Available online at www.jlls.org

JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

ISSN: 1305-578X

Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14(3), 154-189; 2018

Particularised checklists in materials evaluation: Developing contextually relevant criteria for Turkish EFL classes

Meliha R. Şimşek [a] *, Esin Dündar [b]

[a] *University of Health Sciences, İstanbul 34668, Turkey*
[b] *Anadolu University, Eskişehir 26470, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Şimşek, M. R., & Dündar, E. (2018). Particularised checklists in materials evaluation: Developing contextually relevant criteria for Turkish EFL classes. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14*(3), 154-189.

Submission Date: 11/05/2018

Acceptance Date: 03/08/2018

Abstract

The major trend in ELT materials evaluation has been the measurement of general satisfaction levels against borrowed items from previous checklists. However, their real quality can be accurately assessed through contextually relevant criteria. In this study, 85 English teachers, and 500 seventh-graders evaluated the effectiveness of their locally-produced English coursebook with standardised, particularised, and importance-weighted Likert-type checklists. The extent of consumer dissatisfaction in their primary focus areas was found much greater than the overall evaluation alone had yielded. The teachers' evaluations were yet unaffected by gender, experience, and length of textbook use. The top teacher-preferred criteria focused on accommodating different proficiency levels, and learner types; and the top student-preferred criteria on supplementary resources, and thematic appeal. The list of coursebook deficiencies might have been topped by the lack of authenticity, and supplementary resources for teacher guidance, and student self- instruction, but further overlaps existed between user views over such serious weaknesses as lack of: support for creative thinking, thematic appeal, grammatical explanations, and cultural diversity. Since these persistent coursebook concerns have been diagnosed in similar EFL contexts, where local materials were preferred over their global (UK/US-produced) counterparts, a context-sensitive, synergistic model was recommended for drafting, editing, and assessing ELT materials.

Keywords: Checklists; importance-weighting; locally-produced coursebooks; materials evaluation

1. Introduction

Being one of the five pillars in language teaching, materials can be defined as anything capable of facilitating the learning process, and among varied types of materials, the coursebook has always been the most popular for both teachers and learners, as the majority of them would hardly imagine entering the classroom without it (Kitao & Kitao, 1997; Mahfoodh & Bhanegaonkar, 2013; Tomlinson, 2001). The reason behind such attachment can be primarily the sense of structure coursebooks bring to the ever-changing L2 classroom. They are identified as "the visible heart of any ELT programme" or even "an almost universal element of ELT teaching" by the leading figures of materials evaluation, for whom

* The data of this study was derived from the second author's thesis supervised by the first/corresponding author.
Tel.: +90-216-418-9616
E-mail address: malliday@gmail.com

"no teaching-learning situation" would be "complete" without having its relevant textbook (Hutchinson & Torres, 1994, pp. 315-317; Sheldon, 1988, p. 237).

Despite this assumed importance of the coursebook, there is still an ongoing debate around its instructional value. The supporters of the pro-textbook view argue that coursebooks are good at: (i) providing a clear framework or syllabus for a systematic presentation of language items, (ii) supporting inexperienced teachers with extra resources, and methodological guidance, (iii) helping learners to revise and progress without the teacher, and (iv) presenting primary input in convenient and multimodal ways (Cunningsworth, 1995; Harmer, 2001; Hutchinson & Torres, 1994; Ramzjoo, 2010; Richards, 2001; Tomlinson, 2008; Ur, 1996). As for those holding the anti-textbook view, the coursebook is denounced for: (i) lacking variety and relevance for the specific context, (ii) presenting inauthentic language through limited, repetitive, de-contextualised activities, (iii) having commercial concerns rather than pedagogical ones, and (iv) reducing teacher's creativity along with learner's motivation (Harmer, 2001; Harwood, 2005; Littlejohn, 2012; Richards, 2001; Tomlinson, 2008; Ur, 1999). In brief, the pro-textbook view leaves it to the users to decide for themselves whether a certain textbook content is appropriate, while the anti-textbook view reifies teacher competence as providers of sound, pedagogical, and relevant content (Harwood, 2005).

It is evident that even after two decades, Sheldon's (1988, p. 237) description of coursebooks as "necessary evils" holds true, and "whether we like it or not", they will occupy a central position in the EFL classes worldwide. Having become a more commercial than pedagogical product in the "multi-million pound industry" of ELT publishing, it becomes even more important and challenging to choose the best possible coursebook for a particular group of learners among a multitude of equally capable alternatives (Hadley, 2014; Kitao & Kitao, 1997; Sheldon, 1988, p. 237). However, few language teachers are granted the right to use the coursebook that they have selected on the basis of self-perceived learner needs, and interests. As in the case of Turkey, a centralised ministerial approach is predominantly adopted in materials selection, where the individual teacher has little to say, and is made to implement a unified series across the country (Byrd, 2001). Yet, three main methods can be determined for evaluating ELT materials in the coursebook literature; namely, the impressionistic method, checklist method, and in-depth method (McGrath, 2002). The impressionistic method involves a general overview of the coursebook by looking at its blurb, contents page, organisation, topics, layout and visuals, whereas the in-depth method deals with a closer analysis of the materials' claims by examining unit samples (McGrath, 2002). It is the checklist method that combines the objectivity of system with the subjectivity of impression and helps teachers if they cannot form intuitive judgments due to their inexperience, or if they need more objective judgments while evaluating materials in teams (McGrath, 2002; Nimehchisalem & Mukundan, 2013).

