EVALUATING TEACHERS' GUIDES: DO TEACHERS' GUIDES GUIDE TEACHERS?

Hywel Coleman

Abstract

This paper is concerned with TGs and looks at them from the point of view of the NNS teacher. It considers the role of the TG and looks briefly at previous discussions and evaluations of TGs by materials writers themselves and by reviewers. An inventory of factors which need to be taken into consideration when evaluating TGs is proposed. Finally, some attention is given to the possibility of evaluating TGs in training courses for NNS teachers.

Background

Extensive observation of a group of young, inexperienced and relatively untravelled non-native speaker (NNS) teachers of English in an Indonesian university – people lacking confidence in their own command of English – has revealed a striking uniformity of classroom styles, whoever is teaching, whoever is being taught, whatever materials are being used (Coleman, n.d.).

To some extent this uniformity can be seen as the manifestation of a very strong tradition of what 'teaching' is. That

Hywel Coleman is a doctoral student at the University of Lancaster and has published in *ELT Documents* (British Council).

The editors gratefuly acknowledge permission to reprint this article which originally appeared in J. Charles Alderson (Ed.), *Evaluation: Lancaster Practical Papers in English Language Education (Vol. 6)*, Oxford, Pergamon Institute of English, 1985.

is, it is a product of the expectations of both students and teachers of what 'ought' to happen in the classroom. To some extent, also, this uniformity can be attributed to the teachers' exposure to a limited variety of classroom events in their own educational experience, and to the fact that teacher training in Indonesia does not normally concern itself with the mundane details of what happens in the classroom. In any case, many university teachers of English have undergone no teacher training.

Lack of training – or experience of only a very abstract and theoretical training – contributes to the phenomenon of a uniform teaching style in other ways. Firstly, teachers have no training in the evaluation of teaching materials and are apprehensive of making evaluations. Further, they have no training either in the *interpretation* of the teachers' guides (TGs) which accompany teaching materials or in the *evaluation* of TGs. Consequently teachers are reluctant to undertake their own interpretations and evaluations.

Are Teachers' Guides Necessary?

There is little in the literature which describes the attitudes of NNS teachers towards textbooks and even less concerning their evaluations of TGs. However, the author of a review of Parkinson (1978), who admits to being 'an overseas teacher of English,' makes it clear that the NNS teacher does require guidance in the use of textbooks. She says (Moya 1978:30-32):

> It will be very hard for any overseas . . . teacher of English to work with this book because it is rather short of explanation as to how it should be taught . . . . As far as the format of the book is concerned, I would have liked to see in it . . . more explanations on how to use the book (i.e., some sort of guide for both the teacher and the student).

The difficulties which the NNS teacher of English has to struggle with are frequently underestimated by the writers of ELT materials and by writers on ELT. Many NNS English

teachers feel themselves to be only a hair's breadth away from where their learners stand, in terms of competence and experience in the target language. In Indonesia, for example, it is probably safe to say that the majority of high-school English teachers have never spoken to a native speaker of English, and most university English lecturers have had only very occasional contact with native speakers. Potter (1983) recognizes that NNS teachers of English frequently lack confidence in their own competence in the language which they are teaching. This confirms a point made by Willis, who argues that the problems faced by NNS teachers are 'more daunting than the problems faced by native speaker teachers' and that therefore 'non-native speaker teachers of English are sometimes forced to lean heavily on the textbook and depend too much on it' (1981:41f).

Allwright (1981) argues that teaching materials have only limited usefulness in the management of learning and yet, conventionally, they have been given a disproportionately important role. Allwright believes, also, that teachers do 'too much' work in the classroom and that they must be trained not to do so much work. This is all very well, but the NNS teacher who has little confidence in his own grasp of the language, and who has had little exposure to alternative methods of managing learning, is not able to stop doing 'too much' from the position of strength which a native speaker teacher has. If NNS teachers are to stop doing too much (and this is certainly necessary) they will have to do it from a position of relative weakness. This implies a continued reliance on teaching materials and on the TGs which accompany the materials. But it need not mean that teaching materials must continue to play the same role which they have traditionally had. Teaching materials – in the widest sense – can supplement the NNS teacher's competence in the target language, whilst TGs can bolster the teacher's confidence. As the teacher's competence increases, so he can gradually modify or dispense with teaching materials. At the same time, as the teacher's

confidence increases, so he can become increasingly selective in his reliance on the TG.

