

New Approach for Evaluating EFLM (An Eclectic Developed Checklist)

Mr. Ibrahim Hassan Ali Mahfoodh¹, Dr. S.G. Bhanegaonkar²

¹Ph. D. Scholar, Department of English, School of Languages, Lit. & Cultural Studies, SRTMU, Nanded, Email: imahfoodh@gmail.com

²Department of English, People's College, Nanded

Abstract- Nothing is more certain to guarantee disastrous teaching than an unprepared teacher is. As a part of preparing the teacher is to provide an evaluation checklist enabling him to be aware of the textbook he is using. A particular feature of the book may be inappropriate to the situation in which she/he is using it or there may simply be a feature of the book she/he dislikes and wishes to adapt. For a teacher, thus, to know the appropriateness or otherwise of the book and may wish to adapt it and make it suitable for his/her local setting, a checklist is needed to provide him with an evaluation scheme enabling him to make his/her right judgments. To evaluate the appropriateness and efficacy of a textbook is to know the principles on which the textbook has been designed and how it meets the objectives that it aims to achieve. To help evaluating a textbook, the paper has provided an eclectic evaluation checklist.

Firstly, some evaluation models and twelve evaluation checklists have been scrutinized. Secondly, they have been compared to one another. Thirdly, the common salient features have been highlighted. Fourthly, the latest checklist by Babii and Ansary has been taken as the main base to develop a new suitable eclectic developed evaluation checklist.

Moreover, the paper deals with the question of evaluating ELT materials in terms of the definition, the types, the criteria and the techniques used in such evaluation. In this case, the paper will review some textbooks evaluation models and some textbooks evaluation checklists arriving at the researcher's eclectic, developed checklist.

The paper will try to explore how each evaluation tackles /deals with the issue of evaluation and how the researcher's project differs in its aspects from those aforementioned. In other words, the paper will be trying to present its own developed EFLTM evaluation checklist.

Index Terms- Evaluation, EFLTM, Evaluation Checklist

I. INTRODUCTION

Language instruction has five important components: L students, a teacher, materials, teaching methods and an evaluation system. What is the importance of materials in language instruction? What is the purpose of materials in teaching a language? Can a teacher teach English without a textbook?

Allwright (1990) argues that materials should teach students to learn, that they should be resource books for ideas and activities for instruction/learning, and that they should give teachers

notions for what they do. Allwright's point of view is against constructing materials for teachers to use. He shows that textbooks are so inflexible to be used directly as instructional materials. He feels that an instructional material ties the teacher and may mislead him or become a hindrance rather than a help.

O'Neill (1990), in contrast, argues that materials may be suitable for students' needs, even if they are not designed especially for them, that textbooks make it possible for students to review and prepare their lessons, that textbooks are efficient in terms of time and money, and that textbooks can and should allow for adaptation and improvisation. O'Neill's point of view highlights two ideas: the importance of instructional textbooks and the flexibility they should have. He states the need for adaptation when necessary.

Allwright (1990) emphasizes that materials control learning and teaching, whereas O'Neill (1990) emphasizes that materials help learning and teaching. It is true that in many cases, teachers and students rely heavily on textbooks, and textbooks determine the components and methods of learning. Textbooks control the content, methods and procedures of learning. Students learn what is presented in a textbook, and the way a textbook presents topics is the way students learn it.

The educational philosophy of the textbook influences the class and the learning progress. Therefore, in many cases, materials are the centre of instruction and one of the most important influences on what goes on in the classroom.

Theoretically, experienced teachers can teach English without a textbook. However, it is not easy to do it all the time, though they may do it sometimes. Many teachers do not have enough time to make supplementary materials, so they just follow the textbook. Textbooks, therefore, take on a very important role in a language class, and it is important to select a good textbook.

Thus, the textbook is often considered the main source of information and the most common teaching and learning materials. Therefore, the student's success or failure with English often depends on the type of the course book and the teaching materials used.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The Role and Design of Instructional Materials

Materials play an important role in the process of teaching/learning. In this concern, Richards (2001) points out that those teaching materials are a key component in most language programmes. Whether the teacher uses a textbook,

institutionally prepared material, or his/her own materials, instructional materials generally serve as the basis for much of the language input that learners receive and the language practice that occurs in the classroom. In the case of inexperienced teachers, materials may also serve as a form of teacher training as they provide ideas on how to plan and teach lessons as well as formats that teacher can use.