1.1. Literature review

Checklists as items to be ticked for confirmation are appreciated for being "systematic" (containing all important elements), "cost effective" (recording big data quickly), "convenient" (easing comparison between sets of materials), and "explicit" (providing a common framework for final decisions) (McGrath, 2002, pp. 26-27). Moreover, Mukundan and Ahour (2010, p. 336) defined the checklist as "a facilitator" of the materials selection process, and ascertained by analysing 48 checklists of the 1970-2007 period that despite the lack of a specific pattern in their arrangement, the available checklists shared a common set of criteria such as students, teachers, content, skills and practice, whereas constructs like clarity, culture, kinds of activities, exercises, interest, layout, and tests could be cited as other focal areas in these tools.

Although the size and period of the samples varied, similar analyses of influential checklists revealed that they had overlapping coursebook features under different (sub)categories, and different developers adopted common-core or even identical items of evaluative criteria despite the change in time and place (Ansary & Babaii, 2002; Huang, 2011; Jahangard, 2007; Karamoozian & Riazi, 2008; Mukundan & Ahour, 2010; Mukundan, Hajimohammadi & Nimehchisalem, 2011; Mukundan, Nimehchisalem & Hajimohammadi, 2011; Mukundan & Nimehchisalem, 2012; Nimehchisalem & Mukundan, 2015; Riazi, 2003). For instance, Ansary and Babaii (2002) claimed that the 21-year gap between Tucker's (1975) and Ur's (1996) checklists did not much change the "grounds on which one might criticise or reject a textbook" (Ur, 1996, p. 186), and they demonstrated how good coursebooks could be determined on the basis of four summary categories derived from the corpus of ten checklists and textbook reviews: i. approach (language-learning views, theoretical practice), ii. content presentation (course/individual objectives, content selection-gradation-sequencing, syllabus satisfaction, teacher guidance, supplementary materials for students), iii. physical make-up (size, layout, durability), iv. administrative concerns (state policies, price, culture/religion/gender in the local context). In the same way, Jahangard (2007) extracted these 13 common coursebook features from ten evaluation schemes: realisation of objectives, vocabulary presentation and practice, appropriacy of approaches for the target group, revision and test materials, choice of visuals, topics and tasks, clarity of instructions, attractive design, content organisation, authentic language use, grammar presentation and practice, skills practice, learner strategy training.

Just as checklists closely resemble in evaluative criteria and categorical organisation, so they suffer from the same problem of context-sensitivity. Since it has sufficed for most checklists to make a collage of the items used in their predecessors, or to reword and reclassify them into a supposedly more practical version, they may not reflect the true picture of a coursebook's capacity to meet the needs and wants of a specific user group. Consequently, it is best practice to capitalise on both empirically generalised criteria and self-determined priorities of the local classroom situations for making a contextually-relevant choice among all other coursebooks (Ansary & Babaii, 2002; Cunningsworth, 1995; Huang, 2011; Karamoozian & Riazi, 2008; McGrath, 2002; Mukundan et al., 2011; Mukundan & Nimehchisalem, 2012; Roberts, 1996; Shatery & Azargoon, 2012). Different types of coursebook users may have differing or conflicting interests, while the same material "judged by the same criteria" might not be welcome or successful in another context (Sheldon, 1988, p. 245). Instead of judging candidate coursebooks by borrowed criteria, teachers should try "adapting evaluative items to suit the particular demands of the teaching situation" or, more precisely, they should "evolve their own sets of criteria" (Williams, 1983, p. 253).

To this end, they need to specify both: i. what coursebook features are of more urgent concern (weighting), and ii. to what extent their given coursebook owns these features (rating). Hutchinson and Waters (1987) warned that rating results alone can be misleading for diagnosing the most suitable coursebook, as the highest score may be obtained from a single area, and recommended measuring concentrations in the areas the users find most important. As a result, combined use of rating and weighting scales has been strongly advocated, for it not only "permits a checklist which has been developed elsewhere to be fine-tuned to the requirements of a particular context", but also helps "to make comparisons between competing sets of materials both globally and in relation to specific criteria or sets of criteria" (McGrath, 2002, p. 50).

