



International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching
Volume 9, Issue 2, June 2021, p. 124-138

Received	Reviewed	Published	Doi Number
30.04.2021	04.06.2021	30.06.2021	10.29228/ijlet.51174

**Writing Tasks: Purposes and Variety of Genres
in Yeni İstanbul Coursebooks**

Gülay KIRAY ¹

ABSTRACT

Literacy as an emergent concept of study is a field of educational sciences studies and the skill of writing is an integral part of both the definition of literacy and studies of literacy. While many different approaches of research and various research designs serve the purposes of helping learners develop their writing skills and teachers better their writing courses, the present study applies a coursebook analysis methodology since coursebooks are key materials of teaching. For this research, four coursebooks (A1- B2) of teaching Turkish to foreigners coursebook series, Yeni İstanbul, have been analysed. The analysis aims to identify writing tasks included in coursebooks and analyze to what extent these tasks serve language functions suggested by Halliday (1973) and genre variety of activities as purposes and text components of a specific genre are the main attributes of successful writing. To this end, the study uses a 4-step research procedure including identification of writing tasks, exclusion of writing tasks which are below textual level, and specification of purposes and genres of each writing activity. Results of the research show that the coursebooks are mostly designed for learners to practise informative and personal functions of language; thus, it could be proposed to distribute writing tasks for each purpose in a more balanced way. Moreover, genre variety of writing activities in the coursebooks is low, and the coursebooks do not apply a genre-based approach to writing.

Key Words: Foreign language teaching, literacy, writing tasks, functions of language, genres.

**Yazma Görevleri: Yeni İstanbul Ders Kitaplarında
Amaçlar ve Tür Çeşitliliği**

ÖZET

Yeni ortaya çıkan bir araştırma kavramı olarak okuryazarlık eğitim bilimleri çalışmalarının bir alanıdır ve yazma becerisi hem okuryazarlık tanımının hem de okuryazarlık çalışmalarının ayrılmaz bir parçasıdır. Birçok farklı araştırma yaklaşımı ve çeşitli araştırma desenleri öğrencilere yazma becerilerini geliştirmek öğretmenlere de yazma derslerini iyileştirmek için yardım etme amaçlarına hizmet ederken, bu çalışma ders kitabı analizi yöntemini kullanmaktadır çünkü ders kitapları öğretimin temel araçlarıdır. Çalışma kapsamında, bir yabancılar Türkçe öğretim serisi olan Yeni İstanbul serisinin 4 kitabı (A1-B2) incelenmiştir. Bu analiz, ders kitaplarındaki yazma görevlerini tespit etmeyi ve Halliday'ın işlevleri (1973) ve tür çeşitliliği ile etkinlikleri değerlendirmeyi hedeflemektedir çünkü amaçlar ve belirli türlerin metinsel bileşenleri başarılı yazmanın temel özelliklerindedir. Bu amaçla, çalışma yazma görevlerinin tespitini, metinsel düzeyin altında kalan yazma görevlerinin ayıklanmasını ve her bir yazma etkinliği için amaçların ve türlerin belirlenmesini içeren 4 adımdan oluşan bir araştırma yolu kullanmaktadır. Araştırmanın sonuçları bu ders kitaplarının öğrencilerin çoğunlukla bilgilendirici ve kişisel dil işlevlerini uygulamaları için düzenlendiğini göstermektedir. Bu nedenle, her bir amaç için yazma görevlerinin daha dengeli bir şekilde dağıtılması önerilebilir. Ayrıca, ders kitaplarındaki tür çeşitliliği düşüktür ve bu ders kitapları yazmaya tür odaklı yaklaşmamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yabancı dil öğretimi, okuryazarlık, yazma görevleri, dil işlevleri, türler.

¹Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, İstanbul Üniversitesi- Cerrahpaşa, gkiray@iuc.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-2045-8636.

1. Introduction

1.1. Skill of Writing and Language Teaching

Writing, as one of four language skills, is an integral part of the definition of literacy. Literacy was first simply confined to activities including only reading and writing skills. However, the modern concept of being literate includes not only reading and writing skills but also speaking, listening, thinking and visual skills. Still, when literacy is analysed in specific terms, Holme (2004), not disregarding other skills, emphasizes the association of literacy with mostly written form of language. Although the view that overemphasizes the position of written language skills in the definition of literacy was later criticized by many researchers like Heath (1992), Olson (1994), Halliday (2001), written language still inherently exists in literacy studies, even more than spoken language.

