

Off Course: A Comparison of University and EAP Coursebook Writing Tasks

Text Responsibility¹

Taxonomy	Description
personal writing	information from writer's own personal experiences
non-text responsible writing	writers are not responsible for explaining or demonstrating comprehension of the source text but are using it as the springboard for their writing.
text-responsible writing	the writers are responsible for demonstrating an understanding of the source text
optional	tasks which made the use of a text optional
mixed	tasks which required a mix of personal and text-responsible writing
undefined	tasks which were unclear or not defined

Genre²

essay	Task requiring the presentation of an argument in response to a given proposition or question
review	Task requiring the summary and appraisal of a: single text (including non-verbal texts e.g. film, painting)
literature review	Task requiring the identification, summary and appraisal of a range of texts relevant to a specific field of knowledge
experimental report	Task requiring the description and analysis of data obtained from an empirical research procedure
case study report	Task involving identification and discussion of a problem(s) arising from a given situation, along with suggested ways for solving the problem
research report	Task similar in many respects to the Experimental Report, but requiring the description and analysis of information of a more qualitative nature e.g. that obtained from interview or participant observation
research proposal	Task requiring the description of an intended research project, including a statement of its rationale
summary	Task requiring the representation of the main contents of a text or texts
exercise	Task requiring the application of some discipline specific tool or model to a given situation
short answer	Task requiring mainly the reproduction of previously provided items of knowledge e.g. from lectures or textbooks

1. *Text Responsibility* definitions reproduced from Leki and Carson (1996)
2. *Genre, Information Source, and Rhetorical Functions* reproduced from Moore and Morton (2005).

Information Source²

prior knowledge	tasks which do not require students to draw on any external sources of information
primary-provided	Tasks with sources provided in the task itself
primary-collected	Tasks with sources to be collected by students via some prescribed research procedure
secondary	tasks which required students to engage with and incorporate in their writing works of an interpretative nature—monographs, research articles and so on
mixed	tasks which combine any of the above information sources
undefined	tasks which were unclear, undefined, or where outside information sources were optional

Rhetorical Function²

comparison	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to identify the similarities and/or differences between two or more entities or phenomena. Prototypical 'comparative' question: What are the similarities and/or differences between X and Y?
description	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to give an account of the nature of a given entity or phenomenon. Prototypical 'descriptive' question: What are the features of X?
evaluation	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to make a judgement about the value of a given entity or phenomenon with respect to its validity, importance, relevance, etc. Prototypical 'evaluative' question: How valid /important/relevant, etc. is X?
explanation	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to give an account of the causes for a given entity or phenomenon. Both nonvolitional causation (e.g. cause, reason) and volitional causation (e.g. purpose, motive) included under this category. Prototypical 'explanatory' question: What is the cause of X?
prediction	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to speculate about the future state of a given phenomenon or entity. Prototypical 'predictive' question: What will happen to X?
summarization	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to give an account of an author's views on a given entity or phenomenon. Prototypical 'summary' question: What is author A's view of X?
hortation	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to make a judgement about the desirability of a given entity or phenomenon, especially those concerned with actions and states of affairs. Prototypical 'hortatory' question: Should X happen/be done?
instruction	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to outline a sequence of procedures for a given entity or phenomenon. Prototypical 'instructional' question: What must be done to achieve X?
recommendation	Applied to tasks (or components of tasks) which required students to suggest ways of dealing with a given entity or phenomenon, usually presented in the form of a problem. The prototypical 'recommendatory' question was in the form: What can be done about X?

References

- Amiryousefi, M., & Ketabi, S. (2011). Anti-textbook arguments revisited: A case study from Iran. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 215-220.
- Carroll, J., & Dunkelblau, H. (2011). Preparing ESL students for "real" college writing: A glimpse of common writing tasks ESL students encounter at one community college. *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, 38(3), 271.
- Cronback, L.J & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 281-302.
- Gilmore, A. 2007. «Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning». *Language Teaching*, 40 (2): 97-118.
- Harwood, N. (2005). What do we want EAP teaching materials for?. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(2), 149-161.
- Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, 1091–1112.
- Horowitz, D. M. (1986). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(3), 445-462.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1996). "Completely different worlds": EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL quarterly*, 31(1), 39-69.
- Lockett, A. (1999). From the general to the specific: What the EAP tutor should know about academic discourse. In H. Bool & P. Luford (Eds.), *Academic standards and expectations: The role of EAP* (pp. 49-58). Nottingham: Nottingham University Press.
- Long, M. (2014). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Moore, T., Morton, J., & Price, S. (2012). Construct validity in the IELTS Academic Reading test: A comparison of reading requirements in IELTS test items and in university study. *IELTS collected papers*, 2, 120-211.
- Paltridge, B. (1997). Thesis and dissertation writing: Preparing ESL students for research. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(1), 61-70.
- Tribble, C. (2009). Writing academic English—a survey review of current published resources. *ELT journal*, 63(4), 400-417.
- Tribble, C. (2015). Writing academic English further along the road. What is happening now in EAP writing instruction?. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 442-462.
- Wood, D. C., & Appel, R. (2014). Multiword constructions in first year business and engineering university textbooks and EAP textbooks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 15, 1-13.