Compared to qualitative ones, quantitative checklists are few, and even fewer quantitative checklists require rating and weighting coursebook features at the same time (Mukundan & Ahour, 2010). Although the earliest example of a weighting system was provided in Tucker's (1975) checklist, importance-weighting "seem[ed] not to attract emulation", excluding his two eminent followers, Williams (1983) and Cunningsworth (1984) (Roberts, 1996, p. 376). Still very few checklists have since

been documented having both rating and weighting schemes. In the 1990s, four such checklists were developed by Skierso (1991), Ur (1996), Chambers (1997) and Gearing (1999). In Skierso's (1991) checklist, users rate their level of satisfaction by assigning a value of 0-4 (4: excellent; 3: good; 2: adequate; 1: weak; 0: lacking) to each item, while the amount of importance they attach to items is demonstrated with letters/numbers (A/4: absolutely required; B/2: beneficial; N/0: not applicable). In Ur's (1996) checklist, users mark varying degrees of perceived importance by using symbols (✓✓: very important; ✓: fairly important; ?: not sure; X: not important; XX: totally unimportant). Chambers (1997) used a scale of 0-10 for both weighing the importance of desirable features and assessing their relative presence, whereas Gearing (1999) preferred points of 1-3 to indicate how important an item is for the evaluator, and whether they (partially) (dis)agree with each. Both recommended multiplying ratings with weightings and obtaining total scores to ease group decision-making between candidate coursebooks (Chambers, 1997; Gearing, 1999).

A review of the recent attempts to develop checklists has shown that despite their general tendency to apply importance-weighting through a similar merit scoring system, most coursebook researchers avoided writing out their own items, and opted to adapt and/or supplement existing items in universally acclaimed checklists and their previously adapted versions (e.g. AbdelWahab, 2013; Alamri, 2008; Miekley, 2005; Shatery & Azargoon, 2012; Soori, Kafipour & Soury, 2011; Xu, 2004; Zabawa, 2001). Having been developed for a wide range of contexts, including Canada and Saudi Arabia, these checklists were aimed for use by teachers, and besides item authenticity, they lacked standardisation. There were three studies from the Malaysian and Iranian contexts, where evaluative criteria were specified in line with the ELT coursebook literature, and items were designed anew after user interviews (Karamifar, Barati & Youhanaee, 2014; Mukundan et al., 2011; Mukundan & Nimehchisalem, 2012; Nimehchisalem & Mukundan, 2013; Zohrabi, 2011). Mukundan et al.'s (2011) finalised version of the 38-item weighted checklist was piloted with 207 language teachers in Malaysia and subjected to tests of reliability and validity (Mukundan & Nimehchisalem, 2012; Nimehchisalem & Mukundan, 2013). It was not indicated in Zohrabi's (2011) study whether reliability and validity measures were calculated for his 21-item questionnaire. Neither the 40-item teacher form nor the 25-item student form of Karamifar et al.'s (2014) Likert-type checklist was standardised in the Iranian context.

As for the Turkish context, almost identical items were compiled from the aforementioned influential checklists and/or their previously adapted versions, while their validity was not confirmed by factor analysis, either (e.g. Arıkan, 2008; Aytuğ, 2007; Kayapınar, 2009; Oflaz, 2009; Özdemir, 2007; Özeş, 2012; Taylan, 2013; Tekir & Arıkan, 2007; Tok, 2010). In developing evaluative instruments, the coursebook researchers in Turkey seemed to depend solely on expert opinions and/or reliability statistics but were comparatively more concerned with eliciting teacher and student views on local English coursebooks through their Likert-type scales (e.g. Arıkan, 2008; Aytuğ, 2007; Kayapınar, 2009; Oflaz, 2009; Özdemir, 2007; Özeş, 2012; Sümen, 2008; Taylan, 2013; Tekir & Arıkan, 2007; Tok, 2010). In Ezici's (2006) and Çelik's (2011) studies, authentic checklist items were developed on the basis of literature review, user interviews, and expert opinions, and piloted before large-scale implementation. Yet, it was only in Çelik's (2011) research that both teachers and students as consumers were questioned about the efficiency of their local English coursebooks through fully standardised checklist forms.

Rather than localising established criteria or constructing context-sensitive items through importance-weighting, the checklists in the Turkish context focused on measuring the general satisfaction levels of teachers and students, and failed to provide reliable, truthful evaluations of ELT materials. Since satisfaction is a relative concept, determined individually, and varying according to one's aims, needs, and past experiences, the specific requirements of any teaching context should first be identified, and usefulness should be judged not by prepackaged criteria but by the (mis)match between user priorities/consumer expectations, and the coursebook's offerings/performance (Ansary &

Babaii, 2012; Pizam & Ellis, 1999, p. 328). Still, there has been little research into the development of a standardised instrument for contextually relevant materials evaluation (Karamoozian & Riazi, 2008; Mahfoodh & Bhanegaonkar, 2013; Roberts, 1996; Shatery & Azargoon, 2012; Zohrabi, 2011). For this reason, this study aims to investigate the overall and genuine satisfaction levels of seventh-graders from a locally-produced, governmentally-approved English coursebook through the use of a standardised, particularised, weighted checklist tailored to consumer preferences.