According to Ellis (1994), less knowledge we have about the processes of how writing is acquired compared to speaking, which could be because writing is a learned and developmental skill both in native and foreign language settings. Since writing takes a noteworthy place due to its significance in defining the identity of a person with the real acts of writing in a society (Ivanić, 1998), "a basic aim of schooling is to teach students to become competent writers" as Graham (2019) says (p.278). Theories and models of teaching writing have been developed together with the evolution of the definition of literacy. Based on the view of situated literacy, Barton and Hamilton (2000) accepts literacy as a set of social events and practices, associated with different domains of life and the flow of time. Barton (1994) emphasizes the concept of different literacies and these literacies are associated with different domains of life. Each domain of life such as "daily life, educational, social- interactional", etc. asks for a variety of writing practices such as "shopping lists, school forms, reports, personal e-mails", etc. to be able to hold an identity in the modern world (Kucer & Silva, 2006, p.38).

Writing includes three components and each component defines an approach to writing and teaching writing. One of these components is text and this component is associated with the text-focused approaches of teaching. Text-focused approaches highlight the importance of text to identify writing practices in language classrooms. In this approach, quality writing is a product of not only accuracy and fluency factors but also factors of content and discourse choices, complexity and communication strategies (Polio, 2001). Texts are communicative products, in which meanings can be conveyed with rhetorical and genre choices. Writer-focused approaches, on the other hand, focus on the process of writing and tries to describe good writing with not only the text factors but also personal writer factors and task factors (Elbow, 1998). Lastly, reader-focused approaches also accept writing as a socially constructed activity addressed to readers as modern text-focused approaches also design language teaching classroom activities for writing based on factors of purposes and real or potential readers.

1.2 Writing Activities in Language Classes

Although teaching or in specific terms language teaching is an act of dividing the language items into small enough teachable units, writing is a whole in its nature with its cognitive, linguistic and sociocultural dimensions (Kucer, 2005). Thus, a mixed method of teaching is better to be found in order to teach writing in a developmental manner while dividing language teaching into units. Teaching of writing in language classrooms could compile a variety of tasks concerning different dimensions of literacy, i.e. writing. For the reason that a person shows different proficiency levels in literacy practices during lifetime, or in other words, a person being an independently proficient user of a literacy strategy in one context of literacy could perform the same purpose or strategy rather unsuccessfully in another

context, it could be suggested that writing activities are designed in a way that would reflect the variations in contexts and task demands. Therefore, variety serves as a key concept of teaching writing practices.

Writing activities range from controlled to free writing (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). While controlled activities prioritize accurate language use, and they are means of teaching language rather than teaching the skill of writing, freewriting is usually writing by modelling a text which has been read so far. Then, freewriting activities promote textual level writing as well as fluency and creativity more than accuracy of language produced. Nation (2009, p. 109) names such free activities of writing as “independent tasks”.

1.3. Purposes in Writing Activities

Halliday (1973) identifies seven main language functions and lists them as instrumental, regulatory, interactional, personal, heuristic, imaginative and informative. Any text produced serves at least one of these purposes. Kucer (2005) in his work matches these purposes with various text types and lists them as classroom activities for literacy teaching. For instance, writing notes on refrigerator could be accepted as serving interactional function whereas notes to others serves informative function. Then, in order to make the example clear, some situational variations should be clearly described. If one writes a note on the door of his office, saying ‘will be back at 2 p.m.’, this note could aim to inform the ones who visit his office rather than establishing a relationship. Thus, this note has an informative function, but not an interactional function. The main purposes of each function of Halliday could be summarized as follows:

Instrumental: Literacy used as a means of getting things, satisfying material needs

Regulatory: Literacy used to control the behaviours, feelings, or attitudes of others

Interactional: Literacy used to interact with others, to form and maintain personal relationships, to establish separateness.

Personal: Literacy used to express individuality and uniqueness, awareness of self and pride.

Heuristic: Literacy used to explore the environment, to ask questions, to seek and test knowledge

Imaginative: Literacy used to create new worlds

Informative: Literacy used as a means of communicating information to someone who does not possess that information. (Kucer & Silva, 2006, p.9)

A text is produced with at least one specific purpose; however, a text having a purpose does not have to be produced with a specific genre. Genre- specific characteristics exceed purposes, and carries layout, namely, physical organization of the text, and clause and discourse relations (Tribble, 1996).

1.4. Genre Variety in Writing Activities

One of the main problem sources for learners who would like to develop their writing skills is lack of multiple opportunities to write in various genres (McCarthy et al., 2005; McCarthy & Garcia, 2005). As Elliott (1986) states in his research, lack of genre awareness is not only a barrier to develop writing skills but differentiating genres is also a variable to measure development in writing. Thus, genre knowledge has always been one of the main concerns of writing research (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Swales, 1990).

