

Are Written Instructions in Learner Materials Always Necessary?

Kristofer Bayne

International Christian University, Japan

Pre-organised and pre-packaged materials are omnipresent in second or foreign language classrooms worldwide. An element central to those materials are the rubrics, or written instructions given for tasks. This paper is based on the premise that rubrics are not always essential to the successful completion of certain tasks and raises the issue of the necessity of certain elements of the rubric from the point of view of learners. The overall study is broken into three related studies: the ability of learners to understand rubric lexicon, their ability to successfully predict and complete rubric-less tasks, and their ability to predict and form the likely rubric.

INTRODUCTION

From a professional materials writer at the employ of a global publishing house to a hardworking teacher who might prepare a worksheet for her own classroom, a common link will be that they include a written instruction to accompany their learning tasks. The instruction, or rubric, will reflect much more than a 'way' to complete a task (such as setting up your computer). It will encapsulate aspects of teaching methodology, attitudes to classroom organisation and even theories about learning in general. Overall the rubric is a vital element, requiring much thought and consideration, not only in its conception at the desk-face of the writer but also at the chalk-face, in its

execution in the classroom. For these reasons the rubrics in ELT textbook and materials deserve not to be dismissed so easily, and if they are considered obscure and of minimal interest, it maybe because we have grown too used to their presence without considering their impact.

Past and ongoing research by the author into rubrics suggests that it is not a given that rubrics in their 'traditional' format or detail are used or required as they are intended. Teachers' verbal treatment of rubrics (Bayne, 1995) indicated that teachers will 'override' the rubric in a number of ways, while a related study of students' preferred rubric access strategies (Bayne, 1998) revealed that reading the rubric itself is a minor preferred and utilized strategy, ranked after a teacher paraphrase and in-text or teacher-generated examples. Research underway focusing on materials writers and publishers suggests the target audience of the rubric is neither clear nor universal (Bayne, 2002a), and that given tasks, sans rubrics, teachers can and will be quite innovative in their task interpretations (Bayne, 2006). As part of the on-going examination of various aspects of textbook rubrics, the following study will further examine and question the need of rubrics in learner materials. It will lend weight to a claim that the absence of rubrics will not greatly, if at all, impact negatively on the ability of learners to complete certain pedagogical learning tasks. Further it will suggest that learners are able to function equally well using instructional examples, their own initiative and experience with learning materials.

RUBRIC AND TASK DIFFERENCES

Despite their centrality in ELT materials rubrics and related issues have been subject to very little mainstream examination and research. Among several recommended books on materials writing (Bayne, 2005b; Droukis, 2005) rubrics receive no in-depth treatment of any kind and are rarely, if at all, defined in any relevant glossaries. The few references to rubrics in the literature are in passing or as an aside to other issues. Let us, then, define

what is meant by 'rubric', as it is by no means simply 'the written instruction'. The 'rubric' in ELT materials has previously been defined as "graphically-represented directions, written directions and instructional examples in the target language which are addressed to learners in materials with the aim to organise and focus the classroom and learners for learning purposes via specific learning tasks" (Bayne, 2002b). Even within this gloss a variety of elements can be found. For example a rubric may contain the following items:

1. Distinguishing design and layout manipulations (font size, style, or colour, boxing, shading or 'white space', underlining, numbering, lettering or bulleting etc.)
2. Titles denoting skill or topic focus (e.g., 'Speaking', or 'What would you like to go?')
3. Directional graphics and icons (e.g., 🎧 for a audio source)
4. Directions on how to do a task (e.g., in pairs, groups etc.)
5. An explicit, written instruction/direction (usually) in imperative form that may be,
 - (a) single-skill and single-step
 - (b) Multi-step and multi-skill
6. Explanatory or contextualizing information and conditions (e.g., "You are on vacation in...")
7. Questions essential to the successful completion of the task (e.g., "What are you good at?")
8. References to other pages or activities in the text (e.g., tape scripts, A/B pair work roles, answer keys)
9. References to where to complete the task (e.g., 'in the table below...')
10. Completed examples or model answers with direct reference to them
11. Completed examples or model answers without reference to them
12. Further steps to complete within the task (more 'links' in one task than a 'chain' of independently designated but related tasks)
13. In-rubric demonstrations of lexicon (e.g., the word 'Underline' is underlined)

Even this list is perhaps incomplete as publishers and writers aim to add more 'innovations' to their texts.