1.2. Research questions

The research questions of the study can be worded as follows: i. How do teacher users evaluate their local English coursebook in general, and in their own primary focus areas? ii. Do teacher evaluations change with respect to their gender, experience, and amount of textbook use? and iii. How do student users evaluate their local English coursebook in general, and in their own primary focus areas?

2. Method

2.1. Research design

Although they lack the ability of experimental designs to explain causal relationships between variables, survey designs are still regarded popular research models in educational circles, as they serve well "to describe the attitudes, opinions, behaviours or characteristics" of a sample or entire population by collecting quantitative data with questionnaires and identifying the trends in their responses through statistical analyses (Creswell, 2012, p. 376). For this reason, the current study adopted a cross-sectional survey design with the purpose of determining the efficiency of a locally-produced English coursebook from the perspectives of teachers and students against contextually-relevant, user-preferred criteria.

2.2. Participants

The participants of this study were 500 seventh-graders (216 female, 284 male) and 85 English teachers (48 female, 37 male) from eight public middle schools in high-, middle- and low- income regions of Mersin (on Turkey's Mediterranean coast). 23.5% of the teachers had 1-5 years, 24.7% 6-10 years, and 51.8% had more than ten years of professional experience. To make sure that the individuals were selected proportional to their representation in the population, stratified random sampling was used, which involved "dividing the population by the stratum" and "sampling within each group in the stratum" (Creswell, 2012, p. 144). When the participants were administered the checklists for coursebook evaluation, they had been using the new A2-level local English coursebook (Sunshine 7) for two terms during their six-hour weekly study of English in the 2014-2015 academic year.

2.3. Data collection procedures

The quantitative data was collected with two importance-weighted Likert-type checklists. The following procedures were followed in the development of the teacher and student forms of the particularised coursebook checklist (PCC):

1. Item pools were generated from the interviews with the participants.

2. 72 items for the initial teacher form and 56 items for the student form were drafted and presented in a predetermined factor structure to a group of English teachers and seventh-graders.

3. On the basis of their feedback, the teacher form was restructured, whereas the student form remained almost the same excluding some changes in the wording.

4. The revised checklists were piloted with 300 seventh-graders and 50 English teachers.

5. To ensure validity, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were performed, for the former (EFA) helped to determine the underlying factor structure, and the latter (CFA) to verify/test the predetermined factor structure (Henson and Roberts, 2006, p. 395).

6. In EFA, items with a low factor loading (below 0.32) were eliminated, and the remaining 32 items in the teacher form were grouped under the single factor of "evaluative criteria".

7. In CFA, the fit indices, RMSEA: 0.050, NFI: 0.84, NNFI: 0.90, CFI: 0.92, RMR: 0.65, IFI: 0.92, GFI: 0.91, indicated a perfect fit, and the remaining 21 items on the student form were placed under the six factors of visual design, cultural awareness, students' needs, self-instruction, overall construction, and authenticity.

8. To ensure reliability, Cronbach's alpha was calculated, where the teacher form was found "excellent" (0.935), and the student form "acceptable" (0.735) according to George and Mallery's (2003, p. 231) categorisation of the coefficient as "excellent: $\alpha>0.9$, good: $\alpha>0.8$, acceptable: $\alpha>0.7$, questionable: $\alpha>0.6$, poor: $\alpha>0.5$, and unacceptable: $\alpha<0.5$".

The final forms of the teacher and student checklists contain 32 and 21 items respectively and require two kinds of scoring for the overall satisfaction on a 5-point scale (1: strongly disagree; 2: disagree; 3: not sure; 4: agree; 5: strongly agree), and for the perceived importance/priority of each item on a 3-point scale (1: important; 2: very important; 3: most important). For example, a teacher may "strongly disagree" with the fourth item on the checklist ("The activities are designed carefully for the learner types") and give 1 point for the satisfactoriness of the coursebook in this feature. If s/he regards this fourth item as a "most important" criterion in materials evaluation, the teacher may give 3 points for the importance of the feature itself. When the satisfaction and importance ratings are multiplied, the raw score for the item can be obtained. For the fourth item, the raw score (satisfaction x importance) makes 3 (1x3). Raw scores are finally rescaled by using Cummins's (1997) weighting algorithm, where they are further multiplied by the relevant domain score (3: strongly agree; 2: agree; 1: not sure; -2: disagree; -3: strongly disagree). Therefore, the weighted score makes -9 (-3x3) in this example.