Teaching genre in an explicit way would be beneficial for learners of a second language although it is not conscious learning for the first language. Genres which are taught explicitly can range from literary ones to far from literary ones such as from poems, narratives (i.e. short-story, novel etc.), expositions

(i.e. biographies, etc.), to manuals, recipes, news reports, etc. (Martin, 1985) Genres in general share many similar characteristics; however, each genre also carries peculiar characteristics (Swales, 1990, 2008); certainly, compatible with the expectations of the relevant discourse community. Although Cook (1989) calls genre as discourse, he lists many genres of written language people use in order to orient themselves in everyday activities; namely, "letter, menu, notice, sign, advertisement, message, note, ticket, will, article, prescription, manifesto, jingle, warrant" (p.89), etc. The aforementioned texts do not have to be written by each individual in everyday life but they are surely the ones literate people read at least in order to orient themselves in everyday activities. However, the fact that reading and text analysis are one of the main steps of genre education (Flowerdew, 1993), and reading and writing skills support one another in the process of development promotes the idea that genre variety is necessary in language teaching environments. Such genres are also included in descriptors of writing skill for various language levels of Common European Framework (Council of Europe, 2020). Thus, including activities of writing in language classes as tools of teaching language and genre education is an expected criterion of curriculum design of foreign language classes. In order to include activities of various genres in classes, coursebooks are suggested sources of teaching and learning activities (Cunningsworth, 1995).

1.5. Coursebook Analysis as a Means of Educational Sciences Research

Researches on coursebook evaluation can range from general evaluation of coursebooks with the perspectives of teachers and learners (Uyar et al., 2014) to more specific analysis studies such as language and content analysis (Banegas, 2018), conversation analysis (Savova, 2018) and even in this century e-textbook analysis (Kargozari et al., 2018). Moreover, the study of Can et al. (2020) is designed to serve the aim of preparing a coursebook including indicators of both local and global cultures and explains the steps of coursebook writing under field of materials development.

In particular, whenever the coursebook evaluation studies devoted to the field of teaching Turkish are analyzed, the studies reviewed focus on the areas of speaking activities (Kırık-Yavuz, 2015), instructions of coursebook activities (Özbal & Genç, 2019), listening skill (Tiryaki & Kayatürk, 2017), the skill of speaking in general- which is designed in a comparative manner- (Hasırcı, 2019), reading skill (Aydoğan & Aytakin, 2019), and multiple intelligences (Güven & Banaz, 2020). The study of Çekici (2018), on the other hand, is based on a comparative analysis of writing tasks in coursebooks; however, the categorization of writing tasks is unlike the present study which will approach tasks in terms of their purposes and genre variety. Moreover, some other studies in the field of language teaching but not specifically following a coursebook analysis research design also reveal the importance of writing skill as a specific study (Bölükbaş & Özdemir, 2009; Bölükbaş, 2011; Şeref, 2013).

2. Methodological Framework

2.1. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study is to serve to the fields of both coursebook analysis and writing instruction under the general field of foreign language teaching by analysing a series of teaching Turkish as a foreign language coursebooks. This series of coursebooks, Yeni İstanbul, is one of the mostly used coursebooks to teach Turkish to international students in Turkey and in the world. For the scope of this study, the latest version of A1, A2, B1 and B1 language level coursebooks, rewritten in 2020, have been analysed.

Variety as a key concept of teaching practices is the main concern of this analysis and evaluation research. Compatible with this concept, two important questions are tried to be answered for the aforementioned coursebooks. The first is what purposes of writing are practiced in these coursebooks and linked with this question, the second question is how many genre varieties are demanded from learners with the writing products of each unit.

2.2 Research Method and Data Collection Procedure

The research methodology of the study is coursebook analysis and evaluation, which is one of the widely applied research method of education field (Grant, 1987; Cunningsworth, 1995; Tomlinson, 2017). In the present research, the focus is on the skill of writing and the researcher uses a checklist of analysis based on the necessary theoretical framework of writing instruction. On the other hand, the reliability of results was obtained by identifying and re-identifying the purposes of writing tasks, in other words, repeating the process after one month. Later, the purposes identified differently or with a question mark in each of these phases were listed and these tasks were analysed by another specialist to ensure both stability and replicability (Bolognesi et al., 2017).

The research procedure includes 4 basic steps. The first step is identifying writing tasks for each unit of four coursebooks. After this step, controlled writing activities have been excluded from the evaluation process since they are not above sentence level and aim only accurate language use, which is out of the scope of this research. After this process, purposes of each writing activity have been named for the remaining writing tasks. As a last step, referring to the genre specific features of the writing product that the activity demands, how many genre varieties are included in these four coursebooks is questioned and interpreted.