Are Written Instructions in Learner Materials Always Necessary?

In one sense the rubric can be considered as 'broad', comprising of the wide range of the features listed above. For example Sample One contains, in order, 1, 8, 2, 4, 6, 7, 5a, 9, 11. 5b:

Sample One: Textbook Rubric

<p>■¹ L37⁸ Listen Clinic²: Changing Sounds² _____ (in brown print)¹ Work in pairs.⁴ In each of the six sentences, the sound in one word changes.⁶ What sound changes?⁷ What does the sound change to?⁷ Write your answer^{5a} in the space provided.⁹ [Six numbered sentences with space for answers] 11 Listen and check.^{5b}</p>

(Jamall & Wade, 2000, p. 39)

A rubric could be 'narrow' in the sense that it is primarily a 'written instruction' directing the user in how and what to do, as in Sample Two:

Sample Two: Textbook Rubric

<p>A¹ Ⓣ² Listen and practice.^{5b} [followed by the script of a short dialogue]</p>

(Richards, Hull & Proctor, 1998, p. 92)

Or it be even more basic:

Sample Three: Textbook Rubric

<p>Weather¹ & 2 7¹ Match the words and the symbols^{5a} [1~6 weather words followed by a~f weather symbols]</p>

(Potten & Potten, 2001, p. 83)

This study focuses on the 'narrow' written forms within the rubric. That is the actual, written directive that would include items 4~11 on the list above.

THE STUDY

Participants

Two groups of learners at a four-year university in Japan were involved in the study conducted over one thirteen week semester. Both groups of learners shared many features (Appendix 1). A majority of the students were 2nd year language majors, most of these being English majors. Both groups shared commonalities in age (19-21 range), gender distribution (predominantly female), L2 ability and in many cases previous courses taken in the institution. They used a common text and self-study materials, *Passport Plus* (Buckingham & Whitney, 1995) and *Passport Plus Workbook* (Buckingham, 1999).

Their length of contact with above texts was identical, both groups having covered Unit One of the main text, with a further three units used in the study (Five, Six and Ten) unknown. No student possessed the actual *Workbook*, which was the source of tasks for the study. Both groups had to complete and turn in the materials within two weeks with the same stipulation to 'work alone'.

Two groups were established, each group corresponding to a class unit. One group, Original Rubric Group (ORG), maintained the original, complete rubrics from the target text, the other, Minus Rubric Group (MIG), had tasks with all or most directional rubrics removed. The two groups rotated the ORG and MIG roles at different stages of the study. Two control groups were also used in part of the study.

With kind permission from the publisher (Oxford University Press) the *Workbook* (Buckingham) of *Passport Plus* (Buckingham & Whitney, 1995) was used. Tasks related to the regular curriculum were targeted from several units in the text. Depending on the aim of the study, rubrics either retained their complete original form or much of the information directing learners how to answer was removed. Example or model answers and certain contextual items for some tasks were retained (see Appendix 3). As it was essential that student not have access to the original material, copies of the

class text workbook were made and altered with the publisher's permission. The sections of the workbook were compulsory parts of the regular course work and the students were made aware that it was also being used for a study of classroom habits. Students had the option to be excluded from the study.

Hypothesis and Related Studies

Informed by the body of work cited in the Introduction, the overall study was based on the overriding premise that rubrics are not always essential to the successful completion of certain tasks. Three related studies were undertaken to gather support for this general hypothesis: Study One focused on lexical issues; Study Two saw the removal of elements of the rubric; and Study Three looked at the learners' ability to predict rubrics. We will deal with each of these studies in turn.