To determine a respondent's overall satisfaction with the coursebook, an unweighted total score is calculated by adding the satisfaction ratings. In the same way, a weighted total score is obtained through the sum of all weighted scores, so that the genuine satisfaction levels of each respondent can be revealed with respect to their preferential coursebook features. As for the interpretation of the unweighted and weighted total scores, the following scheme is used for defining high, medium, and low score ranges. The total number of items (32 in the teacher form, and 21 in the student form) is multiplied by the highest, medium, and lowest values of rating and weighting (5, 3, 1 in the unweighted mode, and 9, 3, -9 in the weighted mode). For instance, the highest possible score for the student checklist is 105 (21 x 5), the medium 63 (21x3), and the lowest equals to 21 (21x1) in the unweighted mode, whereas in the weighted mode, the highest possible score for the student checklist is 189 (21x9), the medium 63 (21x3), and the lowest equals to -189 (21x-9). In this way, the boundary scores can be determined for all three ranges, and both modes of evaluation as in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Unweighted and weighted score ranges

Score Range	Teacher Checklist		Student Checklist	
	Unweighted	Weighted	Unweighted	Weighted
High	97-160	65-288	65-105	64-189
Medium	65-96	32-64	43-64	22-63
Low	32-64	-288-31	21-42	-189-21

2.4. Data analysis

In this study, Cronbach's alpha and factor analysis were used for ensuring the reliability and validity of PCC. Descriptive statistics were used for summarising the crucial characteristics of sample data and developing a general understanding of satisfaction scores (Heinman, 2011). Frequencies, percentages, standard deviations, and means were calculated to determine the participants' general attitudes towards the coursebook's efficiency. Normality tests were conducted to determine whether the data from their evaluation scores had a normal distribution, and parametric tests could be subsequently applied. Because there were 85 teachers, and 500 students in this study (n>50), Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was preferred to determine the normality of their evaluation scores (Büyüköztürk, 2011, p. 42). Skewness and kurtosis were also calculated for judging the normality of their data, and as with kurtosis, a skewness value between ±2.0 was considered acceptable according to George and Mallery (2016). Finally, inferential statistics were used for verifying relationships between the given population and their scores (Heinman, 2011). The independent samples t-test, and analyses of variance (one-way ANOVA) were performed to indicate whether the teachers' views changed with respect to these variables: gender, experience, and length of textbook use. SPSS 21 and LISREL 8.1 were used for the analysis of the current data.

3. Results

In this section, the findings from the user responses on the efficiency of their locally-produced English textbook were presented in the same order as they appeared in PCC.

3.1. Teacher users' overall evaluation of Sunshine 7

In response to the first research question, 85 teachers evaluated the coursebook's capacity to meet their specific needs in terms of six areas: i. the teaching context, ii. exercises and activities, iii. coursebook content, iv. sensitivity to sociocultural issues, v. organisation and visual design, and vi. supplementary materials. The first ten items in the teacher form collected their opinions on the material's compatibility with important course parameters like learner types (age, proficiency, background, interests), course objectives, syllabus, class size, nature of activities. Table 2 displayed the summary of their responses in relation their teaching context below.

The distribution of the teacher responses in Table 2 showed that they were not much satisfied with the coursebook's performance in meeting the specific needs of their students, and classroom situation. Its most evident deficiency lies in the inapplicability of the activities to large classes, as 80% believed that they were not designed according to the class size. Also, 78.9% argued that the activities did not appeal to different types of learners. 67.1% noted that the material did not seem to care about the readiness level of the students. As to its suitability for multi-level classes, the coursebook was a failure

for 63.6% of the teachers. Similarly, 62.3% stated that the coursebook's adopted methodology did not harmonise with the teaching approaches approved nationally and internationally. Over half of them (53%) thought that the activities could be finished in the given number of class hours, considering the unit length. But almost an equal portion (47%) complained about the misfit between the educational attainments defined, and students' level. While the teachers were divided on the attractiveness of the content (40% proponents, 42.3% opponents), more than 50% agreed that it was compatible with the English curriculum for seventh-graders.

Table 2. Teacher views on the coursebook's compatibility with the teaching context

Items	*SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. The activities are adequate for performing in the class environment.	22	25.9	23	27.1	17	20	17	20	6	7.1
2. The interests of the age group are considered during the content design.	21	24.7	15	17.6	15	17.6	27	31.8	7	8.2
3. The objectives are suitable for the level of the learners.	25	29.4	15	17.6	15	17.6	26	30.6	4	4.7
4. The activities are designed carefully for learner types.	31	36.5	36	42.4	11	12.9	6	7.1	1	1.2
5. The readiness level is obviously a concern for the coursebook.	34	40	23	27.1	15	17.6	9	10.6	4	4.7
6. The coursebook is designed in line with the language teaching approaches approved nationally and internationally.	25	29.4	28	32.9	15	17.6	16	18.8	1	1.2
7. The coursebook follows the English curriculum for seventh-graders.	18	21.2	11	12.9	6	7.1	41	48.2	9	10.6
8. The activities are designed considering large classes.	40	47.1	28	32.9	13	15.3	2	2.4	2	2.4
9. The content is well-adjusted to the class hours.	27	31.8	18	21.2	12	14.1	23	27.1	5	5.9
10. The coursebook takes into account that each student in the class has a different level of proficiency.	31	36.5	23	27.1	18	21.2	11	12.9	2	2.4

*SD: Strongly Disagree; D: Disagree; NS: Not Sure; A: Agree; SA: Strongly Agree

Because they form the greater and maybe the most important part of the teacher's lesson plan, exercises and activities were assessed against the following criteria: motivational features, clarity of the workbook's instructions, appeal to learner interests, variety, ability to create an authentic environment, and support for creative thinking. Table 3 presented the teachers' responses regarding the exercises and activities of Sunshine 7.