During the third stage of the analysis, it was really challenging to identify the purpose(s) of some activities since some purposes could be different for reader and writer roles as two literacy activities. For example, 'a recipe' could be called as carrying an instrumental role for a reader but it is regulatory for the writer role and for this research such an activity was accepted as a literacy practice carrying a regulatory purpose. On the other hand, instructions of some activities were not clear enough to identify a specific purpose for them and as Halliday (2003) suggests for adult linguistic acts, in adult literacy, practices of language production can serve more than one purpose. To overcome this difficulty, the analysis was made not only on writing activities but also on the activities of reading and listening parts as these represent a model for interpreting writing activities and their instructions; as a result, that eases the process of making sure of the text that learners are expected to write.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Brief Information on Analysed Coursebooks

Yeni İstanbul coursebooks, including more personalized and interactive activities as the writers of series stated, are the latest version of *İstanbul* coursebooks. This series includes 6 units in all 4 books from A1 level to B2 level. Each unit contains four language skills and grammar sections. For writing skills, in each unit of each coursebook 3 writing activities are presented to learners.

3.2. Accuracy – Based Controlled Writing Activities

A1 level coursebook includes 18 writing tasks in total as the other language level coursebooks do. Out of these 18 activities, 1 of them is not textual level, even below sentence level, thus it is accepted as

controlled activity as suggested by Grabe and Kaplan (1996). This activity - divided into a and b activities- asks learners to write new words into the blanks and writing words out of jumbled letters. During the analysis of this coursebook (A1 level), a new criterion of deletion emerged and this new criterion has also been used for other language level coursebooks. Out of 18 writing activities, 4 activities are not accepted as writing activities since they ask for writing dialogues rather than texts. They demand learners to write the speeches of first meeting and greeting, booking a room in a hotel and making a plan with a friend respectively, not a text. Thus, the number of activities counted for the analysis of purposes and genre variety is 13 for A1 level coursebook.

A2 level coursebook includes 1 customer- waiter/ waitress conversation and 1 sentence level activity. The sentence level activity asks for writing suggestions, which carries a highly communicative function; however, this activity instructs students to write five suggestions for each discrete situation (i.e. what to do to succeed in Turkish courses); thus, it cannot fulfil the function of a writing activity to be evaluated under purposes and genres of writing products. In conclusion, A2 level coursebook contains 16 writing activities to be analysed within the scope of present research.

B1 level coursebook, on the other hand, includes 2 speaking activities under the title of 'Writing'. These activities are the second and third activities of Unit 1. They demand writing a task- sharing dialogue and question-answer form info- gap speech. For this level coursebook, 16 activities have been analysed to answer two questions of the research.

B2 level coursebook, lastly, includes no speech writing, or below sentence or sentence level activities to be counted as controlled writing activities; therefore, all 18 activities of B2 level coursebook have been analysed to serve for the purpose of this research paper.

3.3. Variety of Purposes Covered

In the coursebooks, 63 writing activities in total were analysed and evaluated for the purpose of checking and identifying what functions of Halliday (1973) are aimed for learners to practice (see *Table 1* for the rate of each purpose in all four coursebooks). Those 63 activities provide practices of 6 main purposes of text production to learners who learn Turkish with New İstanbul coursebooks. Only heuristic function is the function which is not practised with even a single writing task. This function together with informative function are called as later purposes in life during the period of adult language production. Early child language depends more on fulfilling the purposes of getting material needs, expressing self, controlling self and others, and maintaining social relationships, which are instrumental, personal, regulatory, interactional. The other three functions, imaginative, heuristic and informative, come later. Heuristic language use serves the purpose of seeking information. Although it seems like a basic elements of early child language, Halliday makes it clear that the child's language of asking questions is serving more for the purpose of personal and interactional function rather than heuristic (Halliday, 2003). Yeni İstanbul coursebooks are not specifically for children; thus, excluding heuristic function from writing activities could be called as a weak point; however, informative function is the most often practised function together with personal function, and this reason could only be an average excuse for the heuristic function. The practice of heuristic function in writing requires such activities as preparing a questionnaire, writing to enquire information from various sources, conducting a research project and writing practices among the research team to ask for information, etc. Such or similar writing activities were not encountered in any language coursebooks of Yeni İstanbul series. Some essay writing activities were accepted as serving informative function rather than a heuristic one.

For example, the activity below is an example for this informative function rather than heuristic function since learners are not the side seeking for information but giving information using written language.

Answering the following questions write a text about body language and cultural differences.

Are there differences in body language of your home country and Turkey? Explain these differences with examples.

Has anyone understood you wrong when you have used body language belonging to the culture of your country or have you understood anyone wrong in Turkey? Give examples.

What signs of body language you have experienced in Turkey for the first time? Have you used them while communicating with people?