Materials Writers on Teachers' Guides

The literature is remarkably devoid of discussion by materials writers themselves of the role of TGs. Swales (1978), for example, says that he believes the teacher-variable is of great importance in ESP work, yet there is no evidence elsewhere in his description of the writing of *Writing Scientific English* (Swales 1971) that any attention at all was given to the potential problems of teachers in using the materials. Allen and Widdowson (1978) describe the creation of *English in Physical Science* (Allen and Widdowson, 1974a) but they give no indication that they thought very much about the prospective teachers when they were writing their textbook, nor do they describe how the TG for this textbook (Allen and Widdowson 1974b) was written. Bates (1978), describing the writing of *Nucleus: General Science* (Bates and Dudly-Evans, 1976a), makes occasional references to teachers' perceptions of their classroom roles, to student-teacher rapport, and to traditional teacher attitudes to teaching materials. However, he does not attempt to show how these matters were taken into consideration in the writing of the accompanying TG (Bates and Dudley-Evans, 1976b).

An interesting exception to this general failure of materials writers to describe how TGs are prepared is to be found in the collection of papers describing the University of Malaya project (Chitravelu 1980c). Chitravelu (1980a:xiv), for example, defines the role of a TG as:

> to assist the teacher to obtain the best possible results from the lessons. It should contain a statement of the aims of each lesson and activity, suggestions on procedure, advice on feedback and information on the location of the materials for each lesson. It should also provide answers and, where necessary, give explanations for answers.

A paper by Cooper in the same collection (Cooper 1980:9) describes deficiencies discovered in an early draft of the TG and the characteristics of a revised version which provided:

> proper attention to the specification of general and specific aims (linguistic, behavioural, methodological, attitudinal), cross referencing to related lessons, adequate advice on presentation and effective feedback.

In a further paper (Chitravelu, 1980b), the additional help for the teacher which was incorporated into the final version of the materials is described. It may be no coincidence that these materials were originally designed for a specific group of NNS teachers and that NNS teachers were involved in the writing of the materials. Apart from this particular case, however, there is little evidence that materials writers, when given an opportunity to describe their materials, pay much attention to TGs.

Textbook Reviewers on Teachers' Guides

If materials writers seem generally not to attach much importance to TGs, the same can be said of the reviewers of ELT materials. Elliman's model for coursebook evaluation (Elliman. 1981), for example, makes no mention of TGs and indeed Elliman appears to conclude that teachers should be selected with regard to their appropriacy for the materials to be used, rather than that materials should be explicated with regard to the competence of teachers! Williams (1981) suggests that ESP textbook evaluation be included in teacher training courses, and proposes an interesting method for doing this, but he has given no attention whatsoever to TGs.

Drobnic (1978) collects 38 textbook reviews by 12 reviewers. In general, if a TG is available, reviewers refer to this fact but provide no analysis. A typical example, in a three-page review of Glendinning (1974), is this one-line comment (Malmsten 1978:77):

> There is a teacher's edition with a key to exercises . . .

On the other hand, when no TG is available, reviewers tend to regret its absence in rather greater detail. The review by Alyta (1978:170) of Hawkey (1970) is a typical case in point:

> The book has no preface, introduction or notes to the teacher so the intentions of the author will remain unknown.

Such brief observations apart, the overwhelming emphasis of these reviews is on the materials for students.

Something of an exception is provided by Ewer and Boys (1981), who evaluate 10 leading EST textbooks. In performing this evaluation the writers ask themselves to what extent the explanations given for particular teaching points are adequate, and what supplementary help is given to teachers. Their comments fall into three categories: explanations of teaching points, keys to exercises, and suggestions for extra exercises.