Table 3. Teacher views on the coursebook's exercises and activities

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
11. The activities motivate students to learn English.	27	31.8	22	25.9	23	27.1	13	15.3	0	0
12. The instructions of the workbook activities are suitable for their level.	26	30.6	18	21.2	6	7.1	27	31.8	8	9.4
13. The activities in the workbook are chosen from the areas appealing to students' interests.	26	30.6	20	23.5	12	14.1	23	27.1	4	4.7
14. The activities are varied in teaching techniques.	25	29.4	27	31.8	19	22.4	14	16.5	0	0
15. The coursebook is useful for creating an authentic environment for teaching.	42	49.4	28	32.9	9	10.6	5	4.9	1	1.2
16. There are some activities supporting creative thinking.	26	30.6	27	31.8	14	16.5	16	18.8	2	2.4

According to Table 3, the teachers indicated an overall dissatisfaction with all six requirements from the exercises and activities, but the widest gap between the negative and positive teacher responses was detected in Item15, where 82.3% argued against the possibility of creating an authentic atmosphere of teaching with the local English coursebook. It was found most deficient in its support for creative thinking. For 62.4%, it could not provide their learners with enough opportunities for improving creative thinking skills. Not surprisingly, 61.2% criticised the activities for disallowing the use of varied teaching techniques, whereas 57.7% found them unable to motivate students to learn English. Another 54.1% drew attention to its inability to capture learner interest. Finally, the instructions of the workbook activities were considered ill-suited to students' level by 51.8% of the teachers.

Thirdly, the teachers evaluated the textbook content; i.e. how critical course components like grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and topics for contextualisation were dealt with. Table 4 summarised their opinions on the overall content choice, topical appropriacy, quality of grammatical explanations, and listening texts below.

Table 4. Teacher views on the coursebook's content

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
17. The topics covered are not attractive for students.	7	8.2	34	40	4	4.7	18	21.2	22	25.9
18. The topics are chosen from daily life.	9	10.6	20	23.5	12	14.1	38	44.7	6	7.1
19. The listening texts provide an accurate model of pronunciation.	16	18.8	26	30.6	9	10.6	29	34.1	5	5.9
20. The coursebook provides grammatical explanations.	35	41.2	30	35.3	2	2.4	16	18.8	2	2.4
21. I sometimes feel confused about what to teach, as the content is oversimplified.	5	5.9	23	27.1	15	17.6	18	21.2	24	28.2

As can be told from Table 4, the teachers found everything about the textbook unsatisfactory except its topical choice. 76.5% remarked on the lack of grammatical explanations, which may negatively influence students' efforts for self-study. Its two equally-weighted deficiencies related to the absence of a good model for pronunciation, and shallowness of its content (49.4%). However, slightly over half believed Sunshine 7 provided students with real life topics, which could facilitate their internalisation of the presented items (51.8%). Similarly, the topical relevance of its units was acclaimed by 48.2%.

The teachers were also surveyed about how they found the representations of gender roles and culture in the material. Table 5 demonstrated their evaluation of the material's sensitivity to sociocultural issues.

Table 5. Teacher views on the coursebook's sensitivity to sociocultural issues

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
22. Characters are distributed in line with gender.	25	29.4	23	27.1	16	18.8	18	21.2	3	3.5
23. It is possible to find information about the culture of native speakers.	34	40	30	35.3	16	18.8	4	4.7	1	1.2
24. Various cultures are introduced in the textbook.	28	32.9	29	34.1	19	22.4	9	10.6	0	0
25. There are characters from different cultures.	24	28.2	20	23.5	14	16.5	25	29.4	2	2.4

It is clear from Table 5 that the teachers had the tendency to blame the coursebook for being insensitive to gender and culture issues, but the highest level of discontent was felt in Item23: 75.3%

demanded the presentation of the cultures, where English is spoken as L1. In the same way, over half of them maintained that Sunshine 7 failed to provide a variety of cultural content (67%), and characters from different cultures (51.7%), and that the coursebook did not have a balanced distribution of opposite sexes (56.5%). In Table 6, the items from 26-30 elicited their opinions on its performance in: page design, visual quality, general layout, and comprehensibility of instructions.

Table 6. Teacher views on the coursebook's organisation and visual design

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
26. It is hard to follow the order of the activities.	20	23.5	30	35.3	5	5.9	12	14.1	18	21.2
27. Visuals are attractive.	16	18.8	27	31.8	11	12.9	27	31.8	4	4.7
28. Units stand in harmony.	18	21.2	31	36.5	6	7.1	26	30.6	4	4.7
29. Instructions are clear throughout the coursebook.	26	30.6	15	17.6	5	5.9	32	37.6	7	8.2
30. Content page provides useful information.	21	24.7	16	18.8	18	21.2	23	27.1	7	8.2

As can be understood from Table 6, the teachers' negative attitude continued in their evaluation of organisational and visual features. It was only the sequencing of the activities that satisfied 58.8% of the respondents. As for the harmony between units, 57.7% found them disconnected, whereas 50.6% were displeased with unattractive illustrations. The situation was similar in the content page, which turned out to be "unhelpful" for 43.5%. The teachers were divided on the clarity of instructions: 45.8% were in favor, while 48.2% rejected the idea of their being comprehensible.

