

Survey Report

Kyoto University's New Unified Textbooks for Academic Writing

Catherine LeBlanc[#], Timothy Stewart, David Lees,
Tanya McCarthy, Sara Schipper, Yosuke Yanase,
Emi Izumi, Aya Yoshida, David Dalsky,
Toshiyuki Kanamaru, Daniel Milne, John Rylander,
Yosuke Sasao, Daisuke Yokomori^{*}

Abstract

Members of the i-ARRC produced two original textbooks in response to questionnaire data gathered since 2016 from both teachers and students of Kyoto University's English Writing-Listening (EWL) courses. This is a report on the classroom trialing of the new unified textbooks for the EWL courses. The new textbooks, *EGAP Writing 1: Academic Essays* and *EGAP Writing 2: Research Writing*, were first piloted in two faculties to assess their suitability. Full-time ILAS faculty members taught the courses according to the teacher's guide for each textbook. The report explains the background of the AY2021 classroom piloting in detail and, subsequently, shows survey responses from students. In AY2021, closed- and open-response item surveys were administered twice, in both the first and second semesters, to learn about students' experiences with the new textbooks. The survey data indicate that students' experiences with each of the textbooks were generally positive, showing a slight increase in the average mean scores for scaled-item responses between surveys conducted at mid-semester and end-of-semester. The survey findings were carefully considered when revisions were made to the textbooks and teacher's guides. New editions of the books were prepared for the full implementation across the curriculum in AY2022. The full implementation is described together with survey data and comments from teachers about the new unified textbooks. Ongoing developments and future ideas for the textbook project are outlined at the end of the report.

[Keywords] Curriculum development, materials development, academic writing, English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP), faculty development (FD)

Introduction

In 2015, a major reform of the undergraduate English curriculum, initiated by the university administration, was negotiated by faculty members representing all departments at Kyoto University. This was a follow-up to the reform of 2006 initiated due to increasing pressures to internationalize

^{*}Institute for Liberal Arts and Sciences, Kyoto University

[#]Corresponding author

the curriculum and mentor young Japanese researchers with English skills (Maswana & Tajino, 2020). The 2015 reform was a top-down effort driven by the desire to better meet contemporary student needs for more practical English language instruction according to Katsurayama et al. (2018). The new first-year curriculum has two compulsory courses, English Reading and English Writing-Listening. The revised English curriculum was implemented from AY2016 (see Takahashi et al., 2020 for details). The new English Writing-Listening (EWL) course consists of three main components: academic writing, academic listening, and academic vocabulary learning. Both listening and vocabulary are self-study components, although they are tested in class. A new online system called GORILLA¹ was created that allows students to log-in from anywhere and practice listening to academic English outside of class each week (see Katsurayama et al., 2018, pp. 115–117). In addition, students must do self-study of academic vocabulary listed in the reference book *Kyoto University Academic Vocabulary Database 1110* (English Education Research Group, 2009). The EWL course is primarily a writing course; therefore, weekly classroom lessons concentrate on teaching students how to write academic essays in English. This report focuses on the textbooks used to teach academic writing in the EWL course for first-year students.

Organized writing for academic purposes is not a skill that comes naturally (Kaplan, 1987). In academic writing courses for Japanese university students, teachers need to take into account the extant culturally-inculcated tendencies towards inductive structure (Hirose & Sasaki, 1994; Kubota, 1997; Kubota & Lehner, 2004; Savage, 2022), as well as preconceptions regarding citation conventions (Kamimura, 2014; Teeter, 2015). Research in this area suggests that a combination of focused repetition on structure (McKinley, 2013) and regular teacher feedback (Colpitts & Howard, 2018) is required in order to help students attain the target academic writing conventions. In short, learning to write well takes time and, naturally, students progress at varied rates. During the curriculum reform negotiations, the administration agreed to faculty demands of reducing the enrollment in academic writing classes from 40 to 20 students per class as necessary for enabling teachers of the EWL course to provide tailored individual feedback (Katsurayama et al., 2018). This change meant that the number of instructors teaching the EWL course had to be increased to around 40, many of whom were part-time teachers. This staffing expansion led to discussions about the consistency of content coverage across course sections.

Three significant curricular changes were made to address issues raised in management discussions. First, a unified syllabus was written for the EWL course. The syllabus included a number of achievement benchmarks for student writing, vocabulary learning, and listening skills that were solicited from teachers university-wide. Second, a book of academic vocabulary was required for all first-year students in the course. Kyoto University faculty members and graduate students in the English Education Research Group developed this material by creating “a vocabulary list drawn from academic journals in various disciplines that subject specialists expect their students to read and write for” (Maswana & Tajino, 2020, p. 74). Third, textbook selection was limited for the first time. Each of the 10 Kyoto University faculties selected course books from a vetted short list of commercially available English writing textbooks. Ultimately, three textbooks were chosen for each of the two semesters (i.e., six books in total) to deliver the EWL curriculum across all faculties. While having a limited number

of textbooks provided a greater degree of standardization, differences in the structure, approach, and content of the books meant coverage of curricular objectives varied.