It is noteworthy that what attention is given to TGs (limited though this is) comes largely from people working in the field of ESP. One suspects that this is because it is considered legitimate for even a native speaker teacher of ESP to feel a certain degree of uncertainty or nervousness about the language of the specialist field into which he is venturing ('Will my students ask me for definitions distinguishing between *energy* and *power*?). It is therefore acceptable for the ESP teacher to demand backup support and this explains the frequency of reassuring comments in the TGs accompanying ESP texts, such as the following by Hall and Bowyer (1980:1):

> The teacher does not in fact need to know more than is in the book in order to use the book.

On the other hand, it is not often recognized that the NNS teacher of English may feel a very similar unease about English in general ('Will my students ask me what one says if one wants to go to the toilet when visiting somebody else's house?' or 'Will my students ask me why the simple present is not used in "I'm forever blowing bubbles" '?). It is not, therefore, conventionally acceptable for the NNS teacher of English to

demand the same sort of support on linguistic and sociolinguistic matters from general ELT textbooks. Yet if this sort of support is not provided, textbooks may be underexploited or ignored.

Evaluating Teachers' Guides

In this section an instrument for the evaluation of TGs is proposed. The instrument comprises 10 factors which need to be considered when evaluating the usefulness of a TG. These factors fall into five categories: (a) primary factors (assumptions about the nature of language and language use, and about language learning and teaching); (b) materials content; (c) implementation; (d) evaluation; and (e) presentation. The purpose of this instrument is to indicate the ways in which a TG may be inadequate for the purposes of NNS teachers, and the illustrations are therefore largely negative examples.

Primary Factors

Assumptions about shared attitudes towards the nature of language and language use. Does the TG assume – without clarification – that the teacher shares the writer's attitudes to the nature of language? Cases in which such an assumption is made are legion. One example is Stone (1969) which claims, from its title, to teach reading skills. From a close perusal of the book it can be deduced that the author believes that the key to successful reading lies in a minute understanding of every word in a text and that exactly the same procedure should be used in reading a recipe and a short story. But the introduction for the teacher (*op. cit.*: iv-vii) and the accompanying TG (Stone *et al.* 1979) make no attempt to define the nature of written language or the reading process.

An example in which no assumptions about shared attitudes towards the nature of language and its use are made is Candlin *et al.* (1977), which provides a detailed discussion of the

dichotomy between language function and language form. The authors' attitudes are founded on their research into doctor–patient communication, which is well documented and to which they make repeated reference.

Assumptions about shared attitudes towards the nature of language learning and teaching. Does the TG assume, without an explicit statement, that the teacher shares the writer's interpretation of the language learning process? In other words, does the TG assume both a particular methodology and also that the teacher is already familiar with that methodology? There are innumerable instances in which such an assumption is found. A less obvious but increasingly common phenomenon is for the textbook writer to claim that a particular approach is being adhered to (usually 'communicative') but without clarifying exactly what this means in practice. From the point of view of the poorly trained NNS teacher, the writer's use of a label such as 'communicative' is not helpful, unless it can be supported by a detailed explanation of what this really means when the teacher, the learners and the materials come together in the classroom.

Equally unhelpful is a deliberate refusal to provide any assistance at all, presumably on the grounds that advice on how to use materials would restrict the teacher's freedom. A particularly glaring example is Long *et al.* (1980:xiii):

> We offer no recommendations on how to use these materials. It would be presumptuous of us to do so given the appalling ignorance about the necessity, sufficiency or efficiency of classroom teaching and learning behaviours in general, and those related to reading skills in particular.

This is admirably undogmatic but it is of absolutely no value to the teacher who lacks the experience and skill required to make confident decisions about how to use materials.

As if to compensate for their extreme rejection of dogmatism, the writers then go on to claim academic respectability for their book by listing the influences on their work (*op. cit.*: xiv-xv):

> A guide to materials is not the place to indulge in long explanations of the rationale behind them. That is for conferences and journal articles. Any teacher who is familiar with the applied linguistic literature will, however, have recognized several of our allegiances, and other debts will become obvious as you read and use the materials themselves. We would like, therefore, to acknowledge the thinking of the following people: Donald Adamson, Charles Alderson, Patrick Allen, Dick Allwright, Michael Breen. Christopher Candlin, Fernando Castanos, Gary Cziko, Evelyn Hatch, Steven Krashen, Ron Mackay, Alan Mountford, Ken Moody, John Munby, Larry Selinker, Frank Smith, John Swales, Dick Yorkey, and Henry Widdowson. None of them saw *REAS* prior to its publication.