Table 7. Teacher views on the coursebook's supplementary materials

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
31. The teachers' book provides alternative activities.	41	48.2	35	41.2	5	5.9	4	4.7	0	0
32. The teachers' book is designed as a survivor.	46	54.1	28	32.9	3	3.5	8	9.4	0	0

They were ultimately asked to evaluate its supplementary resources, which corresponded to the teacher's manual. Table 7 reflected how useful they found the teacher's book in guiding the flow of their lessons. Almost all were displeased with the teacher's book. 9.4% agreed that it served well when they were in need of help. On the other hand, 89.4% reported that they were unable to find alternative exercises in the teachers' book. To sum up, the local English coursebook was found inefficient by the majority of the teachers in: i. providing alternative activities, ii. creating an authentic environment, iii. building activities for different learner types, iv. adjusting to large and multi-level classes, v. providing grammar explanations, vi. observing students' readiness, vii. informing about the target cultures, and viii. ensuring harmony between units.

3.2. Teacher users' weighted evaluation of Sunshine 7

When the teachers rated the same items with regard to their relative importance, not only the features that they gave most prominence but also the performance of the locally-produced English coursebook in these prioritised areas could be explored. After they assigned an importance label for each coursebook feature, weighted item frequencies were calculated, and the checklist items were rearranged in a descending order of importance as in Table 8.

Table 8. Weighted item frequencies for the teacher form

Item Number	Important		Very Important		Most Important	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
10	5	5.9	30	35.3	50	58.8
12	12	14.1	24	28.2	49	57.6
4	15	17.6	22	25.9	48	56.5
28	10	11.8	27	31.8	48	56.5
30	5	5.9	32	37.6	48	56.5
26	13	15.3	25	29.4	47	55.3
2	21	24.7	18	21.2	46	54.1
8	13	15.3	26	30.6	46	54.1
16	9	10.6	30	35.3	46	54.1
19	12	14.1	27	31.8	46	54.1
3	21	24.7	19	22.4	45	52.9
20	15	17.6	26	30.6	44	51.8
22	20	23.5	22	25.9	43	50.6
6	13	15.3	30	35.3	42	49.4
7	7	8.2	36	42.4	42	49.4
17	16	18.8	28	32.9	41	48.2
31	16	18.8	28	32.9	41	48.2
23	12	14.1	33	38.8	40	47.1
24	12	14.1	33	38.8	40	47.1
29	8	9.4	37	43.5	40	47.1
13	9	10.6	37	43.5	39	45.9
1	20	23.5	27	31.8	38	44.7
5	9	10.6	38	44.7	38	44.7

Table 8 (continued)

Item Number	Important		Very Important		Most Important	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
15	15	17.6	32	37.6	38	44.7
14	10	11.8	38	44.7	37	43.5
9	18	21.2	31	36.5	36	42.4
11	16	18.8	34	40	35	41.2
21	20	23.5	30	35.3	35	41.2
25	12	14.1	38	44.7	35	41.2
32	18	21.2	32	37.6	35	41.2
27	13	15.3	38	44.7	34	40

According to Table 8, 13 items were considered as "most important" for over 50% of the teachers. These user-preferred coursebook features involved: i. observing different proficiency levels (Item10), ii. providing comprehensible instructions (Item12), iii. considering different learner types (Item4), iv. creating harmony between units (Item28), v. presenting a useful content page (Item30), vi. sequencing activities (Item26), vii. appealing to learner interests (Item2), viii. preparing suitable activities for large classes (Item8), ix. fostering creative thinking (Item16), x. producing a good model for pronunciation (Item19), xi. adjusting educational attainments to students' level (Item3), xii. giving grammar explanations (Item20), and xiii. respecting gender differences (Item22). As the five most important criteria belonged to the teaching context category, the teachers seemed more concerned about the variables of the learning environment in materials evaluation. When their responses were reevaluated on the basis of these 13 prioritised areas of concern, their local English coursebook proved a total failure in all the top-rated qualities the teachers had been seeking in an ideal material for the specific context; excepting one single satisfactory area of the sequencing of the activities. Table 9 presented their unweighted scores; i.e. overall impression, as well as weighted scores, indicating how far the locally-produced English coursebook met their expectations in terms of their most vital criteria.