Study One: Lexical Understanding

This part of the overall study was conducted to establish that, in many cases, the lexus of the instruction itself is often beyond the student. We could describe this as a kind of metalanguage used in rubrics, or 'rubric-ese', a discourse analysis of which would reveal the recurrence of certain instructional or directive vocabulary, sentence structures, length and so on. Faced with this learners may have to stop to check the meaning of the rubric before completing the task. This would be particularly true in self-study situations. It would also indicate that this particular group of students had roughly the same lexical background.

Data Collection

Study One is based on the speculation that, due to lexical issues, learners in a self-study situation often need to and will use other means understand

and successfully complete certain pedagogical learning tasks. Lists of lexical items from the selected tasks were distributed to the two groups of learners (ORG and MIG) and two control groups. The latter were not taught by the author and did not use the same texts, but shared very similar backgrounds (Appendix 1).

The list included potentially difficult words from the target tasks (i.e., any that were not grammar items) and participants were asked to simply check the words they did not know (Appendix 2). One weakness in the approach is that if given in context, i.e. in the 'broad' or 'narrow' task rubric, the students would perhaps 'understand' what they mean. To do this, however, would have compromised the rest of the study. The vocabulary test was conducted *after* the tasks had been distributed and completed by both MIG and ORG. This means that the MIG (and the control groups) had not seen these words in context where as ORG has seen them in rubrics. Table 1 below shows the

TABLE 1
Items of Lexical Difficulty

ORG		MIG		Control A		Control B	
Column A	Column B	Column A	Column B	Column A	Column B	Column A	Column B
Lexical Item	No. of Ss	Lexical Item	No. of Ss	Lexical Item	No. of Ss	Lexical Item	No. of Ss
<i>N=28</i>	<i>N= 37</i>	<i>N=28</i>	<i>N= 29</i>	<i>N = 28</i>	<i>N = 25</i>	<i>N = 28</i>	<i>N = 27</i>
Above	1	Above	5	-	0	-	0
Describe	1	Describe	2	-	0	Describe	1
Match	4	Match	5	Match	5	Match	4
Positively	4	Positively	6	Positively	1	Positively	3
Column	9	Column	13	Column	6	Column	9
-	0	Answers	1	-	0	-	0
-	0	Check	1	Check	1	-	0
Circle	2	Circle	3	Circle	3	Circle	3
Complete	1	Complete	2	Complete	1	-	0
Text	1	Text	1	-	0	-	0
Flight	1	Flight	1	Flight	2	Flight	2
Sentences	1	-	0	Sentences	1	-	0
Experience	1	-	0	-	0	-	0
				Correct	1	Correct	1

results of the test, with Columns A indicating the items checked as 'unknown' and Columns B indicating the number of students who checked that item.

An analysis of the results of this lexical survey yields a number of features. Firstly the students tested share the same difficulties with actual lexical items as seen in Columns A. Among the four groups, fourteen different words were identified as unknown out of 28 items. Next, of the items identified there was roughly the same ranked difficulty with same lexical items. The top five most difficult items (in bold in Table 1) were the same for all groups, those being the items 'column', 'match', 'positively', 'circle' and 'flight'. Furthermore, within these top five words there was the same degree of difficulty, as in the ratio of students to certain lexical items (Table 1, Columns B), for example 'column' was the most difficult item in all groups, 'match' the next most difficult, 'flight' the least nominated. When comparing only the target groups, MIG students generally had more difficulties than ORG student (Table 2o). Lexical difficulties experienced by MIG outnumbered ORG, however ORG (N=37) students outnumbered MIG (N=29). And finally, MIG and Control Groups, all of which had not seen the vocabulary in the rubric context, showed very similar results on the test (Table 2).