This is undeniably a magnificent intellectual ancestry for any materials to have (although it is a little difficult to see how the thinking of some of these people can be made compatible and be integrated into one textbook!). But unfortunately there are still vast numbers of English teachers in the world who are not familiar with the applied linguistics literature and who have never heard of Christopher Candlin or Larry Selinker. This recitation of some significant names in the world of ELT is simply not useful for the teacher who wants to know how he can best use the materials which the book contains. In effect, the authors are abdicating their responsibility towards the potential users of their product.

Factors Relating to the Content of the Materials

Assumptions about shared culture in lesson content. Is there assistance in the TG for the teacher who may be unfamiliar with the cultural content of the materials? I once observed an English lesson at a technical college in Central Java which was being taught by a teacher who herself had never been outside Java. Lesson 3 of *Kernel Lessons Intermediate* (O'Neill *et. al.*, 1971a) was being used and the class was discussing the first picture in the lesson. This shows a box and a teapot on a table. The box has the word CORNFLAKES written on it. One of the students asked the teacher what a 'CORNFLAKES' was. The teacher was unable to answer immediately, she was too

embarrassed to ask me, and there was nothing to help her in the TG (O'Neill *et al.*, 1971b). At last, after some hesitation, the teacher explained that cornflakes is an alcoholic drink and that many Westerners drink cornflakes for breakfast. Of course, it may be that the material which was being used in this lesson was culturally inappropriate for the learners, but then it may be that the purpose of the lesson was to prepare the learners for life in the West. What is clear is that the NNS teacher was unable to answer the student's question by relying on her own experience and competence, and she was also unable to refer to the TG to solve her problems.

Assumptions about the teacher's ability to deal with ambiguity. Does the TG expect the teacher to tolerate ambiguity or uncertainty and to manage these in the classroom? An example is found in Swales and Fanning (1980a:64) in which learners are asked to classify verbs which describe change into one of seven categories of change. In the TG which accompanies the textbook, the authors comment (Swales and Fanning 1980b:18):

> Some verbs may fit into more than one category, but it does not matter.

It is quite true that some verbs may fit into more than one category. However, this is not enough, since the NNS teacher may need to know exactly which verbs can be categorized in more than one way, and exactly what those categries are. A very common characteristic of young NNS teachers who lack confidence in their own English is an extreme unwillingness to accept uncertainty like this and to demand absolute answers (even when they may not be available).

Factors Relating to Implementation

Assumptions about shared culture in teaching methodology. Does the TG recommend behaviour which is inappropriate in the culture of the learners and their teacher? Although this is not a very common failing of TGs, some particularly interest-

ing illustrations can be found. Lynch (1975:21) gives some advice to teachers on how to conduct the debriefing after a role playing session. He suggests:

> If students took their roles seriously some interesting confrontations may have arisen during the debate. It might be useful to discuss how these confrontations developed and were resolved.

Teachers therefore are required to encourage learners to publicly introspect about their confrontations with their peers. This is totally inappropriate in Indonesia, for example, where the avoidance of confrontation and the achievement of consensus are the fundamental tenets of social intercourse.

Assumptions about the teacher's ability and willingness to deal with incompleteness. Does the TG assume that the teacher has the time, the resources, the linguistic competence and the self-confidence to elaborate on what the author provides? In the section above on shared attitudes towards the nature of language learning and teaching, we discussed TGs which either take for granted a particular methodology or which renounce all responsibility for determining methodology. Here we look at TGs which do provide guidance on implementation but which still surrender some responsibility to the teacher. Two examples are given to illustrate this. The first comes from Swales and Fanning (1980b:9):

> You will have noticed that the passage is full of spatial prepositions and thus provides an opportunity for revising and developing these.