To be creative in using textbooks in the language classroom, one must define the roles of textbooks. The definition of the roles of a textbook slightly varies from a theorist to another. Allwright (1982), for example, assumes that the roles of teaching materials have to do with what to teach and who uses them. O'Neill (1982), on the other hand, entrusts a differing role to textbooks, arguing that the use of a published textbook as a basis on which to pattern the unpredictable interaction is necessary to classroom language learning. Swan (1991) states that good textbooks build bridges across teaching language components which the creative movement of textbooks is possible and even easy. Swan's point of view reveals the communicative role as well as the creative movement of textbooks.

Cunningsworth (1995: 7) briefly summarizes the role of materials in language teaching as:

- a resource for presenting materials
- a source of activities for learner and communicative interaction
- a reference source for learners on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, etc.
- a source of stimulation and ideas for classroom activities
- a syllabus
- a support for less experienced teachers who have to gain confidence

The Role of Textbooks in the TEFL Classroom

Teaching language consists of certain components, but the essential constituents to EFL programmes and classroom are the textbooks and the instructional materials that are used by language constructors. In the same respect, Hutchinson and Torres (1994) suggest that the textbook is an almost universal element of English language teaching. Millions of copies are sold every year and numerous aid projects have been set up to produce them in various countries. It seems that no teaching learning situation is complete until it uses a relevant textbook. Sheldon (1988: 37), as a well-known theorist in evaluation, agrees with this observation and furthermore he suggests that textbooks not only "represent the visible heart to any ELT programme but also offer considerable advantages-for both the students and the teacher-when they are being used in ESL/EFL classroom".

Haycroft (1998), for example, suggests that one of the primary advantages of using textbooks is that they are psychologically essential for students since their progress and achievement can be measured concretely when they use them.

Sheldon (1988) also points out, that students often harbor expectations about using a textbook in their particular language classroom and programme and believe that published materials have more credibility than teacher-generated or "in house" materials.

It is worth mentioning that more recent authors have criticized textbooks for their inherent and culture biases. Researchers such

as Porreca (1984), Florent and Walter (1989), (Larke 1990) or Carrel and Kowitz (1994), and Renner (1997) have demonstrated that many EFL/ESL textbooks still contain rampant examples of gender bias, sexism, and stereotyping.

Badarous (1988) points out that the materials that teachers use to implement the programme have to be designed according to the learners' level. In other words, they must be relevant to the student's level and interest.

Undoubtedly, the role of textbooks in TEFL is very vital. They may have defects and biases. Then, the role of the teacher is to adapt and supplement the textbooks.

The Role of Teacher in the TEFL Classroom and With Materials

Teachers are a key factor in the successful implementation of curriculum changes and particularly in textbook. Exceptional teachers can often compensate for the poor-quality resources and materials they have to work from. However, inadequately trained teachers may not be able to make effective use of teaching materials no matter how well they are designed. Richards (2001: 99) suggests that teachers may vary according to the following dimensions:

- language proficiency
- teaching experience
- skill and expertise
- training and qualification
- morale and motivation
- teaching style
- beliefs and principles

Teachers also play an important role in evaluating and assessing the EFL/ESL materials used from time to time. A teacher can complement, supplement and adapt the materials when necessary. When heavy foreign cultural bias exists in the content of TEFLMs, the teaching of the set requires a tactful teacher to manage the whole situation and make the needed changes or amendments.

Defining Evaluation of Textbooks

According to Hutchinson and Waters (1987), textbook evaluation is basically a straight forward, analytical matching process i.e. matching needs to available solutions. They divide the evaluation process into four major steps:

- Defining criteria
- Subjective analysis
- Objective analysis
- Matching

Sheldon (1987), on the other hand, argues that evaluation is rather more emotive and controversial for teachers. He defines evaluation of textbook as a matter of judging the fitness of something (textbooks/materials) for a particular purpose (teaching in an EL situation for example). Tomlinson (1998) states that the term "materials evaluation" refers to attempts to measure the value of materials.