TABLE 2
Ratio of Unknown Lexical Items

	Number of unknown lexical items as indicated on returned test papers									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ORG N=37	22	6	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
MIG N=29	13	7	2	3	2	1	0	1	0	0
Control A N=25	14	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Control B N=27	14	6	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0

There was an obvious difference in the results of the lexical test based on target rubrics. From this we can draw a conclusion. ORG students had

difficulty with the same items, but taking into account total numbers of students and total number of difficulties it could be seen that ORG had less of a problem with lexus than MIG students and the control groups. We can surmise that this was because they had already seen and ‘dealt’ with them in rubrics. There are two questions to ask: how did they deal with them, and was the ORG students’ better understanding of the rubric vocabulary reflected in comparative task completion success rates between the two groups?

Study Two: Rubric Removal

The learners do not always understand the lexicon of rubrics was established in Study One and we can speculate that the difference in results between MIG and ORG can be accounted for by the use of dictionaries and/or contextual clues in the ‘broad’ rubric and task itself. One aim of Study Two is to confirm this. Also, if the rubric is significant in explaining to the student what to do, those students without the rubric may have misinterpreted the task and completed it incorrectly unless they drew on other indicators to complete the task. Another aim of Study Two is to see then if the lack of elements of a rubric has an effect on the students’ success.

Study Two compared MIG and ORG groups of learners to establish that learners in a self-study situation can successfully predict and then complete certain pedagogical learning tasks without rubrics. The two groups were given the identical set of pedagogical tasks to complete in a self-study situation within the same time frame.

Data Collection

All students in the study group, MIG and ORG, completed the same tasks, either with or without the rubrics for the tasks (reproduced and described in Appendix 3). A questionnaire was distributed and learners were instructed to read and complete it *only after* the tasks were finished. Twenty-six out of 37

Are Written Instructions in Learner Materials Always Necessary?

ORG learners and 20 of 29 MIG learners returned completed questions. The questionnaire asked learners to indicate how they were able to complete the tasks given to them. They were given a choice of seven strategies as follows based on past research (Bayne, 1998) and subsequent research by the author:

1. referred to dictionary
2. referred to example
3. consulted friend
4. guess
5. re-read/read instructions
6. reviewed Units
7. past experience
8. no comments
9. 'problems' circled
10. no mistakes

Participants were also asked to rank their 'top three' strategies out of 1~7. Items Eight and Nine were used to record the selection of extraneous information and Item Ten was used to indicate their success in completing the tasks.

Based on the results of the survey, of the Original Rubric Group (ORG), participants in equal numbers (14) used dictionaries or referred to the task example, and of these seven used both. In all, 21 of 26 students who responded used a dictionary and/or the instructional example. Ten consulted a friend however, of these, seven did so in conjunction with dictionary/example use. Ranking of strategies was limited (8), with examples and using past experiences as the two most relied on strategies. ORG learners showed no evidence of actual translations on their homework sheet. The MIG learners, on the other hand and somewhat obviously, relied on examples and guesswork (12/20 and 7/20 respectively) in the absence of a full rubric. Nonetheless ORG learners who did have the full range of the rubric similarly relied heavily on examples (14/26). Interestingly it was ORG learners who were more likely to consult a peer about the task (10/26 as opposed to 5/20 for MIG). Unfortunately the survey did not ask what the consultation was

about (rubric or completed task?). While no ORG learners indicated that they had a 'problem' in completing the task while almost half (9/20) of MIG did indicate this. Despite this, among the Minus Rubric Group there were no tasks that were completed incorrectly. The main area of confusion was the content focus in the final link in a task 'chain' (see Appendix 5). MIG students did not know whether to use the text example (a vacation in London), or an example of their own. As a pedagogical task it was completed with the same accuracy as the ORG, with most MIG students (correctly) using a Japanese example. It could be said that at least the MIG answers indicated a more meaningful thought process than the original task, and was at least more meaningful to them.