This is a relatively modest instance which requires the teacher to identify 'spatial prepositions' and then to decide how to 'revise' and 'develop' them. We should not be surprised if the recommendation is ignored, however, for many teachers will lack the time, the linguistic competence or the confidence to 'develop' exercises for revision.

It is to be hoped, incidentally, that the teacher is able to identify these 'spatial prepositions,' for the term is not explained anywhere else by Swales and Fanning, nor is it used in any of the standard descriptions of English to which the

teacher is likely to have access, such as Hornby (1975), Thomson and Martinet (1980) or Quirk *et al.* (1972).

In the second example, much greater demands are made of the teacher. Candlin *et al.* (1977:34) discuss the ways in which particular discoursal functions may be manifested:

> The purpose of the *Code Characterisation* section is to lay out for the Instructor *typical* but not *unique* realisations (*grammatical, lexical* and *phonological*) of the FUNCTIONS in question. We hope that the instructor will be able to extend this set of realisations from his own observations of doctor–patient communication, and relate them to some communicatively oriented grammar . . . . The set of formal realisations given is *not* intended to be complete, but merely typical and illustrative.

The teacher is asked to make his own recordings of doctor–patient communication, identify realizations of discoursal functions, and then classify these using the categories employed in a communicative grammar! Many well-trained native speaker teachers working in well-endowed institutions with no shortage of facilities would quail before such a prospect. For the NNS teacher working with limited facilities and with a heavy teaching load, this advice is meaningless.

Factors Relating to Evaluation

Assumptions about the teacher's ability and willingness to deal with open-endedness. Does the TG provide assistance for teachers wishing to evaluate learners' responses to activities and exercises for which there cannot be predictable answers? Alexander (1967:127), for example, contains the following instruction for students:

> . Write a composition in about 300 words on one of the following:
> (a) A visit to a factory.
> (b) Machines that do housework.

It is of course impossible to provide a 'key' to exercises of this type. But the introductory sections for the teacher (*op. cit.*: vii-xv) give no guidance to the teacher as to how students' responses to this task are to be evaluated. Consequently the

NNS teacher who is uncertain of his own ability to evaluate students' writing – and there are many such teachers – will either not ask his students to perform the task at all or will not attempt any evaluation of the work which the students do even if they do complete it.

Assumptions about the teacher's ability and willingness to work out answers. Does the TG provide keys to those exercises which do have predictable answers? In cases where it is possible to identify correct responses to a task, the TG may still not provide the information which the overworked or undertrained NNS teacher requires. Look, for example, at the following from Harvey and Wheeler (1976a: Drillcard 2.9):

DRILL 1 we leave now . . . get there in time
PART A *If* we leave now, *we'll* get there in time
PART B If we want to get there in time, we must leave now
or we'll have to leave now
I push the caravan over here . . . get the car in beside (. . .)
PART C In order to get there in time we've got to leave now
DRILL 2 Place 'it follows that' or 'then' in the prompts for Drill 1.
DRILL 3 leave now . . . get there in time
PART A Leaving now means we'll get there in time
or Getting there in time means leaving now
Go through the prompts in Drill 1 making statements of the above type.
PART B We got there in time because we left immediately

I leave it to the reader to work out exactly what it is that learners are supposed to do and what they are required to produce, for the TG accompanying the materials (Harvey and Wheeler 1976b) gives no help here. These drills are completely mechanical, but the teacher must invest an inordinate amount of time working through them.

Factors Relating to Presentation

Organization of guidance. Does the TG provide detailed guidance which still requires careful interpretation or cross-referencing? The following passage, taken from Fowler (1975:

29), describes a procedure for administering a listening comprehension exercise:

> Read the passage three times at normal speed. Each reading should take not more than three minutes. During the second reading, allow a pause of 10 seconds at the points marked 1, and allow a pause of five seconds at the same points during the third reading. Students should be given two minutes to read the questions after the first reading; two minutes to note down answers they are already sure of after the second reading; and three minutes to complete their answers at the end. The definitions of words printed at the foot of passages should be given to students before the passage is read.

This procedure actually consists of nine simple steps, but the order in which these steps are described is not the same as the order in which they are to be performed. It is particularly curious that the first step in the procedure is the one which is described last of all.