Lynch (1997) defines evaluation as a systematic attempt to gather information in order to make judgments or decisions. In this concern, evaluative information can be both qualitative and quantitative in form and can be gathered through different methods such as observation or the administration of pencil-and-paper test.

Cunningsworth (1995) and Ellis (1997) suggest that textbook evaluation helps teachers move beyond impressionistic assessments and it helps them to acquire useful, accurate, systematic and contextual insights into the overall nature of textbook. Litz (2005), on the other hand, states that "evaluation textbooks" assists educators in identifying the particular strengths and weaknesses in textbooks already in use.

In the researcher's point of view, textbook evaluation is a matter of examining and checking the ready-written in hand material/textbook to know the appropriateness or otherwise of this textbook for a particular context. In this concern, the process of evaluation can take four stages:

- Defining the principles/criteria of designing materials in addition to the features of the situation it is applied in and of students it is applied for
- Defining the criteria on which the evaluation will be based on: a checklist, a framework, etc.
- Matching both criteria using a valid, reliable, practical instrument of collecting data such as a questionnaire
- Analyzing the findings that will help the evaluator decide to what extent the course book/material is suitable for the user.

Criteria for Evaluating ELT material

Power (2003) suggests thirty criteria for evaluating ELT materials/textbooks:

- 1- Learners' needs
- 2- Ordering and pacing of syllabus
- 3- Maintenance of interest-suitable (perhaps for captive learners)
- 4- Type of course, exam based, intensive, vacation-fixed period or continuous intake
- 5- Age group-suitable for maturity-level and motivation of learners
- 6- Time scale-variety and quantity of material-suitable for length of course
- 7- Cultural orientation
- 8- Suitable for the class-size
- 9- Role of teachers and learners appropriate to preferred teaching and learning styles
- 10- Mono or multilingual
- 11- Narrative or topic based
- 12- Assumption of learner knowledge
- 13- Mixture of syllabus; structural; national functional; task-based
- 14- Right measure of authenticity i.e. suitable adapted for level
- 15- Appropriateness of lexis, structure for learner's level
- 16- Right selection of vocabulary and syntax for learners' refecation and complexity
- 17- Range and Appropriateness of texts
- 18- Range and weight of skills
- 19- Revision technique: cyclical or linear
- 20- Suitability for self-access
- 21- Do learners' exercise, activities and task work?
- 22- Ease of use for teacher
- 23- Ease of use for students
- 24- Summary of items for reference
- 25- Visual impact

- 26- Accompanying aids: charts, cassettes, etc.
- 27- Dated or modern language
- 28- Metalanguage
- 29- Teacher's' Book
- 30- Course or part course book

Types of Evaluation

There are two main types of evaluation: formative and summative. Formative evaluation is an on-going, in-course evaluation and contributes to the modification of the course, if necessary. Summative evaluation, on the other hand, is the end-of-course evaluation and it helps the teacher to find out if the objectives are really achieved and if the methods and internals have been useful for this purpose to achieve the objectives.

The purpose of summative evaluation is not to provide feedback for on-going modification. The curriculum changes whenever there is a change in one element of the curriculum (objectives, methodology, content) there must be a change in the evaluation system too.

Cunningsworth (1995) and Ellis (1997) cited in Litz (2005) have suggested that there are three different types of material evaluation. They argue that the most common form is probably the "predictive" or "pre-use" evaluation that is designed to examine the future or potential performance of a textbook.

The other types of textbook evaluation are the "in-use" evaluation designed to examine material that is currently being used and the "retrospective" or "post-use" (reflective) evaluation of a textbook that has been used in respective institution.

Regarding TEFLMs evaluation, on-progress evaluation is recommended and it is achieved through teacher's questions and workbook exercises/tasks. It can be also of great help for checking students's progress. In addition, the end-of-course evaluation can be achieved by final tests or end-term-tests.

The Time for Evaluation

Students' needs and interests are changeable by the time. A textbook works successfully today, it may not be so tomorrow. In relation to evaluation, it is said that evaluating materials in-use is a need to be applied from time to time: on-going evaluation or end-in evaluation.