Faculty comments in end-of-semester surveys and at teacher feedback meetings over five years (2016–2021) indicated a significant degree of dissatisfaction with the selected commercial textbooks. Some teachers repeatedly complained that one of the first-semester books did not have enough content for a 15-week course. In contrast, many teachers said that the two other books, designed for intensive English courses in the United States, contained far too much material. Moreover, lesson preparation proved to be difficult for instructors required to use different books while teaching the same course. Generally, the feedback reveals that a patchwork pattern of implementation developed from the attempt to match commercial textbooks with Kyoto University’s EWL curriculum. From the students’ perspective, a number of survey comments every year expressed frustration when their instructors were unable to use the textbooks they purchased to the extent they had expected. Student comments resulted in managers of the course reminding teachers to routinely make use of the textbooks in classes. In response to persistent student and teacher feedback, the full-time English Writing-Listening instructors decided to produce two in-house academic writing textbooks.

The new unified textbooks are the central products of several major material development projects for the academic writing course. These projects reflect the purpose and function of the i-ARRC² which is “research and development of teaching methods for practical language proficiency” (International Academic Research and Resource Center, n.d.). Full-time faculty in the Division of English Language Education (DELE) of the i-ARRC set out in 2017 to better align the three primary components of the new EWL course: academic writing, listening, and vocabulary (see Figure 1). Based loosely on the principles of Biggs and Tang’s (2011) theory of Constructive Alignment, target content from each component was selectively replicated in the other components. This can be seen as a “horizontal” alignment of the curriculum; meaning that content instruction is coordinated across course components, sections of the same course, or the same grade. It is in contrast with “vertical” alignment which




Figure 1. Horizontal Alignment of Course Components

is the sequential integration and progression of content instruction at different grade levels (UNESCO, n.d.). For example, over a period of three years, an extensive set of online listening-practice material was created for GORILLA by DELE faculty members that utilizes lexical items selectively drawn from the course vocabulary book (English Education Research Group, 2009). The listening units focus on organization of academic texts, stages of the writing process, and citation conventions, as well as strategies for academic listening skill development and test taking. Furthermore, model paragraphs and essays featured in the new textbooks similarly include a number of target words that students study in the course vocabulary book. To ensure a higher degree of standardization in vocabulary assessment, several DELE members created and validated a full set of tests that are accessible to all EWL teachers (Rylander et al., 2018). The unified textbooks introduce students to the process of academic writing while emphasizing the functions and features of an essay's basic structural elements. The organization of the new books promotes repeated writing and research practice. The intent of this alignment was to create a web of cohesion linking the course components horizontally, as illustrated in Figure 1. This intentional overlapping of some content means that students can encounter the target content, in part, across the three course components to reinforce learning. The integration of self-study and taught content resembles what Mercado (2015) calls classroom and autonomous learning integration (CALI).

Writing and Revising the New Unified Textbooks

The work of writing the new texts was undertaken by a small team of teachers who volunteered for this additional duty. Over a two-year period, the team met weekly to plan, write, and revise the new materials. Care was taken throughout the material development process to involve all DELE members in this important project and ensure that all voices were heard. To deepen the collaborative effort, all DELE colleagues were encouraged to submit writing models and exercises to a shared online folder. In addition, regular meetings were held each semester with all DELE faculty members to update colleagues on the status of the writing progress, solicit input, and obtain group approval for the contents of the books. Furthermore, the original drafts of the new textbooks were stored online, and all DELE faculty were given access privileges to read and comment on the material throughout the writing process. Colleagues outside of the primary writing team volunteered a great deal of their time proofreading and commenting on the new materials. This collaborative work cycle significantly improved the quality of the manuscripts. During the initial writing process, nine versions of the first-semester book and seven versions of the second-semester book were drafted by the writing team.

The first major review of the manuscripts by members of the wider university community occurred early in 2020. Drafts of the two books (*EGAP Writing 1: Academic Essays*; *EGAP Writing 2: Research Writing*) were submitted for review to the English Standing Committee in May 2020. After receiving provisional approval from the committee, pdf as well as print copies were distributed to all ten faculties across the university for further review. Professors representing each faculty were invited to submit written comments and revision suggestions. To clarify the suggestions of colleagues from across the university, the Chief of the DELE held online meetings in July and August of 2020

with representatives of each faculty. Out of these discussions, 35 revisions were suggested to the manuscript for the first-semester book and 34 revisions for the second-semester book. There were a number of comments about format, layout, clarity of wording, citation/referencing styles, punctuation, and variety of rhetorical modes modeled in the books. The textbook authors met to discuss these suggestions and attempted to accommodate as many as possible when revising the two manuscripts. In addition, work began on creating teacher's guides for the two volumes and the course syllabi were revised.

In December 2020, the revised EWL syllabi and new unified textbooks were approved for use by the English Standing Committee. In addition, the committee approved a plan to pilot the new unified textbooks in AY2021 before introducing the material in all EWL courses from April 2022. However, approval was granted on the condition that the first implementation had to include all of the first-year students in the participating faculty. Consent for trialing the new textbooks was obtained from two faculties with the fewest number of students. Since only seven course sections were required for the two faculties, all classes could be taught by full-time faculty members. One unplanned benefit of piloting the new textbooks in the two participating faculties is that they both have a more balanced gender distribution compared with other Kyoto University faculties. A further decision was made by the English Standing Committee to forego selling printed books and instead provide students with a pdf of the textbooks that they could download free of charge from KURENAI³. The manuscript for *EGAP Writing 1: Academic Essays* (Stewart et al., 2022a) was finalized in January 2022, while that for *EGAP Writing 2: Research Writing* (Stewart et al., 2022b) was submitted for distribution in February 2022, together with the teacher's guides (McCarthy et al., 2022; Stewart & LeBlanc, 2022).