(B1 Unit 6a)

The example activity above is also questionable in terms of accepting it as an example of informative or personal function which possibly but wrongly seem to substitute each other. Specifically, this activity seems like giving personal information; however, it only asks for experiential info- giving rather than expressing self whenever the before reading part accompanying the writing activity has been evaluated. The reading text is highly informative and this writing activity does not include any detail in its instruction making it serve a different purpose rather than informative. If, for instance, it were asking for specific genre writing such as writing for your personal blog it could have been called more personal or interactional. A1 6a, A2 4a and 5a, B1 1a and 2b and B2 2a activities were also accepted as serving informative function although they ask in parts personal information. Whenever the accompanying reading parts were analysed, there was no single sign that these activities demand learners to use language serving personal language use. On the other hand, B1 1a activity demands writing about learners' apartment and giving information on the location, size, age, closeness to facilities of public transportation of their houses, but this writing is instructed as writing a text rather an advertisement, thus; this writing activity makes learners practise info-giving language not regulatory language.

Personal purpose activities, the second most practised, cover 31.7 % of all writing activities in coursebooks while informative purpose is the most practised with the percentage of 34.9. The difference between these purposes is not only the quantity of activities but also it is that B1 and B2 level coursebooks carry more informative function in their writing activities while A1 and A2 level coursebooks include the most of personal function activities. This is meaningful a lot when this result is analysed with the information conveyed about early language development by Halliday (2013). As he says, during the process of language development the need for informative language use comes later, and Yeni Istanbul coursebooks are so responsive to this principle.

First units of A1 coursebook serve the purpose of meeting for the first time and introducing ourselves; therefore, for self- expression. A1 6a activity which asks to give information about relatives was identified as informative whereas A1 4a asking for introducing family members was accepted as personal. The reason behind this identification is that A1 4a activity clearly asks learners to use personal 'I' language whenever the example given before the instruction of the writing activity. However, A1 6a activity requires learners to use third person 'he/she' language as can be seen with the example text given following the instruction of the writing task. Although the activity below was questioned for its potential to carry imaginative function, it was named with personal purposes since the guiding

questions of the task showed that it does not aim learners to use language to create new worlds but express their preferences and opinions.

Getting help from the questions below write about your dream job.

The place and name of the profession

Reasons to choose it

Salary

Characteristics (high income, funny and entertaining, dangerous, flexible working hours, team work, traveling)

Requirements (education, certificates, knowledge of languages)

(B1 Unit 2c)

The activities for personal opinion sharing, or in other words argumentative writing topics; however, not asking for giving objective information but personal beliefs and preferences were also called as activities demanding personal language use. This type of writing cannot be called even as argumentative writing practice as argumentative writing is covered with some arguably correct and objective information to refute or support an idea, not only with opinions. For instance, B1 4c activity is to answer whether school, environment or family is more important for education; however, there is no clear guidance for learners to seek for information using sources and follow specific steps of argumentative writing such as listing your supports first and later listing reasons to refute. Thus, this activity was accepted as a simply opinion sharing writing practice; therefore, asking learners to use personal language. The same reason is also true for the activity B2 3b because this activity also asks for opinion sharing rather than arguing an idea. This time the topic is being a vegan/ vegetarian. For personal function, the most difficult activity to identify was B2 4c activity. This activity asks learners to write a text giving information, criticizing and suggesting solutions for problems about an event they have attended. Since it is not an advertising writing, it was not called as regulatory but sharing personal experience and opinions text; thus, personal function writing practice.

Following informative and personal purposes, the second mostly practised purposes are instrumental and regulatory function. While regulatory function aims to direct others, instrumental one aims to satisfy personal needs. Depending on this basic information, it was not so complicated to identify and categorize writing activities for these two purposes of writing. The most challenging one to name with instrumental function was B1 4b activity. This activity asks learners to write an e-mail, a specific genre, which makes the researcher to ask whether it could an interactive purpose writing; however, when the instruction of the activity was carefully checked, its purpose of asking for help, not even asking for information, could clearly be understood. Above-mentioned activity clearly instructs that learners want to learn a new language and write to a teacher in their city to get courses, in other words to satisfy their needs.

Not only directive writing practices such as writing to give directions on how to make pasta (A2 1a) and how to drive (B2 2c), but also the texts written for persuasive purposes were accepted as regulatory

writing as this analysis is compatible with the Halliday's definition of regulatory function (Kucer & Silva, 2006, p.9). B1 6b activity is an argumentative writing including steps of argumentative essay writing in order to persuade the readers whether living in a village is better than living in a city.

Respectively, imaginative function writing activities are asking learners to write a modern tale (A2 4b), complete a film story (A2 5c), a song lyrics or poem (B2 3c) and a create news story (B2 4b). On the other hand, B2 4a activity also asks learners to write a news report, but following some guiding questions (What was the crime? Who were the criminals? What was the punishment? How were the reactions of people against this crime?) it is surely news report writing which serves informative function, not imaginative function.