The survey results confirm that learners have to sometimes use a dictionary to understand rubrics and accounts for the ORG learners slightly better results in lexical comparison in Study One. It also shows, however, that students also cross-reference or even 'by-pass' the rubric. Both students who did not have full rubrics (MIG) and those who did (ORG) relied on examples, guesswork, peer consultation and contextual language cues to do the tasks. All participants answered the tasks correctly except as indicated (Appendix 4). Among MIG, who did not have rubrics, any other 'mistakes' were not made in how to answer, rather than the accuracy of the answer. Also, tasks left incomplete were the final ones and suggest time rather than misunderstanding as earlier identical tasks had been completed successfully. It was interesting that one student who did not have a rubric both correctly answered a 'match' task and embellished it by added her own answers. Overall the results of Study Two suggest that, with or without a 'narrow' directional element of rubrics, students will draw on a variety of contextual hints to successfully complete tasks.

Study Three: Learner Conception of Rubrics

Study One confirmed that learners have issues with 'rubric-ese'. Study two demonstrated that the lack of certain directional elements of rubrics did not

necessarily hinder the successful task completion. Study Three sought to further confirm this by examining the ability of learners to predict the aim of tasks by having them write their own rubrics. Using different tasks from Study One and Study Two students we asked to speculate on what the missing rubric might be and add it.

Data Collection

For Study Three, rubrics were removed from materials for all participants in the overall study. As this was an activity that was ‘un-necessary’ for the actual completion of homework, participation was voluntary. Rubrics were removed from self-access materials. Students were required to:

- (i) complete the tasks as they perceive them
- (ii) add the rubric as they perceive it

A total of fourteen tasks were used, two of these however had two sections, thus the number of separate tasks was sixteen. Two tasks in particular (Appendix 5) were seen as potential ‘problems’ that would require careful examination/consideration to both answer correctly and formulate a rubric.

Based on the returns, there was a very high rate of correct identification of aim of the task. Except for the two ‘problematic’ tasks passed over by a majority of the learners all students could correctly add a functioning rubric to accompany. With varying degrees of detail or grammatical accuracy, all, however, show an understanding of what to do, for example:

Sample One: Student-generated rubrics

Original rubric: Match the words on the left with their opposites on the right.

Learner rubrics: Each word has an antonym the other side. Please choose it.

Draw the opposite word.

Find a pair of word.
Opposite.

There were also isolated examples of a ‘new’ task that fit the original task. In one or two cases learners interpreted a different aim and completed the task with a rational, ‘do-able’ rubric in mind. As can be seen somewhat in Sample One and more clearly in Sample Two below, there was frequent and accurate use of metalanguage or ‘rubric-ese’ in the rubric, lexicon and structures common to written instructions found in ELT materials. The learner attempt was in some cases more ‘complicated’ than the original as in Sample Three.

Sample Two: Student-generated rubrics

Original rubric: Put the words in the correct column. Then add two more words of your own in each column.

Learner rubrics: Classify the following words into the same category.
Classify these words below into three categories.
Place the words which you think are suitable for each 3 categories.
Divide words in the below box into three categories.

Sample Three: Student-generated rubrics

Original: Write the question.
Learner: Please make an interrogative sentence to fit the answer.

Another feature of this study was that it supported Study Two in that there was a very high rate of correct completion of the tasks. A majority of the tasks were done without mistakes. In two cases where the original rubric for preposition practice tasks had indicated ‘limitations’ (“Use each word only twice.”) there was a degree of mistakes. This was not a reflection of their

failure to grasp *how* to do the task but a demonstration of a weakness in their understanding of grammar. In fact it was a fairer test of the targeted skill - in the original form students could use a process of elimination rather than knowledge of correct grammatical usage. Those in the groups who opted to not write rubrics completed the tasks with *the same degree of accuracy* etc. as the rest of the class.

DISCUSSION

The outcomes of the three studies lends weight to the argument that a majority of rubrics or at least parts of a broad rubric are redundant as far as the learners are concerned and the learners show a high degree of intuition and/or commonsense and/or familiarity in dealing with the tasks. In some isolated cases learners can improve on or modify to complete as an 'individualized' learning task. (It was not the aim of the study to attempt this.) There could be three other interpretations and subsequent conclusions made of the results however.