The TG for *Kernel Lessons Intermediate* (O'Neill *et al.* 1971b) is rich in well-intentioned guidance which is presented in such a complicated way that it becomes difficult to exploit. Unfortunately space does not permit a detailed discussion here. However, the interested reader with plenty of time to spare may like to look at Unit 11 e/f (*op. cit.*: 67 and facing page) as an example and try to make a list of everything which has to be done if all the material in the unit is to be used and if all the suggestions for use are to be followed, keeping a note at the same time of how frequently it is necessary to search back through earlier pages of the book in order to understand the instructions fully.

Linguistic complexity and clarity. Does the TG employ language of a complexity which is appropriate only for native speakers or extremely fluent NNS teachers? The following example comes from Candlin *et al.* (1977:27):

> In the light of the development of this opposition we have at last become concerned with the only proper goal of a language learning syllabus, that of leading a learner to be able to communicate and understand in a foreign language not only the meaning within linguistic form, but also meaning as the communication of functional information negotiated between speakers and hearers in the actual world of context and presupposition.

A closely related phenomenon is the failure to ensure that the advice which is given in the TG is expressed clearly and unambiguously. The example which follows -- from Panpat *et al.* (1978:20) – is given with its original punctuation:

> This dialogue leaves the student with certain options, but refer back to 3.2 if any learner is in doubt. Note however that *I hope you liked the dinner* in line 3 must mean that in line 2 the first speaker thanks for the evening. (Note: the evening not the night) with the possibilities:
>
> *Thank you for a* *pleasant* / *nice* / *lovely* *evening.*

Conclusions

In this discussion of the factors which need to be taken into consideration in an evaluation of TGs, no assumptions have been made about what constitutes a most desirable methodology, about what constitutes a most acceptable theory of language acquisition, or about what form a most acceptable theory of the nature of language would take. I have attempted to remain neutral on these issues and to be eclectic in my selection of illustrative texts. That is to say, I have tried to ensure that the illustrations are taken from materials representing a range of approaches to ELT.

It is not my intention to suggest that materials have no potential pedagogic value simply because there are inadequacies in their TGs as perceived from the point of view of the NNS teacher. (In fact there may even be a conflict in some cases between a desirable learning procedure and the uncertain NNS teacher's need for security and certainty.) What I am arguing is that many TGs appear to be little more than incidental afterthoughts and that far less care seems to have gone into their creation than into the materials for learners. Furthermore, the inadequacies of TGs undoubtedly do influence the responses of NNS teachers to materials. If teachers perceive materials as being impenetrable or extremely compli-

cated or requiring an excessive investment of time and energy before teaching can begin, then they may respond to the materials in one of three ways.

(a) Teachers may exploit only those fractions of the materials which are amenable to use by the restricted repertoires which they possess. In other words, if a teacher is familiar only with one teaching style, in which the teacher reads aloud to a passive class, that teacher will obviously select only those passages which he considers suitable for recitation. I have seen *Kernel Lessons Intermediate* (O'Neill *et al.* 1971a) used in exactly this way by many Indonesian teachers.

(b) Teachers may exploit only those fractions of the materials which are accessible to the restricted linguistic competence which they possess. Thus, a teacher may skip certain activities, not because he considers them inappropriate but because he is uncertain of his own ability to evaluate what the students may produce. I often see teachers rushing through two or even three lessons of *Developing Skills* (Alexander 1967) in one 90-minute class, for example. The teachers admit that this is because they dare not allow the students to work on any of the more open-ended exercises such as composition or letter writing: they do not know how to evaluate the students' work.

(c) Teachers may reject the materials altogether.

This inventory of factors for evaluating TGs is really a plea. Perhaps we can look forward to a time when all English teaching will be done by teachers who are not obliged to take on excessive teaching loads in order to keep their families alive, who work in well-equipped institutions, who have near-native competence in English, who are confident and well trained, and who are familiar with the work of Candlin and Selinker. But until that day comes it is important for the writers and publishers of ELT materials to remember the difficulties which are faced by many of their potential customers and to ensure

that TGs are thorough and clear. Recommendations for use need not be equated with restrictions on teachers' freedom. The teacher who does not need advice is not obliged to follow it. But if ELT materials are to be exploited more efficiently by their users, teachers' guides must be able to guide teachers.