There were only two writing activities purely serving interactional purposes. These activities are writing a reply e-mail to the mother (A1 4c) and an agony aunt writing (B1 3c). Although agony aunt writing is described as writing for giving advice in the coursebook, concerned with the needs of communication in modern times and referring to the suggestions of Kucer (2005) on Halliday's language functions, it was accepted as a typical example of interactional purpose. Kucer (2005) states that "... letters to Dear Abby or Ann Landers, and postcards sent while on vacation can be interactional in nature." (p, 25).

Table 1. *Purposes of writing activities*

Purposes	Language level and unit of books activities included	Total number and percentage of purposes
Instrumental	A1 Unit 2b A2 Unit 3a/ 6a/ 6c B1 Unit 2b/4b/ 5c/ 6c	8/ 12.6 %
Regulatory	A2 Unit 1a B1 Unit 3a/ 6b B2 Unit 1b/ 1c/ 2b/ 5b	7/ 11.1 %
Interactional	A1 Unit 4c B1 Unit 3c	2/ 3.1 %
Personal	A1 Unit 2c/ 3a/ 3b/ 4a/ 4b/ 5b/ 5c/ 6c A2 Unit 2a/ 2b/3b/ 4c/ 5b B1 Unit 2c/ 4c/ 5a/ 5b/ B2 Unit 3a/ 3b/ 4c	20/ 31.7 %
Heuristic	X	X
Imaginative	A2 Unit 4b/ 5c B2 Unit 3c/ 4b	4/ 6.3 %
Informative	A1 Unit 1c/ 2a/ 6a A2 Unit 1c/ 2c/ 3c/ 4a/ 5a B1 Unit 1a/ 2b/ 3b/ 4a/ 6a B2 Unit 1a/ 2a/ 2b/ 4a/ 5a/ 5c/ 6a/ 6b/ 6c	22/ 34.9 %

3.4. Variety of Genres

The coursebooks include 27 genre writing practices out of 63 writing tasks (42.8 %). This number could be questionable since it is less than half of the writing tasks; however, it is not unexpected as the coursebooks highly include essay writing practices, especially B1 and B2 coursebooks. Following the information in *Table 2*, it is clear that the variety of genres is low but the process of analysis has also shown that the coursebooks are weak at applying a genre-based approach to writing instruction. Most of the writing activities, except for the ones listed below as strong activities, lack either necessary instruction and layout of the practised genre or they are not accompanied with a model text to guide learners to write a text of given genre.

Form filling activities (A1 2b/ A1 4b) are the strong ones in terms of reflecting specific genre characteristics. Additionally, personal e-mail to the mother (A1 4c), recipe (A2 1a), timetable (A2 2a), daily plan (A2 5b), agony aunt column (B1 3c), postcard (B1 6c) and reply post (B2 1b) are the other strong genre examples with their layout characteristics. However, except for the one in A1 level coursebook Unit 4c (e-mail to the mother), the other e-mail writing activities include simply a blank space for learners; that is, these spaces does not include any details such as “from:/ to:/ cc:/ bcc:/ subject:” that shows it is going to be an e-mail writing practice.

On the other hand, modern tale writing in A2 coursebook Unit 4b is also one of the activities following genre-approach since it is accompanied with a model text of a tale (Keloğlan) in the Reading Part of the coursebook. On the contrary, the film review (A2 5c) activity, which is also accompanied with a model reading text, is one of the weakest genre writing activities as the model text only includes the summary of the story i.e. plot of the film in its content. However, film reviews should also cover opinion giving parts decorated with positive connotation words for the purpose of leading the readers to see the films, in other words the function of recommendation.

Lastly, the review essay in B2 coursebook Unit 5a has been accepted as a specific genre writing activity since it elaborately instructs learners what to include in a research paper in its introduction, body and conclusion parts. In addition, this activity does not simply ask learners to research about their topic but also directs them about how to use citations. Other essay writing practices, different from the one described above, are reflections of organized writing practices (rhetorical approach) instead of genre writing activities.