Piloting the New Unified Textbooks: Student Surveys

Throughout AY2020, the textbook authors tested many new exercises drafted for the textbook in their classes and, in April 2021, the official organized classroom trialing of the new books began. During the first implementation of this material (April 2021–January 2022) the unified textbooks were piloted exclusively by seven full-time DELE faculty members (four English-native teachers and three Japanese-native teachers). The instructors were encouraged to closely follow the textbook exercises as directed in the teachers' guides in order to ensure that the directions were clear and that the textbooks met the goals of the curriculum. Teachers also exchanged information during the academic year through online meetings and by writing detailed comments in a feedback form shared online. In addition, they solicited comments from students about textbook exercises via Web-based surveys and during lessons. Student and teacher comments were later carefully considered and revisions made to the two unified textbooks and the accompanying teacher's guides.

To learn about students' experiences with the new textbooks in the first and second semesters of AY2021, surveys were created. These surveys aimed to assess ease of access to the pdf text through KURENAI, the effectiveness of exercises in achieving the course goals, and the level of comprehensibility for students, as well as their preferred format and digital environment when using the material. A bilingual English-Japanese survey was administered twice in the first semester, at the conclusion

of week 8 (Survey 1a) (see Appendix for Survey 1a) and week 14 (Survey 1b) with some minor revisions made to the survey between distributions. In the second semester, the survey was administered after week 7 (Survey 2a) and week 14 (Survey 2b). Google Forms were used to distribute the surveys either in face-to-face or online class formats.

Overall findings from data collected in the four surveys are described in the following section. Table 1 shows the distribution of student responses by faculty, with a total of 94 respondents for Survey 1a, 61 respondents for Survey 1b, 80 respondents for Survey 2a, and 71 respondents for Survey 2b. Since the survey was voluntary and teachers taught different groups of students in the first and second semesters, the number of respondents varied over surveys and semesters.

Table 1. Faculty Distribution of Students in First and Second Semester Surveys 1 (n)

Faculty	Survey 1a	Survey 1b	Survey 2a	Survey 2b
Faculty A	44	33	47	37
Faculty B	50	28	33	34
Total	94	61	80	71

Tables 2 to 5 display results from the Likert-scale items (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree) by n-size and percentage for each of the surveys. All items in Table 2 were rated on the positive end of the scale. This was particularly true for students' overall experience with the textbook (Item 1) with a mean of 3.11, and the item asking students about ease of understanding the explanations and instructions (Item 7) with a mean score of 3.41. Similarly, mean scores for all items in Table 3 show positive responses ranging from 3.02 to 3.56.

Table 2. Results of Scaled-response Items for Survey 1a

Item	Item Response Scale								Mean Score
	1		2		3		4		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1	0	0.0	14	14.9	56	59.6	24	25.5	3.11
2	4	4.3	27	28.7	36	38.3	27	28.7	2.91
5	1	1.1	15	16.9	63	67.0	15	16.0	2.98
7	1	1.1	7	7.4	38	40.4	48	51.1	3.41
8	4	4.3	24	25.5	54	57.4	12	12.8	2.71

Table 3. Results of Scaled-response Items for Survey 1b

Item	Item Response Scale								Mean Score
	1		2		3		4		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1	0	0.0	5	8.2	31	50.8	22	36.1	3.31
5	0	0.0	8	13.1	24	39.3	27	44.3	3.33
7	0	0.0	5	8.2	16	26.2	37	60.7	3.56
8	4	6.6	24	11.5	54	52.5	12	26.8	3.02

Note. See Appendix for a list of revisions made to each subsequent survey version.

Survey responses in the second semester followed similar patterns as in the first semester with items receiving a mean score at the positive end of the scale in Survey 2a (Table 4), and a slight increase in mean scores, except Item 7, in Survey 2b (Table 5).

Table 4. Results of Scaled-response Items for Survey 2a

Item	Item Response Scale								Mean Score
	1		2		3		4		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
1	1	1.3	12	15.0	44	55.0	23	28.8	3.11
5	0	0.0	12	15.0	48	60.0	20	25.0	3.10
7	1	1.3	5	6.3	35	43.8	39	48.8	3.40
8	3	3.8	25	31.3	37	46.3	15	18.8	2.80

Note. Numbering of items kept for consistency. See Appendix for a list of revisions made to each subsequent survey version.

Table 5. Results of Scaled-response Items for Survey 2b

Item	Item Response Scale								Mean Score
	1		2		3		4		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
1	1	1.4	8	11.3	38	53.5	24	33.8	3.20
5	1	1.4	5	7.0	41	57.7	24	33.8	3.24
7	1	1.4	4	5.6	37	52.1	29	40.0	3.32
8	3	4.2	22	31.0	23	32.4	23	32.4	2.93

Note. Numbering of items kept for consistency. See Appendix for a list of revisions made to each subsequent survey version.