The first interpretation is that in most cases rubrics are not needed, with instructional examples being sufficient. In most cases the learners can work out what to do (Study Two) based on the physical presentation of the task itself and hints about how to answer. While the survey of MIG saw some indicate that they had problems in answering because there were no rubrics, mistakes by the MIG were all but non-existent. Furthermore, learners could very accurately reconstruct in their mind and create a rubric that reflects the materials writer's intention as expressed in the original rubric (Study Three). This is true with or without instructional examples. Having no rubric (or at least very limited or partial ones) would draw the learner into the task more as they need to consider (i) how to do the task and (ii) the relationship with the overall goals/aim of the unit/topic etc. and encourage degrees of learner autonomy and innovation. This very much reflects Breen's (1989) suggestion that:

Involving learners in judging their chosen procedures and preferred ways of undertaking tasks can lead them to an accepting awareness of alternatives which can help them to be more adaptable when confronting future learning purposes and different content. (p. 200)

The second interpretation is that rubrics as they currently presented in materials are not a problem. Since learners can very accurately reproduce an appropriate rubric that is either 'functional' and in many cases can include a surprisingly level of technical/metalinguage (Study Three), the rubric-ese I have suggested as a hindrance is clearly not. Also, despite their success rate MIG learners did indicate having no rubric is a problem. Having rubrics in their current state would explain, lead and direct them to what to do with 'no doubt' (learners still do misunderstand even with rubrics) about what they need to do. We could 'stay' with the status quo - materials that leave us and the students in no doubt about what to do with, or rather how to do, the task in our moves toward becoming more fluent or knowledgeable.

The third possible interpretation is that the case for or against certain elements of rubrics is neither confirmed nor conclusive. Rubrics should occasionally be included if the task is not clear through the task. There are times/tasks where rubrics can clarify and direct, particularly when the layout of the task does not suggest what to do as in the two 'problematic' tasks in Study Three. There may also be tasks that have no physical form. This study dealt with materials for speaking skill practice. Materials for other skills may indeed require much more specific direction, particularly writing and reading.

CONCLUSION

One issue purposely not addressed in this trilogy of studies on rubrics, but one of vital importance to classroom materials-learner-teacher dynamics, is that of teacher input in the form of task explanations and adaptations. It is not

uncommon for teachers to interpret (as in re-explain, not translate) or even modify what the rubric suggests. This is not to say at all we should refrain from such input; in fact many materials writers expect it and the different contexts in which texts are used demand it. Some writers even state that the rubric is for the teacher, or at least for both learners and teachers (Bayne, 2002a). Even so, students have cited such changes by the teacher as potentially confusing (Bayne, 1998). Many trust more their eyes (reading a rubric) than their ears (hearing what the teachers say to do). Removing rubrics may level the field somewhat by allowing teachers to adapt a task and possibly for students to develop their own way of doing a task. A compromise between no rubrics and current status quo could take a number of forms such as removing certain elements of rubrics and relocating them, thus maintaining the original intent of the materials writer but allowing the actual users to adapt as they see fit (Bayne, 2005a).

If we take a more global perspective, materials are *learning* materials, or should be, as Allwright way back in 1981 pointed out, not *teaching* materials in a sense. Furthermore, there is a general and more recent trend in most discussions and proposals on materials innovations to emphasize autonomy and cooperation and to recognise that learners have different learning styles and their own ‘curriculum’ (Breen, 1987). Without being too negative materials can lead to outcomes that are “limited and impoverished” (Islam & Mares, 2003, p. 93), lacking challenges and restricting, not encouraging, language use, and they may even “handicap the development of other ways of working” (Bruner in Littlejohn & Windeatt, 1989, p. 171). As rubrics are central to materials they are therefore central to these wider and weightier issues.