Table 2. *List of genres writing activities demand*

Genres	Language level and unit of books genres included
Hotel registration form (filling)	A1 2b
Registration form (social media account) (filling)	A1 4b
Personal e-mail	A1 4c/ A2 6c
Recipe	A2 1a
Timetable	A2 2a
Blog post	A2 2b
News text (Medical)	A2 2c
Poster	A2 3a
Itinerary	A2 3b
Modern tale	A2 4b
Daily plan	A2 5b
Film review	A2 5c
Job advertisement	A2 6a
Application e-mail (job)	B1 2a
Success story	B1 2b
Agony aunt column	B1 3c
Formal letter (asking for info)	B1 4b
Complaint letter	B1 5c
Postcard (invitation)	B1 6c
Reply post (advertise)	B2 1b
Travel writing	B2 1c
Guidebook (how to drive)	B2 2b
Lyrics/ Poem	B2 3c
News report (crime)	B2 4a
News story (imaginative)	B2 4b
Review essay (website)	B2 5a

Conclusion

Based on the results of the present study, the following conclusions could be reached, and predicated on these conclusions, some helpful suggestions are possible to propose for a writing instruction carrying more variety in purposes and types of genre. Writing tasks are used for two basic reasons in language teaching environments. One of the two is writing as a means of practising correct language use, which is called controlled writing practice. However, such activities are not the ones which are suggested in literacy development studies as means of teaching writing for its own sake, for they are designed to teach language in general or specifically teaching correct language structures. Thus, controlled activities, including one in eight (1/8) of the total writing tasks could be suggested to be turned into free writing tasks to serve practising and developing written language use rather than practising specific language items. Whenever the opportunity of learners to practise writing increases, it shouldn't be forgotten that will positively support their language learning process in general.

Secondly, whereas some functions of language are mostly practised, some others are less practised, and depending on the variety principle, a more balanced practice of purposes could be recommended to coursebook writers. In particular, interactional function is one of the most practised purpose in real life; however, among writing tasks, only two of them could be identified as serving the interactional use of language. Therefore, including more interactional writing activities could be suggested to both teaching

practitioners in their courses and developers of instructional materials in their designs. On the other hand, all coursebooks exclude heuristic function although heuristic function is marked as one of the important language uses for adults. Yeni İstanbul is not a coursebook series designed for only children, these coursebooks are used even by adults more when the context of teaching Turkish as a foreign language to foreigners is considered. Based on the criterion of potential language learners in language teaching, including heuristic use of language for writing purposes i.e. preparing a questionnaire or interviews, writing emails for the reasons of enquiry, etc. is highly recommended for coursebook writers while designing and producing writing activities.

Lastly, the results of the study have shown that the variety of genres is low in the coursebooks and more than half of the writing activities even do not ask learners to write in a specific genre. In real life people normally realise written communication by writing in various kinds of genre. Thus, learners need to practise these genres in their language learning environments since language level singly cannot describe successful writing skills while the development of writing skills support language development in return.

One of the weaknesses of this study is its being limited to only four books from the series; however, it still gives sufficient information on the series of coursebooks as the study covers the language levels from basic user to independent user of a language. On the other hand, during the study, these four level coursebooks were the ones which were revised for the purpose of including more personalised and interactive activities. Still, for future studies, the procedure used in this research could be employed in other level coursebooks and even in comparative studies of coursebooks written to teach Turkish or other foreign languages. In brief, the present study with its aim to serve the betterment of teaching writing is expected to be supported with other studies of the field, not only the coursebook evaluation ones but also materials design studies.

References

- Aydoğan, H. & AYTEKİN, K. (2019). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde set halinde kullanılan İstanbul metot kitaplarında okuma metinleri ve metin altı soruları üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. 12 (67), 5-11.
- Banegas, D. L. (2018). Evaluating language and content in coursebooks. In M. Azamoosh, M. Zeraatpishe, A. Faravani & H. R. Kargozari (Eds.). *Issues in coursebook evaluation*. (p. p. 21-31). Leiden: Brill Sense.
- Barton, D. (1994). The social impact of literacy. In L. Verhoven. (Ed.), *Functional literacy- theoretical issues and educational implications*. (p.p. 185-197). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Barton, D. & Hamilton, M. (2000). Literacy practices. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies- in reading and writing context*. (p.p. 7-15). London: Routledge.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: cognition/ culture/ power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Bolognesi, M., Pilgram, R., & van den Heerik, R. (2017). Reliability in content analysis: The case of semantic feature norms classification. *Behaviour Research Methods*, 49(6), 1984–2001. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-016-0838-6>