Evaluation is one of the four components of a curriculum. Objectives, content and methodology are the other three components of the curriculum. When we construct TEFL materials, we are supposed to administer an evaluation before handling the materials for use. Moreover, while and at the end of the course, the evaluation is needed too. In general, an evaluation is to be led when we feel that some problems pop up or shortcomings are discovered and we want to know the origin of such problems.

The Method of Evaluation

Trochim (2003) suggests a method of evaluation and calls it "the evaluation cycle." This evaluation cycle consists of four stages: formulating questions, collecting data, analyzing the data and drawing conclusions.

Formulating the questions refers to identifying objectives and designing stakeholders. It also refers to defining evaluation goals or research questions. In short, formulating questions tries to answer two questions:

- Why is one carrying out this evaluation?
- What information does one need?

There are some common objectives for evaluation:

- determining the effectiveness of a particular intervention
- finding out how well students are learning
- identifying improvements which could be made to a specific course, learning activity or learning process
- satisfying internal or external auditing requirements
- demonstrating value to stakeholders (which might include project founders)
- reflecting on professional practice in a structured way
- building evidence for a portfolio (e.g. career development, teaching fellowship)
- producing guidelines for colleagues (internal and external) who might want to carry out a similar innovation
- generating data for a research study or publication
- investigating an issue of personal, intellectual or professional interest

This question to the two answers should lead to a list of key stakeholders in the evaluation process. The stakeholders may include lecturers, learning technology specialists or a support staff or future employers, future clients or managers and founders.

The second stage is "collecting data". This stage refers to identifying resources; e.g. students or the involved group. In this stage, the evaluator is supposed to choose a data collection strategy. Moreover, the time of collecting the data has to be identified, whether it is after, before, or during a learning activity. This stage tries to answer three questions:

- Who can provide us with data?
- How can data be collected?
- When can data be collected?

The third stage refers to "analyzing the data and how it can be analyzed". It includes selecting appropriate analysis techniques, bearing in mind the nature of the data collected and the evaluation goals. It may include a questionnaire, an interview or an observation.

The fourth stage refers to "analyzing the data" collected previously. It reflects an implication for own practice; draw recommendations or lessons for others. It considers the community of implementation and finally, considers the ability to identify dissemination opportunities.

Ways of Evaluating TEFL Materials

EFLTM evaluation can be achieved by different ways and a variety of bases. Each evaluator looks at materials/textbooks from an angle to view his opinion and bases his/her evaluation on a particular framework.

Some evaluators base their study of evaluation on reviewing some EFLTM evaluation models, some others use already established checklists or review some checklists and develop their own one. Another group of evaluators creates or states criteria for designing an English language teaching course, then advocates or extracts a checklist. Upon the elicited checklist, the evaluator tries to examine to what extent there is a match between the criteria of designing and the items mentioned in the checklist, and then he matches both with real implementation of the course.

Murshed (2005), on the other hand, presented some evaluation models such as Davison's model (1976), Breen's and Candlin's criteria (1979), Marian's evaluation model (1980), William's scheme and checklist for evaluation(1983), Cunningsworth's model (1984), Dougill's evaluative framework and Hutchinson's model (1987) named "What's Underneath?", an interactive view of materials evaluation. After that, Murshed adapted his model in a form of a questionnaire.

III. THE STUDY

Reappraisal of Some Evaluation Models

The researcher, to avoid prolixity, is to highlight and to reappraise some models of evaluation mentioned in the previous section. Grant's model (1984) cited in Murshed (2005) shows that the evaluation procedure could be classified into two types; the pre-utility evaluation and the in-utility evaluation. The difference between the two types is that the former is applied after designing is over and before administering the material to the user whereas the later is an on-going evaluation done during the implementation of the programme.

White's model (1984), in contrast, mentioned in his book *ELT Curriculum: "Designing Innovation and Management"* draws up four stages for evaluation: doing preliminaries, data collection, major data collection, further data collection and Completion.

Harmer (1983) focuses his evaluation model on the learner from three dimensions to be taken into account before evaluating EFLTM. They are a description of learner's profile (age, sex socio-cultural background, their occupation, their motivation, attitude, etc), a description of learner's needs in terms of when they are likely to use English and what skills they should acquire in the language, and thirdly to consider if the type of materials is appropriate for a particular group of learners.

