems.

Of the three missing words, my—bad—posture, only the latter one is challenging. However, it is the unit title and appears on the same page as the listening. Difficulties students may face completing this gap fill arise from decoding connected speech, from differentiating between separate lexical items aurally. More support is possible if the missing words were replaced with underscores for each letter rather than a simple blank for the whole. Or the first letter in each word may be provided to aid decoding. Thinking along the support

continuum going towards total support, the vowels only may be omitted. Without giving away the full answer, the missing words can be in a word box. The audio can be recorded at the word level with temporal gaps to represent the graphic spaces. At this level of learning with the target user in mind, there will be a point at which writers decide not to go beyond. However, the assumptions can be stretched when writers write according to the precepts of differentiated instruction. Something that seems too elementary may have an expression in some mixed ability classes. The following rubrics show a tripartite division of tiered tasks.

1. *Challenge* Close your book. Write everything you hear.

Or After hearing the reason, write two possible things the speaker did badly.

Or After you write the words, make a note of any pronunciation issues you noticed. (For example, stress, linking, or contraction.)

Practice (As current.)

Review Write at least one word.

These are examples, and the writer would strive for a degree of consistency throughout the work. If pronunciation was a focus in this activity, the writer may decide to submit the whole to a mini-syllabus in pronunciation using the repeated instances of this activity type to develop that syllabus.

The final example is taken from a short reading section later in the unit. The text describes a patient who has come to 'you'—the imagined self of the trainee therapist after graduating.

Jim is a teacher who stands up for many hours every day. His feet point inwards. This overpronation made him unbalanced. He has developed soft tissue damage in his feet. He can't walk well now and is off work. He wants to return to his job quickly.

Answer these questions.

1. What is Jim's situation?
2. What is his postural problem?
3. What is his medical problem?
4. Why has he come to you?

Through texts like these, students gain an understanding of therapy concepts and the ability to differentiate between stages in the development of a health problem. The questions aim to separate the 'situation', 'posture' and 'medical' problems. The answer to question 1 may well be the repetition of the entire paragraph. Doing so, however, leaves questions 2 to 4 moot. There are multiple ways of interpreting question 1, and accordingly there are many methods of adding support. Including in the text (or online) an L1 translation of the text and questions and expected answers would be total support. Methods for supporting a longer unit of text are numerous, and I will only discuss a few here. Prior to the reading, pre-reading points help focus the student on to the purpose of both the text and their reason for reading it. Before students attempt the comprehension questions, re-reading questions can help them understand certain aspects. For example in this text, there is a clear causal continuity present. Causal words like 'because', 'and then' can be introduced in a re-reading task to show the connections more clearly. There is a new technical term and at least two common words that have specific meanings in therapy contexts. Re-reading tasks can help support students in deciphering these.

Different responses are more possible with longer stretches of discourse, and again, I only offer a couple of suggestions for tiered rubrics. In the textbook following the four questions is an activity where students need to select an appropriate treatment. This limits the Chal-

lenge rubrics to implications in the text.

Challenge Rewrite the paragraph using words like 'because' and other joining words.

Practice (As is.)

Review Find four problems Jim has.

5 Conclusion

I have described a problem increasingly faced by many teachers. Multi-level classes offer their own challenges, and recently in both general education and in EFL, the concept and methods of differentiated instruction have taken widespread root. The perception, though, is that DI is a teacher action, to be decided upon either prior to a class contact period or during the class itself. In this article, I have argued for the adoption of tiered rubrics in the body of the textbook page. These go some way towards realising the same goals of DI at the writing stage. I also promoted the idea of the support continuum. As writers become more aware of possibilities in support, their writing may become simultaneously more sensitive and more usable by a wider range of class group.

References

Laura Baecher. *Differentiated instruction for english language learners: Strategies for the secondary english teacher*. Wisconsin English Journal, pages 64–73, 2011.

Bill Bowler and Sue Parminter. Mixed-level teaching: tiered tasks and bias tasks. In *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*, pages 59–64, 2002.

James Dean Brown. *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1995.

Chin-Wen Chien. Differentiated instruction in an elementary school efl classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 3(2):280–291, 2012.

Mar'ia De Guerrero and Olga S Villamil. Activating the zpd: Mutual scaffolding in l2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*,

84(1):51–68, 2000.

Luke Meddings and Scott Thornbury. *Teaching Unplugged: Dogme in English Language Teaching*. Delta teacher development series. Delta, 2009. ISBN 9781905085194. URL <http://books.google.co.jp/books?id=H0dfPgAACAAJ>.

Peter Skehan. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford Applied Linguistics. OUP, 1998.

Sheryn Spencer-Waterman. *Handbook on Differentiated Instruction for Middle & High Schools*. Routledge, 2014.

Pearl Subban. Differentiated instruction: A research basis. *International Education Journal*, 7(7): 935–947, 2006.

Merrill Swain and Sharon Lapkin. A vygotkian sociocultural perspective on immersion education: The l1/l2 debate. *Journal of immersion and content-based language education*, 1(1):101–129, 2013.

Carol Ann Tomlinson. *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. ASCD, 2012.

Carol Ann Tomlinson, Catherine Brighton, Holly Hertberg, Carolyn M. Callahan, Tonya R. Moon, Kay Brimijoin, Lynda A. Conover, and Timothy Reynolds. Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of literature. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 2003.

Lev S Vygotsky. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press, 1980.

Darrell Wilkinson. Student-centered activities in mixed-level classes. In *JALT2011 Conference Proceedings*, pages 625–635, 2012.



MW-Sig Committee

Executive Committee

Jim Smiley: Co-ordinator/Programmes

James Essex: Publications

Travis Holtzclaw: Membership

Scott Petersen: Treasurer/Publications Layout

Nate French: Member-at-large

MW Resources

MW-SIG Web Site

<http://materialswriters.org/>

The site contains articles on topics ranging from copyright to desktop publishing techniques, an extensive list of publishers including contact information, tutorials and software recommendations, and information on submission requirements for *Between the Keys*.

On the Inside

From the Publication Chair2

Coordinator's Column

Jim Smiley.....2

Starting from Scratch: A Beginner's Publishing Tale

Loran Edwards9

Confessions of a collaborator--part 1

Richard Walker16

Differentiated Instruction through Tiered Rubrics

Jim Smiley19

The Materials Writers SIG is dedicated to continually raising the standards in the creation of language teaching materials, in all languages and in all media, whether for general consumption or for individual classroom use. The editors encourage participation from colleagues using new media or teaching languages other than English.

Spring 2015 Volume XXIII, Number 1