- Bölükbaş, F. & Özdemir, E. (2009). Aktif öğrenmenin yazılı anlatım becerilerine etkisi. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12 (2), 27-43.
- Bölükbaş, F. (2011). Arap öğrencilerin Türkçe yazılı anlatım becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 6 (3), 1357-1367.
- Can, T., Frazier, S., McManus, C. & Rey, A. (2020). Globalisation in action: 'Less is More' English coursebook series. *Training, Language and Culture*, 4 (2), 56-66.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2020), *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment – companion volume*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Macmillan Education- Heinemann.
- Çekici, Y. E. (2018). Türkçenin yabancı dil olarak öğretiminde kullanılan Yedi İklim ve İstanbul ders kitaplarında yazma görevleri. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2 (1), 1 – 10.
- Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power- techniques for mastering the writing process* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elliott, M. (1986). Nasr's development as a writer in his second language: The first six months. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 120–153.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flowerdew, J. (1993). An educational, or process, approach to the teaching of professional genres. *ELT Journal*, 47 (4), 305-316.
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. London: Routledge.
- Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. *Review of Research in Education*, 43 (1), 277-303.
- Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your coursebook*. New York, NY and London: Longman.
- Güven, A. Z. & Banaz, E. (2020). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretimi kitaplarının çoklu zekâ kuramı açısından incelenmesi (İstanbul Yabancılar İçin Türkçe b1-b2 kitap seti örneği). *International Journal of Language Education and Teaching*, 8 (2), 44-52.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2001). Literacy and linguistics: relationships between spoken and written language. In A. Burns & C. Coffin. (Eds.), *Analysing English in a global context- a reader*. (p.p. 181-193). London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2003). Functional basis of language. In J. Webster (Ed.). *On language and linguistics*. (p.p. 298-322). London and New York, NY: Continuum.
- Hasırcı, S. (2019). Yabancılar Türkçe öğretimine yönelik ders kitaplarının konuşma becerisi açısından karşılaştırılması. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 8 (2), 1068-1098.

- Heath, S. B. (1992). Literacy skills or literate skills? considerations for ESL/ EFL learners. In D. Nunan. (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. (p.p. 40-55). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holme, R. (2004). *Literacy: an introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ivanić, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kargozari, H. R., Peyvandi, G. & Faravani, A. (2018). E-textbook evaluation criteria revisited. In M. Azarnoosh, M. Zeraatpishe, A. Faravani & H. R. Kargozari (Eds.). *Issues in coursebook evaluation*. (p. p. 111-121). Leiden: Brill Sense.
- Kırık- Yavuz, M. (2015). Interaction level of speaking activities in a coursebook series of teaching Turkish as a foreign language. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24 (2), 133-145.
- Kucer, S. B. (2005). *Dimensions of literacy- a conceptual base for teaching reading and writing in school settings- second edition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Kucer, S. B. & Silva, C. (2006). *Teaching the dimensions of literacy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Martin, J. R. (1985). Process and text: two aspects of human semiosis. In J. D. Benson and W. S. Greaves (Eds.) *Systemic perspectives on discourse, vol. 1: selected theoretical papers from the 9th international systemic workshop*. (248-274). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- McCarthy, S. J., Garcia, G. E. (2005), English language learners' writing practices and attitudes. *Written Communication*, 22 (1), 36-75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088304271830>
- McCarthy, S. J., Guo, Y. H. & Cummins, S. (2005), Understanding changes in elementary Mandarin students' L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14 (2), 71-104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.003>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/ EFL reading and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Olson, D. R. (1994). Literacy and the making of the Western World. In L. Verhoven. (Ed.), *Functional literacy- theoretical issues and educational implications*. (p.p. 135-150). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Özbal, B. & Genç, A. (2019). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe ders kitaplarında alıştırmaya yönergelerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 31, 123-146.
- Polio, C. (2001). Research methodology in second language writing research: the case of text-based studies. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda, (Eds.). *On second language writing*. (p.p. 91-116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Savova, L. (2018). Conversation analysis criteria for evaluating the authenticity of ESL textbook conversations. In M. Azarnoosh, M. Zeraatpishe, A. Faravani & H. R. Kargozari (Eds.). *Issues in coursebook evaluation*. (p. p. 85-95). Leiden: Brill Sense.

- Şeref, İ. (2013). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde yazma ve konuşma becerileri kazandırmada iletişimsel yaklaşımın kullanımı için model önerisi. *International Journal of Language Education and Teaching*, 1 (1), 43-60.
- Swales, J. (1990 /2008). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2017). *SLA research and materials development for language learning*, New York, NY and London: Routledge.
- Tiryaki, E. N. & Kayatürk, N. (2017). Yabancılara Türkçe öğretimi kitaplarındaki dinleme metinlerinin örtülü anlam açısından değerlendirilmesi (İstanbul b1-b2 seviyesi ders kitabı). *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14 (39), 300-319.
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Uyar, Y., Çepik, Ş., Doğan, A., Özmen, D. & Aydoğan, H. (2014). A coursebook evaluation research. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (9), 688-696.

Analysed Coursebook Series

- Kaya- Bölükbaş, F., Yılmaz, M. Y. & Keskin, F. (Eds.). (2020). *Yeni İstanbul: Uluslararası öğrenciler için Türkçe ders kitabı*. İstanbul: Kültür Sanat Basımevi.