IV. METHODOLOGY

This study examines checklists prepared for evaluating textbooks/courses and aims at providing good foundation and base to accomplish, to what extent, a thorough review to evaluate the EFLTM and particularly textbooks in a clear definite light. Checklists include different items/statements for their purpose is to measure the appropriateness and efficacy or otherwise of the textbook under discussion.

The researcher's main focus is to lead his evaluation on finding out the suitability or otherwise of CECY. This will be done by examining and reappraising some already-established checklists and, finally, arriving at a composite/eclectic developed evaluation checklist.

Here are some evaluation checklists in a chronological order:

- 1- Chastain, k. (1971). *The Development of Modern Language Skills: Theory to Practice* (pp. 376-384). Philadelphia: The center for curriculum Development, Inc.
- 2- Tucker, C.A (1975). *Evaluating Beginning Textbooks*. English Teaching Forum, 13, 355-361.
- 3- Cowles, H(1976). *Textbook, Materials Evaluation: A Comprehensive Check Sheet*. Foreign Language Annuals, 9(4), 300-303.

- 4- Daoud, A. and Celce Murcia, M. (1979), *Selecting and Evaluating a Textbook*. In M. Celce-Murcia and LMcIntosh (Eds), *Teaching English As a Second or Foreign Language* (pp. 302-307). Cambridge, MA. Newbury House Publishers.
- 5- Candlin, C.N and Breen, M.P.(1979). *Evaluating, Adapting and Innovating Language Teaching Materials*. In C. Yrio, K Perkins and J Schacter (Eds). On TESOL 19: The Learner in Focus (pp. 86.108). Washington, D.C. *Teacher of English to Speaks of other Language*
- 6- Rivers, W. (1981). *Teaching Foreign Language Skills* (pp. 475-483). Chicago University of Chicago press.
- 7- Williams D. (1983). *Developing Criteria for Textbook Evaluation*. *ELT Journal* 37(2), 251-255.
- 8- Sheldon, L.(1988). *Evaluating ELT Textbooks and Materials*, *ELT Journal*, 42 (4), 237-246.
- 9- Skierso, A. (1991). *Textbook Selection and Evaluation*. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 432-453). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle publishers
- 10- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory* (pp. 184-187) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 11- Garinger, D(2000). *Textbook Evaluation ELT Journal*.
- 12- Ansary, H. and Babaii, E. (2002): *Universal Characteristics of EFL/ESL Textbooks: A Step Towards Systematic Textbook Evaluation*. *TESL Journal*

V. ANALYTICAL DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS

Reappraisal of Some of Evaluation Textbook Checklists

The checklists of evaluating the text books will be analyzed in this section and to arrive at a new eclectic evaluation checklist that can be used for evaluating textbooks in EFL/ESL situations. To begin with, Chastin (1971) focuses his evaluation checklist on the development of the language skills. His evaluation pays great importance for language skills as they are very basic foundations of the language. To Chastin, good textbooks care mostly for language skills and how they are applied successfully in textbooks. Language skills maintain the learner's language and help him to have control over the language he is studying/learning.

Tucker's checklist (1975), (Appendix D), introduces a system that has three components:

- a set of criteria claimed to be "consistent with the basic linguistic, psychological, and pedagogical principles"
- a rating scheme which provides a method for judging the comparative weightings of a textbook's merits and
- a chart/graph which provides a visual comparison between the evaluator's opinion of the book and a hypothetical idea model, hence facilitating a quick and easy display of the evaluator, judgment

Tucker's checklist/scheme consists of two types of criteria; internal criteria that are language related and external criteria that give a broader view of the book. The internal criteria are divided into three criteria: Pronunciation, Grammar and Content criteria. Under pronunciation criterion; the presentation of pronunciation requires attention to: (1) completeness of presentation which

refers to the coverage of sound and supra segmental features (2) appropriateness of presentation which concerns whether or not students are from a single language background, whether or not students are kids or adults, and all this affecting the type of presentation, and (3) adequacy of practice which deals with both the quality and quantity of practice. Quality, here, refers to practice in a context i.e. practising sounds in words, and developing words in sentences, and so on.