Figures 2 through 5 present an item comparison between the four surveys. For items 1 (overall impression) and 5 (effectiveness), shown in Figures 2 and 3 respectively, a general trend of improvement can be observed within the same semester, with percentages moving up the rating-scale in the first semester between Survey 1a and 1b and in the second semester between Survey 2a and 2b. Notably, Item 5 saw the highest percentage increase between surveys, with a gain of roughly 26% more “strongly agree” responses compared with “agree” responses.

Figure 4 shows students’ ease of understanding written explanations and instructions in the textbooks. Similar to Figures 2 and 3, a slight increase in percentage can be observed between Surveys 1a and 1b in the first semester; however, a small decrease for this item was recorded between Surveys 2a and 2b in the second semester.

In Figure 5, students’ reported level of interest in the topic areas featured in the model essays and other examples of writing in the textbooks are indicated. Here, too, an increase at the upper end of the scale can be observed between surveys for both semesters.




Figure 2. Item 1 - Overall Impressions




Figure 3. Item 5 - Effectiveness of Exercises in Achieving Course Goals




Figure 4. Item 7 - Level of Comprehensibility of Explanations and Instructions




Figure 5. Item 8 - Level of Interest in Topic Areas




Figure 6. Item 6 - Average Level of Understandability for Chapters 1 to 7




Figure 7. Item 6 - Average Level of Understandability for Chapters 8 to 14

Figures 6 and 7 show the average level of understandability for content presented in Chapters 1 to 7, and 8 to 14 respectively for the first-semester textbook (*EGAP Writing 1*) and the second-semester textbook (*EGAP Writing 2*). The two figures indicate that the majority of students were able to understand a larger percentage of the content in Chapters 1 through 7 for both textbooks with some variability for Chapters 8 through 14. This variability may be due to several factors, including the students' effort and progress in the course, and changes in course scheduling. In addition, initial chapters in both books offer highly scaffolded instruction that leads students into more autonomous practice in the latter half of the book. Finally, the level of subject complexity in the textbooks purposefully increases to challenge students as they work through the material.

Table 6 shows a summary of responses for Item 3 and Item 4, respectively, regarding students' preferred textbook format and devices they used to access the textbooks. The top section of the table indicates the percentage of students who used the textbook in its original pdf and those who printed paper copies. All four surveys demonstrated that a majority of students utilized the pdf, with a sharp shift in preference for the pdf version towards the end of the first semester and continuing at the same rate in the second semester. As for the type of device students used to access the digital version of the textbook, the bottom section of Table 6 reveals that most students used the textbook either on a personal computer or a tablet, with some variation between each survey.

Table 6. Item Responses in Percentage for Preferred Textbook Format and Type of Device for Accessing Digital Textbook

Textbook Format	Survey 1a	Survey 1b	Survey 2a	Survey 2b
Original PDF	78.7	90.2	90.0	90.1
Printed Copy	21.3	9.8	10.0	9.9
Preferred Type of Device				
Personal Computer	79.8	67.2	72.5	77.5
Tablet	12.8	19.7	11.3	14.1
Smartphone	2.1	1.6	0.0	1.4
Personal Computer + Tablet	3.2	1.6	6.3	4.2
Smartphone + Personal Computer	1.1	9.8	5.0	2.8
Smartphone + Tablet	1.1	0.0	1.3	0.0

In addition to data presented above, Item 2 (ease of access) in Survey 1a (see Appendix) showed that during the initial trialing of the new books in the first semester of 2021, 31 students, about 33% of respondents, had some difficulty accessing the textbook pdf. The textbook download link is available in the course syllabus posted on KULASIS⁴. Considering that first-year students at the start of the academic year in April are unlikely to be familiar with the online systems of the university, accessing the book via the download link in the syllabus might have been confusing for some students. Thus, instructions for downloading and using the pdf textbooks were subsequently prepared. This information will be distributed to students during orientation sessions in April each year.

Despite the high percentage of students utilizing the textbook in digital form, Item 2 from Survey 1a was replaced with a new item in Survey 1b asking students if they would prefer to receive a free downloadable version of the textbook or pay ¥1500 (as estimated by the university's in-house printers) for a bound printed copy. Eighty-five percent of respondents chose the first option of receiving the downloadable version, which affirms the English Standing Committee's decision to forego selling printed copies to students.

Students were invited to write comments or questions about the textbooks in the final open-response item of each survey. In the first semester, there were a total of 19 comments on Surveys 1a and 1b and a total of 13 comments in the second semester on Surveys 2a and 2b. Negative comments mostly reported difficulties using the pdfs or were requests for clarifications to facilitate use of the textbooks, as exemplified with the following comment: “索引をもう少しわかりやすくしてほしい” [“I would like the index to be a little clearer.”]. As previously explained, to address these comments, additional materials with instructions for navigating and editing pdfs were prepared and will be distributed to students. Positive comments focused on the content of the textbooks and the student's overall general impression of the books. For example, in Survey 1a, one student noted that, “FYIが面白くてとても良い” [“The FYI section was interesting and good”], and in Survey 2b, another respondent mentioned that, “最後の、接続詞や参考文献の書き方一覧のところが最も参考になりました” [“The list of how to write conjunctions and references at the end was the most helpful”]. Thus, comments from students support findings from the closed-response items.