Postscript

What value is there in performing an evaluation of TGs? In recent in-service workshops I have been encouraging NNS teachers to undertake their own evaluations of TGs, using the inventory of factors proposed here. Not surprisingly, the teachers have frequently come to the conclusion that TGs do *not* satisfy their needs, that the guides are not guiding them. If nothing else, this has indicated to the teachers that, even by an apparently 'objective' assessment, the problems which they experience are real and legitimate. No easy solutions to these problems have been offered, for they do not exist. But this validation of their problems has helped relieve teachers of some of their feeling of inadequacy of the TGs. At the same time, this validation of problems has contributed to an atmosphere of solidarity between the teacher trainer and the teachers, and has left the latter more receptive to what the former has to offer. A similar phenomenon was experienced by Early and Bolitho (1981:82) when working with a group of German teachers of English:

> in the process of eliciting problems from the teachers, we [found] ourselves sympathetically bearing the brunt of them. [Conseqently] we were better placed to get a hearing for our ideas now that we had shown ourselves to be aware of, and sensitive to [the teachers' problems].

The next steps are to indicate two things to teachers. Firstly, ways in which TGs can be interpreted. Even though interpreting guides can demand considerable effort, it may be rewarding if it enriches the teacher's repertoire. Secondly, ways of exploiting published ELT materials regardless of – or

in spite of – the TGs which accompany the materials. The inadequacy of instructions is not sufficient reason to reject the materials themselves. Even if the authors' original intentions are not clear or are inappropriate, it may still be possible to exploit the materials in other ways. But these matters are beyond the scope of the present paper.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Ken Moody for letting me use a couple of sessions in a workshop held at Hasanuddin University, Indonesia, in 1982, for discussion of some of these ideas. I am grateful, too, to Jim Hardman for agreeing to devote one of his sessions in a workshop held at the British Council, Jakarta, in 1982, to discussion of the same ideas. Jim Hardman also helped me to obtain copies of some of the materials discussed here. Finally, I am grateful to Charles Alderson for the comments he made on an earlier draft of this paper.

References

Alexander, L. G. 1967. *Developing Skills: An Integrated Course for Intermediate Students*. (New Concept English Series.) London: Longman.

Allen, J. P. B. and Widdowson, H. G. 1974a. *English in Physical Science:* (English in Focus Series.) London: Oxford University Press.

Allen, J. P. B. and Widdowson, H. G. 1974b. *English in Physical Science: Teacher's Edition*. (English in Focus Series.) London: Oxford University Press.

Allen, J. P. B. and Widdowson, 1978. Teaching the communicative use of English. In Mackay and Mountford (1978). pp. 56-77.

Allwright, R. L. 1981. What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal, 36*(1): 5-18.

Alyta, K. 1978. Review of 'English Practice for Engineers.' In Drobnic (Ed.). pp. 170-171.

Bates, M. 1978. Writing 'Nucleus.' In Mackay and Mountford (1978). pp. 78-96.

Bates, M. and Dudley-Evans, T. 1976a. *General Science*. (Nucleus English for Science and Technology Series.) London: Longman.

Candlin, C. N., Bruton, C. M., Leather, J. H. and Woods, E. G. 1977. *Doctor-Patient Communication Skills: Teachers' Book*. Chelmsford: Medical Recording Service Foundation.

Chitravelu, N. 1980a. The University of Malaya English for Special Purposes Project. In Chitravelu (1980c). pp. v-xvi.

Chitravelu, N. 1980b. The revised version of the UMESPP material: a resume. In Chitravelu (1980c). pp. 116-121.

Chitravelu, N. (Ed.). 1980c. *The University of Malaya English for Special Purposes Project (UMESPP).* (ELT Documents 107.) London: The British Council.

Coleman, H. (n.d.) From spectacle to festival: the teaching of English in an Indonesian university. Unpublished paper.