Under grammar criterion; (1) adequacy of pattern inventory deals with how much and how well structure would be presented, (2) appropriate sequencing refers to the organization of grammar content and its gradation from simple to difficult and (3) adequacy of drills and "patterns display" criterion refers to student's desire and interest and how much practice is required to achieve that.

Under content criteria, the functional load is maintained. Moreover, the input and output are stiffed to arranging techniques. Thirdly, content choice must be appropriate to the user's context, culture, environment and situation.

The second part of the scheme states criteria about the textbook in broader/overall term. It refers to the authenticity of language used in the content. It also refers to the availability of supplementary materials, also how adequate the teacher is, how competent the author is and the durability, price and value as well. However, this scheme worked successfully, yet to be developed, some more criteria are to be added, replaced or changed.

Cowle's checklist (1976) points out that no textbook or set of materials has all the answers and no review can foresee all the situations in which they might be used. This checklist is an attempt to bring together considerations connected to evaluation of textual materials in a comprehensive format that is easy to use. Cowle's includes in his checklist the communicative competence as he claims that the communicative competence still awaits definition in the evaluation of textual materials. Thus, the term "free expression" has been retained in the current checklist, although it may appear overly simplified to some.

Three years later, Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979) presented a developed evaluation checklist. They divided it into three main headings. They highlighted the importance of the textbook and its content and the researcher's manual to be included in EFLT material evaluative checklist.

Under the "Textbook" heading, five components are stated: subject matter, vocabulary and structures, exercises, illustration and physical make up. In each of heading, some items are presented by a five-scale response each "Excellent, Good, adequate, weak and totally lacking". This scheme is more practicable than the previous one. It pays attention to evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation.

Cunningsworth's checklist (1984) touches upon the importance of relating materials to the course objectives to assess all processes. To him, the textbook is considered good/acceptable if it could satisfy and match the objectives of the materials i.e. while designing and implementation.

Sheldon's checklist (1988) is very extensive and tries to assess/measure all aspects of content including such diverse factors as graphics and physical characteristics to authenticity and flexibility. Sheldon's checklist produces suggested course book criteria. He considers designing and evaluating course

books/textbooks are dependable in other terms "they are two sides for one coin". The feedback deduced from using the checklist for evaluation helps much in reviewing the course. It is worthy to quote a version (1987: 241) in which he appreciates his checklist. He states "I would like to present what I think is a bell-jar, summary of common-core factors that reviewers, teachers, learners, and educational and administrative advisers most frequently use in deciding whether or not a textbook is chosen" On the issue of assessment and evaluation, Sheldon (1987) shows the importance of assessment. He comments, "It is clear that course book assessment is fundamentally a subjective, role of thumb activity, that no neat formula, grid or system will ever provide a definitive yardstick", (p. 245). Sheldon's checklist even includes units criteria and how they are organized; horizontally or vertically and the advantages and disadvantages of this organization, it presents criteria for material, some criteria for learner, some criteria for teacher and some others focus on the context (classroom, society) in which the three components interact.

Both Skierso (1991) and Chall Conrad (1991) utilized Bloom's Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain to assess the processes and skills that textbooks require for learners to perform. The rating of a textbook will directly reflect the level of the skill that the textbook demands. For example, a book that uses synthesis and analysis would rate higher than one that demands only comprehension.

Both Chall and Conrad have adapted Bloom's Taxonomy to create a "Question Complexity Rating Scale". They use this to evaluate individual questions in order to analyze the difficulty of questions and to display the range of cognitive skills needed by the students to complete textbook activities. These concerns highlight the increasing significance that professionals place on the process of learning and the recognition that focusing solely on outcomes often does not address all the second language learners' needs.

Ur's checklist (1996) appears to be more or less having a similar focus and an approach to EFL/ESL textbook evaluation. She includes features related to the approach such as to what extent the approach is educationally and socially acceptable to the target community. Moreover, she pays more attention to the importance of fluency in learning the language skills rather than accuracy because fluency helps learners develop their own learning strategies and to be independent in their learning.