To summarize, the results of the descriptive statistics suggest that students' evaluation of the unified textbooks was very positive overall with an increase in appreciation for the new material indicated in the latter half of both semesters (Surveys 1b and 2b). This increase, particularly observable in the item regarding effectiveness of the textbooks for achieving course goals (Figure 3), may be explained by students' growing familiarity with the course design and goals, as well as the textbook content. Increased student awareness could be due, in part, to the organization of the new books which lead students through cycles of repeated practice that move from explicit instruction to increased autonomous application. The alignment of curricular goals, course materials, and pedagogy seems crucial for reinforcing students' awareness of course objectives (Biggs & Tang, 2011), which can be validated through their repeated application of the skills and knowledge accentuated in the materials (McKinley, 2013). Furthermore, students' increased familiarity with technological tools used in the course might explain the decrease in their use of printed copies of the textbook noted in Survey 1b (Table 6). Similarly, the return to in-person classes at the end of the first semester in AY2021 is a likely reason for the shift from using personal computers to more portable tablets or smartphones (Table 6). The student survey findings, together with feedback from teachers, are essential information for the writing team to continue to revise the textbooks and teacher's guides.

Full Implementation of the New Unified Textbooks: Teacher Survey

In July–August 2021, part-time teachers of the EWL course were introduced to the new unified textbooks through a video presentation by the editor. Part-time faculty were also sent a one-page

summary of the main features of the books together with links for downloading the latest pdf version of the texts. In January 2022, prior to the teacher feedback meetings, all EWL teachers received the latest print version of *EGAP Writing 1* (Stewart et al., 2022a). In April 2022, a print version of *EGAP Writing 2* (Stewart et al., 2022b) was delivered to all EWL teachers. Revised versions of the textbooks will be reprinted and distributed at the start of each academic year. Updated pdf copies of both textbooks and teacher’s guides are available to teachers via PandA on the English WL Resources site operated by the course management team.

With the introduction of the revised syllabi and new textbooks, it was anticipated that both part-time and full-time faculty teaching EWL classes would appreciate resources to facilitate the transition. Thus, in April 2022 the DELE launched an online forum for EWL teaching faculty in PandA. All teachers were invited to join the new EWL Teacher Forum. The forum is moderated by full-time faculty from the DELE. The site houses an archive of teaching resources and “how-to” guides related to the textbooks. Table 7 outlines the forum’s four sections as well as some anticipated benefits for teachers. Over the coming years, the most beneficial aspect of the EWL Teacher Forum and the new unified textbooks is anticipated to be their potential to draw teachers together in supporting the EWL curriculum. In short, opening a common space online where EWL teachers can contribute to the course has the capacity to reduce the isolation of busy Kyoto University teachers and further faculty development (FD).

Table 7. English Writing-Listening Teacher Forum Organization and Anticipated Benefits

Organization	Anticipated Benefits
1) General Questions/Comments about the new textbooks and teacher’s guides	1) Supports EWL teachers as they transition to using the new textbooks
2) Ideas for Activities/Exercises for teachers to supplement exercises	2) Directs questions and suggestions related to the textbooks through proper channels; avoids extraneous communication to EWL management team
3) Answer Keys for exercises	3) Addresses longstanding request from part-time EWL faculty for more communication amongst teaching staff
4) External Resources to extend textbook exercises	

Teachers were surveyed after the full implementation of the new material began in AY2022. Questions about the textbook and teacher’s guide were added to the standard online survey for faculty members teaching the EWL course. Teachers were asked to rate the learning effectiveness of the exercises in the textbook *EGAP Writing 1* on the anonymous survey at the end of the first semester. Figure 8 shows the distribution of responses from 30 course instructors who used the new textbook. Seventy percent of teachers rated the textbook exercises as “effective” to “very effective.” Regarding the teacher’s guide, 67% of respondents said that it was either “useful” or “very useful” while an additional 30% rated it as being “slightly useful.” These questionnaire responses provide a strong indication that the new first-semester book is widely appreciated by course instructors. Anonymous comments made in the same questionnaire provide further evidence for this claim, while also voicing reservations some teachers had about the new textbook.




Figure 8. Learning Effectiveness of the Exercises in the New Textbook

Below is a select list of faculty comments that highlight various impressions of *EGAP Writing 1*.

- *The textbook is a vast improvement over past years. It is a good match for our students. It does not bog the teacher down with superfluous material, and will guarantee a certain minimum standardization among the teachers but still allow some flexibility. I am seeing good results in the students' essays.*

This comment touches on several outcomes that DELE colleagues anticipated would result from writing original textbooks for the EWL course. First, this teacher's impression is that the new book is a "vast improvement" from the previous selection of commercial books. Second, the comment about the text being "a good match for our students" and the concluding remark that there are "good results in student essays," indicate that the teacher sees better alignment between the course curriculum documents and the teaching materials. Finally, the textbook authors set out to ensure minimum standards for all sections of the course by indicating primary goals, while encouraging teachers to teach the material in their own way.