THE AUTHOR

Kristofer Bayne holds a Masters in Teaching ESP from Aston University and has taught in Japan for over twenty years. In that time he has developed

a wide range of materials, particularly for content-based courses and more recently for academic writing. He has published and presented on both areas.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, R. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal*, 36(1), 5-18.
- Bayne, K. (1995). Features and strategies of teachers' verbal treatment of written instructions in the EFL classroom. *Dokkyo University Studies in Foreign Language Teaching*, 14, 202-215.
- Bayne, K. (1998). How students know what to do: Learner access to ELT textbook rubrics. *Dokkyo University Studies in Foreign Language Teaching*, 17, 253-283.
- Bayne, K. (2002a). Hedging and hoping: The addressee in textbook rubrics. *Between the Keys*, X(2), 8-11.
- Bayne, K. (2002b). Written instructions in ELT materials. Featured Speaker Workshop at Japan Association for Language Teaching Annual Conference, 2002.
- Bayne, K. (2005a). The rubrics reloaded: Raising options for how we frame learning tasks. *Folio*, 9(2), January, 21-24.
- Bayne, K. (2005b). More for a material writer's bookshelf. *Between the Keys*, XIII(2), 14-15.
- Bayne, K. (2006). Colouring outside the lines: A training exercise in the adaptation of written instructions in ELT materials. *Folio*, 10(2), 30-33.
- Breen, M. (1987). Learner contributions to task design. In C. Candlin & D. Murphey (Eds.), *Language learning tasks* (pp. 23-46). London: Prentice-Hall International.
- Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buckingham, A. (1999). *Passport plus workbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buckingham, A., & Whitney, N. (1995). *Passport plus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Droukis, D. (2005). A material writer's bookshelf. *Between the Keys*, XIII (1), 5-7.
- Islam, C., & Mares, C. (2003). Adapting classroom materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 86-100). London: Continuum.

Are Written Instructions in Learner Materials Always Necessary?

- Jamall, M., & Wade, B. (2000). *Business listening & speaking*. Tokyo: ABAX Ltd.
- Littlejohn, A., & Windeatt, S. (1989). Beyond language learning: Perspectives on materials design. In R. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 155-175). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Potten, H., & Potten, J. (2001). *Clockwise elementary classbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J., Hull, J., & Proctor, S. (1998). *New interchange student book 3*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX 1

Participant Background

	+ Rubric group	- Rubric group	Control group A	Control group B
No. of students	N=37	N=29	N=25	N=27
Gender	Male 6 Female 31	Male 7 Female 22	Male 3 Female 18 Not stated 4	Male 5 Female 19 Not stated 3
Major	Eng. 2 nd yr 32 Eng. 3 rd yr 3 Frn. 4 th yr 1 Unkn. 1	Eng. 2 nd yr 18 Eng. 3 rd yr 3 Frn. 2 nd yr 5 Ger. 2 nd yr 1 Intn. St. 4 th yr 1 Lang. 4 th yr 1	Lang. 3 rd yr 25	Lang. 3 rd yr 27

Eng. = English. Frn. = French, Ger. = German, Intn. = International Studies, Lang. = Languages, Unkn. = Unknown

APPENDIX 2
Study One Vocabulary Test

Name: _____

DO NOT check a dictionary or ask another student.

Do you understand these words? Check (✓) the ones you understand.

<input type="checkbox"/> above	<input type="checkbox"/> ideas
<input type="checkbox"/> airport	<input type="checkbox"/> imagine
<input type="checkbox"/> answers	<input type="checkbox"/> information
<input type="checkbox"/> box	<input type="checkbox"/> match (verb, <i>to match</i>)
<input type="checkbox"/> check (verb, <i>to check</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/> own
<input type="checkbox"/> circle (verb, <i>to circle</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/> positively
<input type="checkbox"/> column	<input type="checkbox"/> question
<input type="checkbox"/> complete	<input type="checkbox"/> sentences
<input type="checkbox"/> conversation	<input type="checkbox"/> short
<input type="checkbox"/> correct	<input type="checkbox"/> text
<input type="checkbox"/> describe	<input type="checkbox"/> use (verb, <i>to use</i>)
<input type="checkbox"/> experience	<input type="checkbox"/> vacation
<input type="checkbox"/> flight	<input type="checkbox"/> visitor
<input type="checkbox"/> home town	<input type="checkbox"/> word

APPENDIX 3
Rubrics from Target Tasks

Column A identifies the task. Column B represents the rubric as seen by the ORG students, i.e. the full original written instruction. Column C represents what was given to MIG students. A brief description of the task is given in italics.