Garinger's checklist (2000) reflects a new criterion which is not mentioned in the previous checklists. It reflects concerns of teacher choosing textbooks. To Garinger, selecting particular items to create a personal evaluation index is the best method for ensuring that the realities of each individual learning situation are addressed. This checklist, as he claims, was created to evaluate textbooks being used in a variety of community-based ESL programmes in a local setting. To create his personal checklist, he reviewed the previously published checklists, then selected the salient common features that he felt among all and added some features which he felt their need to his local setting. This checklist consists of two main parts: "Practical consideration" is representing the pedagogic part and "Language related Consideration" is representing the theoretical part. Garinger criticizes his textbook evaluation checklist by confessing that his checklist is personal for local settings in ESL programmes.

The last checklist to be reviewed is the checklist prepared by Babii and Ansary (2002) entitled "Universal Characteristics of EFL/ESL Textbooks: A Step Towards Systematic Textbook Evaluation". Babii and Ansary attempt a study to indirectly explore whether or not a de facto consensus exists at all over what makes a good/standard EFL/ESL textbook a good/standard textbook. "This is an attempt to possibly locate some theory-neutral, universal and broad characteristics of EFL/ESL textbooks and to draw up, as such, some guidelines for the generation and/or systematic evaluation of EFL/ESL text books. Babii and Ansary's checklist (2002) has been framed into four broad groups. Each group is preceded by a criterion. Under each criterion, sub-criteria are listed. They concern "approach, content presentation, and physical make-up and administration concerns". Under "approach" criterion, the textbook requires to be based on the nature of language (Krashen's theory), the nature of learning and how the theory can be put to applied use.

Content presentation criterion refers to stating purposes and objectives for the total course and the individual units. It also includes how and to what extent criteria of selections are achieved. Content presentation aims at measuring how satisfactory the syllable is to the teacher and students.

As a fact, the content of the textbook may be satisfactory but suffers from physical making-up. Therefore, this universal checklist took into consideration the importance of this criterion and included some items such as:

- appropriateness of size and weight,
- attractive in the layout,
- how durable the textbook is,
- if it is of high quality of edifying and publishing and
- the appropriateness of title

Under "administrative concerns criterion", (1) macro-state policies refer to whether the textbook meets the policy of the authority. (2) "Appropriate for local situation" includes the appropriateness of the content of the textbook to the culture, religion, and (3) the appropriateness of the price.

Undoubtedly, no evaluation checklist can satisfy all evaluative situations nor it can be applied for any textbook evaluation. Even the newest/latest checklist published by Babii and Ansary (2002) claimed to be "a Universal Checklist" for EFL and ESL situation still awaits for some adaptations and reduction.

The Present Study Checklist: The Eclectic Evaluation Checklist
This checklist is an adaptation of the "Universal Checklist" developed by Ansary, H. and Babaii, E. (2002) who based their checklist on ten previous textbooks evaluation checklists between 1971 and 1996. The present checklist evaluated the ten checklists in addition to two more checklists done between 1997 and 2005. The items of the checklist of the study are stated below:

(NB. Items in italic are new criteria for this checklist)

I - Approach

A - Dissemination of a vision (approach) about

- the nature of language
- the nature of learning
- how the theory can be put to applied use

II- Content presentation

A - Stating objectives

- for the total course

- for individual units
- for individual lessons
- B – Selection and its rationale
 - Coverage
 - Grading
 - Organization
 - Sequencing
- C – Satisfaction of the syllabus
- 1- To the teacher
 - Providing a guide book (TB)
 - Giving advice on the methodology:
 - 1- giving theoretical orientation
 - 2- key to the exercises
 - Supplementary materials
- 2- To the student
 - Piecemeal, unit by unit instruction
 - Graphics (relevant, free from unnecessary details, colourful, etc)
 - Periodic reviews
 - Workbook
 - Exercises:
 - 1- in the classroom
 - 2- homework
 - 3- sample exercise with clear instructions
 - 4- varied and copious
 - Periodic test sections
 - Appropriate audio, visual and audio-visual aids
- III- Suitability to Students'
 - *situation*
 - *area*
 - *culture*
 - *self background*
 - *religion*
 - *level of competence*
 - *age*
 - *interest*
 - *gender*
- IV- Author/Constructor
 - *communicative competence in both (English and Arabic)*
 - *Native of the country (Yemen) and expert in LI(English or expert of English language*
 - *Awareness of learners' culture*
- V- Physical Make Up
 - appropriate
 - Attractive
 - Durable
 - Clear printing
 - Suggestive
 - Interesting
 - Effective
- IV- Nature of Content
 - *Authenticity from varied fields*
 - *Relevant to macro and micro community/policy*
 - *Balance of the two cultures (target students and target language)*
 - *Promote fluency*