- *It is very easy to use (much better than the textbooks we used to use), but I had to distribute additional handouts in regard to different types of paragraphs and essays (especially the explanation on argument essay). It also did not include enough information on the APA style guide.*

Likewise, this teacher emphasizes significant improvement by stating that the textbook is "very easy to use" and "much better." The teacher also seems to indicate that the textbook should display the full range of rhetorical modes, as well as a more complete introduction of the American Psychological Association (APA) documentation format. While these desires are partially fulfilled by the second-semester textbook, in accordance with the syllabus, the aim of the first-semester course is simply to introduce students to writing as a process together with the basic elements of academic essay organization. Since every group of students will have different needs, teachers should expect

that additional material will be needed to supplement any course book. Aply, EWL teachers can now participate in the creation of an archive of supplementary course activities by submitting their materials to the EWL Teacher Forum housed in Panda.

- *The new textbook is well organized and flexible enough for teachers to adapt to their teaching style. However, it jumps from paragraph to essay a little quickly. Students might need more body paragraph practice before attempting an essay as they do not know how to express themselves well yet.*

This teacher expresses satisfaction with the text organization and appreciates the fact that the exercises are not overly prescriptive. However, the teacher would like to see a slower progression leading to instruction for the basic essay (three paragraphs). The approach in *EGAP Writing 1* is to first introduce the basic elements of body paragraphs followed by instruction on the structure of introduction and conclusion paragraphs. When classes meet once each week for 90 minutes, teachers may find it improbable to cover all aspects of academic writing to their satisfaction. In addition, judging when the time is right to shift from teaching basic paragraph structure to short essay writing is extremely difficult for teachers given the range of English writing abilities amongst students.

- *Because of the new textbook, no class may have an advantage over another, so grading should be more fair.*

This teacher underscores greater fairness in grading that might result from having a unified course book. Increased standardization is expected as curricular goals have been systematically worked into the new textbooks; thereby addressing the gap created when multiple commercial books written for a global audience were being used in EWL classes.

In addition to survey comments, direct comments were collected during teacher feedback meetings held at the end of the first semester in 2022. For example, one very experienced part-time teacher said that the quality of student essays was “the best I have ever received” and credited the new textbook for this improvement. Some teachers mentioned the convenience of directing students to the glossary of keywords for reference. Survey results and comments provide the textbook writing team with input needed to revise the new course books according to the desires of faculty members using the material.

Conclusion

This article is based upon preliminary survey results focused on the process of creating and implementing the new unified textbooks. Findings have helped to identify areas of improvement in the overall transmission of course goals and content. Students and teachers alike showed favorable attitudes toward the use of the textbooks. However, it may be difficult to gauge the extent to which the new textbooks can have a direct impact on student learning achievements since there is no data

for comparison from previous cohorts. A more robust empirical research framework would be required to further investigate the effects of curricular alignment and learning gains in this course.

The unified textbooks were created to improve delivery of the EWL curriculum for Kyoto University students. A major goal is achieving equivalence in instruction of the course to all 3,000 first-year students. With this in mind, the textbook writing team decided to specify the primary learning goal for each chapter in alignment with the course syllabus. As a result, course learning of all first-year students should now better align with the syllabus. In addition, teaching faculty can easily share experiences from their classes online via the EWL Teacher Forum about how well students understand the textbook directions and exercises and suggest revisions when necessary. Because the new unified textbooks are distributed as pdfs to students, changes can be made to the material with relative ease according to student needs. Furthermore, most students appreciate no longer having to pay for and carry bulky textbooks to class.

For teachers, having unified textbooks will make course planning and instruction more manageable. Course preparation time is a significant issue, especially for many part-time instructors who teach at several schools. In addition, unlike commercial books, the new unified textbooks are the property of Kyoto University and are rendered in electronic format. This means that as teachers use the books, they will be able to make suggestions for possible revisions that can be made annually. Moreover, the pdf version is convenient because it makes projecting the material onto a screen very easy for teachers during lessons. Finally, course instructors can now help to build a valuable archive of teaching materials geared specifically to the course by submitting their supplementary activities to the newly created EWL Teacher Forum on Panda. In this way, individual teachers of the EWL course should feel more connected and empowered since they now have more direct channels to contribute to the future development of the course by voicing their opinions in discussion forums and submitting original teaching activities to supplement the new unified textbooks.

Writing the new unified textbooks was entirely a bottom-up innovation (see Stoller, 2009) initiated by experienced DELE faculty members. This project indicates the strength of the faculty's professional commitment to quality education. Ideas for further horizontal integration include inserting links in the textbook pdfs to short lectures, conversations, and instructional videos reinforcing students' writing, vocabulary, and listening study and, possibly, combining the textbooks and teacher's guides into composite e-books for instructors.