Cooper, M. 1980. Reading for meaning. In Chitravelu (1980c). pp. 1-16.

Drobnic, K. (Ed.). 1978. *38 ESP Textbook Reviews.* Corvallis. Oregon: Oregon State University.

Early, P. and Bolitho, R. 1981. Reasons to be cheerful: or helping teachers to get problems into perspective. In Marsh (1981). pp. 71-85.

Elliman, J. 1981. A model for coursebook evaluation. *English for Specific Purposes Newsletter, 46*, 1-4.

Ewer, J. R. and Boys, O. 1981. The EST textbook situation: an enquiry. *The ESP Journal, 1*(2), 87-105.

Fowler, W. S. 1975. *First Certificate English: Book 4: Listening Comprehension: Teacher's Book.* Sunbury-on-Thames: Nelson.

Glendinning, E. H. 1974. *English in Mechanical Engineering.* (English in Focus Series.) London: Oxford University Press.

Hall, D. and Bowyer, T. 1980. *Mathematics: Teacher's Notes.* (Nucleus English for Science and Technology Series.) Harlow: Longman.

Harvey, G. M. and Wheeler, M. S. 1976a. *North Sea Challenge.* (Language Training Pack1.) London: BP Educational Service.

Harvey, G. M. and Wheeler, M. S. 1976b. *North Sea Challenge: Teacher's Guide.* (Language Training Pack 1.) London: BP Educational Service.

Hawkey, M. 1970. *English Practice for Engineers.* London: Longman.

Hornby, A. S. 1975. *Guide to Patterns and Usages in English.* 2nd edn. London: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H., Allen, W., Cyr, A., Lemelin, C., Ricard, E., Spada, N. and Vogel. P. 1980. *Reading English for Academic Study.* (English for Academic Study Series.) Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Lynch, M. 1975. *North Sea Challenge: Teacher's Guide.* (Decisions Series.) London: BP Educational Service.

Mackay, R. and Mountford, A. 1978. *English for Specific Purposes: A Case Study Approach.* (Applied Linguistics and Language Study Series.) London: Longman.

Malmsten, N. 1978. Review of *English in Mechanical Engineering.* In Drobnic (1978), pp. 75-77.

Marsh, G. (Ed.) 1981. *Focus on the Teacher.* (ELT Documents 110.) London: The British Council.

Moya, V. 1978. Review of *English for Doctors and Nurses.* In Drobnic (1978), pp. 28-32.

O'Neill, R., Kingsbury, R. and Yeadon, T. 1971a. *Kernel Lessons Intermediate: Teacher's Book.* London: Longman.

Panpat, S., Long, M. N. and Richards, J. C. 1978. *Breakthrough 1: Teacher's Book.* Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

Parkinson, J. 1978. *English for Doctors and Nurses.* London: Evans Brothers.

Potter, M. 1983. Socio-cultural reality in foreign language teaching programmes: whose reality? Paper presented at the 17th Annual TESOL Convention. Toronto, 17 March 1983.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* London: Longman.
Stone, L. 1969. *Reading English Objectively: Stage 1.* London: Macmillan.
Stone, L., Malone, R. L., Lancaster, M. and Ttoel. C. 1979. *Reading English Objectively 1-3: Key.* London: Macmillan.
Swales, J. 1971. *Writing Scientific English.* Sunbury-on-Thames: Nelson.
Swales, J. 1978. *Writing Scientific English.* In Mackay and Mountford (1978), pp. 43-55.
Swales, J. and Fanning, P. 1980a. *English in the Medical Laboratory.* Sunbury-on-Thames: Nelson.
Swales, J. and Fanning, P. 1980b. *English in the Medical Laboratory: Key.* Sunbury-on-Thames: Nelson.
Thomson, A. J. and Martinet, A. V. 1980. *A Practical English Grammar.* 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Williams, R. 1981. A procedure for ESP textbook analysis and evaluation on teacher education courses. *The ESP Journal. 1*(2): 155-162.
Willis, J. 1981. The training of non-native speaker teachers of English: a new approach. In Marsh (1981), pp. 41-53.