- *Promote improvisation*

As it has been mentioned earlier that the checklist of the present study solely is based on Babii and Ansary's checklist, in this section the paper is going to highlight the new criteria added as well as the replaced one. Babii and Ansary's "administrative concerns" criterion has been replaced by a criterion that has relation to the author. Its importance is felt because of its effect on the content. "The burden culture", the poison of culturally biased TEFLMs, is generated due to the author's unawareness of local culture where the textbook is to be applied.

Two criteria have been added to Babii and Ansary's checklist: suitability for student/Yemeni context and nature of content. "Suitability for student" criterion has been added due to the importance of the material to match student's concerns because the student is the cornerstone of the whole process. Under this criterion, some student's concerns are included such as situation, environment, culture, self-background, religion, level of understanding, age, interest, and gender. "Nature of content" criterion has been added because if the content is biased, student's acquisition will be spoiled. The content is supposed to have some authentic texts from various fields, to be relevant to macro and micro policy of the community, to balance the two cultures (student's and target language), to promote fluency rather than accuracy and to be able to promote improvisation.

VI. CONCLUSION

More or less, if TEFL materials are designed for a group of learners, they may/may not work appropriately with another group. One of the main objectives of this research is to provide a kind of scale/measurement tool i.e. an evaluation checklist to help a better judgment. The present checklist claims to be more suitable for evaluating EFL textbooks as being the latest and eclectic checklist.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cunningsworth, A 1995. *Choosing Your Coursebook*. Heinemann.
- [2] Florent, J. and C. Walter. 1989. A Better Role for Women in TEFL. *ELT Journal*, 43, 180-184 .
- [3] Grant, N. (1987). *Making the Most of Your Textbook*. Longman.
- [4] Haycroft, J. 1998. *An Introduction To English Language Teaching*. Longman.
- [5] Hutchinson, T. Torres, E. (1994). The Textbook as Agent of Change. *ELT Journal*, 48,315-328
- [6] Littlejohn, A. (1998). *The Analysis of Teaching Materials: Inside the Trojan Horse*. In *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. B. Tomlinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 190-216.
- [7] Kitao, K. and S. Kitao. 1997. 'Selecting and Developing Teaching/Learning Materials.' *The Internet TESLJournal*.Vol. IV, No.4. available at: www.aitech.ac.jp/~iteslj/Articles/Kitao-Materials.html. Accessed on 12 January 2006.
- [8] McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials Evaluation and Design for Language Teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [9] McDonough, J and Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [10] O'Neill, R. 1982. Why Use Textbooks?. *ELT Journal*, 36, 104-111 .
- [11] O'Neil, T. and Snow, P. (1998) *Crescent English Course for Yemen: Teacher's Book5*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [12] Porecca, K. 1984. Sexism in Current ESL Textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18,

- [13] Riazi, M.A. 2003. *What Do Textbook Evaluation Schemes Tell us? A study of the textbook evaluation schemes of three decades*. In W.A. Renandya (ed.), *Methodology and Materials Design in Language Teaching*. (pp.52-68). SEAMEO Regional Centre.
- [14] Sheldon, Leslie E. (Ed.) (1987). *ELT Textbooks and Materials: Problems in Evaluation and Development*. Modern English Publications.
- [15] Sheldon, Leslie E. (1988). Evaluating ELT Textbooks and Materials. *ELT Journal*, 42, 237-247
- [16] Tomlinson, B (ed.). 1998. *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Tomlinson, B. 2003. *Material Evaluation* in B. Tomlinson (ed.) *Developing Materials for Language Teaching*. (15-36. London & New York: Continuum.
- [18] Williams, D. 1983. Developing Criteria for Textbook Evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 37, 251-255