During the extensive English curriculum reform meetings in 2015, several high-ranking administrative officials repeatedly expressed a desire for the university's full-time English teachers to identify elements comprising *Kyodai eigo*. Basically, these administrators were asking English specialists at the university to collaborate on the creation of a curriculum better tailored to address the needs of Kyoto University students. Seven years later, progress toward this desire has been achieved by i-ARRC faculty members through major material development projects intended to better align the three primary components of the new EWL course: academic writing, listening, and vocabulary. To begin with, creation of the course vocabulary book was led by current and former members of the i-ARRC (English Education Research Group, 2009) with the cooperation of professors in all faculties. The goal was to learn which English academic journals students in various disciplines

at Kyoto University are expected to read and build a corpus of vocabulary used in these journals. Selective words from the vocabulary book *Kyoto University Academic Vocabulary Database 1110* are now integrated into GORILLA listening units and exercises in the textbooks. In addition, the content of the newly created online listening units overlaps with the textbooks by highlighting key features of academic writing and research, while also focusing on listening strategy practice. Finally, although the notion of *Kyodai eigo* is obscure, the experience of compiling the academic vocabulary list is a good example of what cooperative effort can achieve. In short, better collaboration across the university on the teaching of research writing is a possible vertical integration (UNESCO, n.d.) with the potential to be very beneficial to Kyoto University students.

Notes

- 1 Global Online Resources for International Language Learning Assistance (GORILLA)
- 2 International Academic Research and Resource Center for Language Education (i-ARRC)
- 3 Kyoto University Research Information Repository (KURENAI)
- 4 Kyoto University Liberal Arts and General Education Student Affairs Information System (KULASIS)

References

- Biggs, J. B., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
- Colpitts, B., & Howard, L. (2018). A comparison of focused and unfocused corrective feedback in Japanese EFL writing classes. *The Poznan Society for the Advancement of Arts and Sciences*, 60(1), 7–16.
- English Education Research Group. (2009). *Kyoto University academic vocabulary database 1110*. Kenkyusha.
- Hirose, K., & Sasaki, M. (1994). Explanatory variables for Japanese students' expository writing in English: An explanatory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(3), 203–229.
- International Academic Research and Resource Center. (n.d.). *Purpose and function of DELE*. Kyoto University. <https://www.i-arrc.k.kyoto-u.ac.jp/english>
- Kamimura, T. (2014). Citation behaviors observed in Japanese EFL students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 85–101. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1047463.pdf>
- Kaplan, R. (1987). Cultural thought patterns revised. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 9–21). Addison-Wesley.
- Katsurayama, K., Takahashi, S., Kanemaru, T., Sasao, Y., Stewart, T., Dalsky, D., & Tajino, A. (2018). English education reform at Kyoto University: A focus on the English Writing-Listening course. *The Institute for Liberal Arts and Sciences Bulletin - Kyoto University*, 1, 111–122. <https://www.z.k.kyoto-u.ac.jp/pdf/link/link0871.pdf?1556293624>
- Kubota, R. (1997). Are-evaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse. *Written Communication*, 14(4), 460–480.
- Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.003>
- Maswana, S., & Tajino, A. (2020). ESP curriculum development: A systems approach. In H. Terauchi, J. Noguchi, & A. Tajino (Eds.), *Towards a new paradigm for English language teaching* (pp. 66–76). Routledge.
- McCarthy, T., Schipper, S., & Yoshida, A. (2022). *Teacher's guide for EGAP writing 2: Research writing*.

- Kyoto University, International Academic Research and Resource Center for Language Education.
- McKinley, J. (2013). Displaying critical thinking in EFL academic writing: A discussion of Japanese to English contrastive rhetoric. *RELC Journal*, 44(2), 195–208.
- Mercado, L. A. (2015). Integrating classroom learning and autonomous learning. In D. Nunan & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Language learning beyond the classroom* (pp. 190–201). Routledge.
- Rylander, J., LeBlanc, C., Lees, D., Schipper, S., & Milne, D. (2018). Validating classroom assessments measuring learner knowledge. *The Institute for Liberal Arts and Sciences Bulletin - Kyoto University*, 1, 83–110. https://doi.org/10.14989/ILAS_1_83
- Savage, M. (2022). A study on the effect of instruction on freshman English paragraph writing. *CELE Journal*, 30, 81–96. https://asia-u.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=pages_view_main&active_action=repository_view_main_item_detail&item_id=26250&item_no=1&page_id=15&block_id=22
- Stewart, T., & LeBlanc, C. (2022). *Teacher's guide for EGAP writing 1: Academic essays*. Kyoto University, International Academic Research and Resource Center for Language Education.
- Stewart, T., LeBlanc, C., Lees, D., & Schipper, S. (2022a). *EGAP writing 1: Academic essays*. Kyoto University, International Academic Research and Resource Center for Language Education.
- Stewart, T., LeBlanc, C., Lees, D., McCarthy, T., & Schipper, S. (2022b). *EGAP writing 2: Research writing*. Kyoto University, International Academic Research and Resource Center for Language Education.
- Stoller, F. (2009). Innovation as the hallmark of effective leadership. In M. A. Christison & D. E. Murray (Eds.), *Leadership in English language education* (pp. 73–84). Routledge.
- Takahashi, S., Kanamaru, T., & Iijima, Y. (2020). EAP in undergraduate education. In H. Terauchi, J. Noguchi, & A. Tajino (Eds.). *Towards a new paradigm for English language teaching* (pp. 152–163). Routledge.
- Teeter, J. (2015). Deconstructing attitudes towards plagiarism of Japanese undergraduates in EFL academic writing classes. *English Language Teacher*, 8(1), 95–109. 10.5539/elt.v8n1p95
- UNESCO (n.d.). *Vertical and horizontal articulation of the curriculum*. International Bureau of Education. <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/en/glossary-curriculum-terminology/v/vertical-and-horizontal-articulation-curriculum>

Appendix

Print-version of Survey 1a

All versions of the questionnaire have the following introduction and diagnostic items with revisions made for the second-semester book *EGAP Writing 2: Research Writing*.