	B	C
Unit	Original Rubric Group	Minus Rubric Group
1.1	Complete the conversation. Use the words in the box. <i>Nine words in a box and a closed dialogue for completion.</i>	(Removed)
1.2	You went to Australia on vacation. You enjoyed your vacation very much. Circle the word which describes Australia on	

Are Written Instructions in Learner Materials Always Necessary?

your experience *positively*.

vacation. You enjoyed your vacation very much.
Model answer retained.

Six sentences, each with three adjective choices, one positive, two negative. One answer completed as a model.

- 1.3 You are meeting a visitor at the airport. Write the question.

You are meeting a visitor at the airport.
Model answer retained.

Five sentences with key content words only given. One answer completed as a model.

- 1.4 How was your flight? Read the texts below and answer the questions. Check (✓) the correct answers.

How was your flight?

Three short 'flight descriptions' followed by ten sentences to be checked 'True' or 'False'.

Unit Six

- 6.1 Imagine you are in New York. Match the questions with the answers.

Imagine you are in New York.

Two lists, a~e (questions) proceeding 1~5 (answers).

- 6.2 Imagine you are going to London for a short vacation. Put the words in the correct column.

Imagine you are going to London for a short vacation.

Nine items in a box to be written under three headings.

- 6.2 cont. Now complete the sentences. Use information from the box above.

(Removed)
Model answer retained.

Four partially completed sentences. One answer completed as a model.

- 6.2 cont. Now complete these sentences about your home town.

(Removed)

Three partially completed sentences.

- 6.3 Match the first half of the sentences (a-e) with the second (1-5).

(Removed)

Two list, a~e (activities) proceeding 1~5 (suggestions).

- 6.4 Now complete these sentences. Use your own ideas.

(Removed)

Six partially completed sentences.

(Buckingham 1999, pp. 4-5,14-15)

APPENDIX 4
ORG and MIG Survey Results

Numbers 1-10 represent the questionnaire options provided. The letters of the alphabet represent the students who returned questionnaires. Lettered notes under each table give references to particular students.

Original Rubric Group Strategies

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	
1	○	○	○	○		2		○	○	1		2							○	○	3	○		○			
2	○	○	○			1	○								○	○	2	2		○	2	○	○		1		
3		○				○	3			○	2	○	1					○				○				○	
4													3			1					○						
5		○															1			1		1		2			
6				○																							
7																											
8															○											○	
9																											
10	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

*L – wrote 'Japan' as home town

Minus Rubric Group Strategies

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	n	o	p	q	r	s	t						
1		2	○	○		○						○				○	○		○							
2		3	○		○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○						○		○	○	○				
3		1	○			○							○			○										
4			○			○					○					○		○		○	○					
5																										
6																										○
7																										
8	○														○	○										
9			○	○				○	○	○						○		○		○	○					
10	○	○	○	○	○	*	○	○	○	○	○*	○	*	○	○	○	*	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

f – some final questions incomplete (time?)

j – added own opinion to 6.1

l – slight mistake on 6.1

o – not complete 6.3, 6.4 (but 6.1 successful – time?)

Are Written Instructions in Learner Materials Always Necessary?

APPENDIX 5:
Two 'Problematic' Study Three Tasks

5:4 Follow the directions below. Write the room number.

*[Floor plan of a building with numbered or labelled rooms. Start point identified.
Five written directions with space to write room numbers.]*

Now write directions to two more offices.

[Two numbered spaces for student sentences.]

9:1 Read the telephone conversation.

[Conversation.]

This is the message the receptionist leaves for Mrs. Biggs. Correct the mistakes in the message. There are four mistakes.

[Mock 'message form' with four mistakes.]