This form will ask a few short questions about the new textbook, *EGAP Writing 1: Academic Essays*. Please be honest with your answers. They might help improve the textbook in the future. All of your responses are anonymous.

このアンケートでは、新教科書「EGAPライティング1：アカデミックエッセイ」に関していくつかの質問を行います。将来的には教科書の改善に役立つかもしれないので、できるだけ正直に答えて下さい。すべての回答は匿名です。

Faculty / Department / 学部

1. (...)
2. (...)

Female or Male / 性別

- Female / 女性
- Male / 男性
- Prefer not to answer / 答えたくありません

Survey 1a Items

1. How was your overall experience with the textbook? / この教科書を使ってみての全体的な印象はどうでしたか？

良くなかったと思う 1 2 3 4 良かったと思う

*2. How easy was it to access the textbook through KURENAI? / KURENAIを通じて教科書にアクセスすることは簡単でしたか？

全然簡単ではなかった 1 2 3 4 とても簡単だった

3. In what form did you mainly use the Digital PDF textbook? / デジタル教科書を主にどちらの形で使用しましたか？

- As it is / デジタルPDFのまま
- Printed copy / 自分でプリントアウトしたもの

4. When accessing the digital format of the textbook, which type of device did you mainly use? / デジタル教科書にアクセスするにあたって、主にどの機器を使用しましたか？

- Smartphone / スマートフォン
- Personal computer / パソコン
- Tablet / タブレット

**5. How effective was the textbook in achieving the course goals (1 = not effective at all, 4 = very effective)? / この教科書は授業の目標を達成するのにどの程度効果的でしたか (1 = 全く効果がなかった、4 = 非常に効果があった) ?

全く効果がなかった 1 2 3 4 非常に効果があった

**6. How well did you understand the content of the chapters that you have covered in class until now? (approximate percentage, leave blank if you have not covered the chapter) / これまで授業で取り上げてきた章の内容をどの程度理解しましたか (おおよその割合, 章を扱っていない場合は空白のままに)

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

**7. Were the explanations and instructions given at an appropriate level? / 説明や指示は適切なレベルで行われましたか?

適切なレベルでは全くなかった 1 2 3 4 とても適切なレベルだった

8. Were the topics introduced in the textbook appropriate for your area of interest? / 教科書で紹介されたトピックはあなたが関心を持つ分野に合致していましたか?

全く合致していなかった 1 2 3 4 十分に合致していた

9. Do you have any comments or questions about the textbook for this course? / この教科書についてコメントや質問はありますか?

*Note: Item 2 was deleted from Survey 1b and replaced with an item regarding purchasing a printed copy of the textbook.

**Item 2 was deleted from Survey 2a and Survey 2b; therefore, items 5, 7 and 8 were relabeled as items 4, 6 and 7, respectively in the final version of the survey.

京都大学におけるアカデミック・ライティング 新統一教科書の編纂

ルブラン キャサリン[#]、スチュワート テイモシー、
リーズ デイヴィッド、マッカーシー ターニャ、
スキッパー セラ、柳瀬 陽介、和泉 絵美、
吉田 亜矢、ダルスキー デビッド、金丸 敏幸、
ミルン ダニエル、ライランダー ジョン、
笹尾 洋介、横森 大輔^{*}

要 旨

京都大学国際高等教育院附属国際学術言語教育センターでは、2016年以來、全学共通科目「英語ライティング・リスニング」の教員と学生から収集されたアンケートデータに基づき、2冊の統一教科書「EGAP Writing 1: Academic Essays」と「EGAP Writing 2: Research Writing」の編纂に取り組んできた。これらの新教科書とその教師用ガイドは、まず2021年度に専任教員によって2学部で試験的に使用され、その適合性が検証された。この期間中、使用感を把握するために、クローズド／オープン・クエスチョンのアンケート調査を前期・後期のそれぞれ中盤と終盤の2回ずつ実施した。新教科書に対する学生の使用感は概ね肯定的で、中盤と終盤のアンケート結果を比較すると、終盤で尺度項目の回答の平均スコアがわずかに上昇していることが確認された。アンケート結果は慎重に検討され、2022年度の全学部での使用開始に向けた改訂に活用された。本稿では、まず試用の背景を詳しく説明し、続いてアンケートに対する学生からの回答内容を示す。また、その後の全学部での使用についても、調査データと教員からのコメントとともに説明する。最後に、本プロジェクトの現況と今後の展開について簡単に述べる。

【キーワード】 カリキュラム開発、教材開発、アカデミック・ライティング、一般学術目的の英語(EGAP)、ファカルティ・ディベロップメント (FD)

* 京都大学国際高等教育院

[#] 責任著者