Table 9. Distribution of teachers' evaluation scores according to satisfaction levels

Satisfaction Levels	Evaluation Mode			
	Unweighted		Weighted	
	f	%	f	%
High (97-160)	22	26	1	1
Medium (65-96)	0	0	0	0
Low (32-64)	63	74	84	99
Total	85	100	85	100

According to Table 9, 63 teachers gave low scores to Sunshine 7, whereas only 22 gave it more than 96 points, indicating large-scale dissatisfaction in the unweighted mode. However, the situation became

even more serious in the weighted mode, where the population of the high-scorers fell from 22 to 1. Therefore, it became evident with importance-weighting that the locally-produced English coursebook failed to meet the primary demands made by 99% of the teachers, and that it was found most unsatisfactory in adjusting to different levels of proficiency, and learner types during the design of its activities. The second research question explores the interaction between the teachers' evaluation scores and variables of gender, experience, and textbook use. As the sample size was greater than 50, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used for indicating the normality of their evaluation scores each time.

Table 10. The results of normality tests for gender groups

Unweighted Scores	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
			Statistic	sd	p	Statistic	sd	p
Female	-.200	-.926	.071	48	.200	.969	48	.229
Male	-.255	-.803	.102	37	.200	.967	37	.332
Weighted Scores	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
			Statistic	sd	p	Statistic	sd	p
Female	.371	-.685	.093	48	.200	.963	48	.131
Male	.471	-.537	.157	37	.022	.960	37	.199

According to the results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in Table 10, the female and male scores did not have a significant deviation from the normal distribution ($p>0.05$) in both modes of evaluation, for the weighted scores of the male teachers could also be considered to have a normal distribution by looking at their skewness (.471) and kurtosis (-.537) values. As a result, the independent samples t-test was used for determining the interaction between their evaluation scores, and gender in both modes of evaluation.

Table 11. Relationship between teachers' evaluation scores and gender

Gender	Evaluation Mode											
	Unweighted						Weighted					
	n	$\overline{X}$	S	sd	t	p>0.05	n	$\overline{X}$	S	sd	t	p>0.05
Female	48	75.89	22.7	83	.829	.409	48	-5.79	76.1	83	-1.02	.308
Male	37	79.97	22.1				37	11.18	75.2			

As shown in Table 11, the mean scores of the male teachers ($\overline{X}$= 79.97; $\overline{X}$= 11.18) were always higher than the female ($\overline{X}$= 75.89; $\overline{X}$= -5.79), but there was no significant difference between their mean scores in weighted and unweighted modes: t(83) = .829, p (.409)>0.05; t(83) = -1.02, p (.308)>0.05. Thus, gender did not have any influence over the teachers' evaluation scores.

Table 12. Distribution of teachers' evaluation scores according to professional experience

Experience	n	Evaluation Mode			
		Unweighted		Weighted	
		$\overline{X}$	ss	$\overline{X}$	ss
1-5 years	20	82.3	20.9	5.6	84.4
6-10 years	21	73.7	23.1	.38	81.6
11-15 years	21	83.8	19.4	22	68.3
16-more	23	71.5	24.5	-19.4	62.6

When their weighted and unweighted evaluation scores were grouped according to their length of experience in Table 12, it was seen that the participants with 11-15 years of teaching gave relatively higher scores than those in the other groups ($\overline{X}$= 83.8; $\overline{X}$= 22).

Table 13. The results of normality tests for experience groups

Unweighted Scores	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
			Statistic	sd	p	Statistic	sd	p
1-5 years	-.576	-.373	.138	20	.200	.936	20	.204
6-10 years	.056	-1.099	.138	21	.200	.953	21	.387
11-15 years	.037	-1.138	.145	21	.200	.947	21	.295
16-more	-.074	-1.023	.143	23	.200	.960	23	.464
Weighted Scores	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
			Statistic	sd	p	Statistic	sd	p
1-5 years	.274	-.799	.146	20	.200	.950	20	.363
6-10 years	.475	-.741	.157	21	.191	.922	21	.095
11-15 years	.437	-.505	.216	21	.011	.948	21	.313
16- more	.519	-.044	.117	23	.200	.963	23	.526

According to the results of Kolmogorov Smirnov test in Table 13, the data collected from different experience groups had a normal distribution ($p>0.05$), for the weighted scores of the teachers with 11-15 years of experience could also be considered to have a normal distribution by looking at their skewness (.437) and kurtosis (-.505) values.

Table 14. Relationship between teachers' evaluation scores and experience

Evaluation Mode		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p>0.05
Unweighted	Between Groups	2407.5	3	802.5	1.6	.189
	Within Groups	39841.2	81	491.8		
	Total	42248.7	84			
Weighted	Between Groups	19275.2	3	6425.08	1.1	.344
	Within Groups	462747.1	81	5712.9		
	Total	482022.4	84			

By using one-way variance analysis (ANOVA), the teachers' evaluation scores were compared against four classes of professional experience. Table 14 demonstrated that their unweighted and weighted scores did not change significantly with respect to the number of years they spent in the teaching profession: F(3, 81)=1.6, p (.189)>0.05; F(3, 81)=1.1, p (.344)>0.05. In short, professional experience had no effect on the teachers' views of their local English coursebook.

Table 15. Distribution of teachers' evaluation scores according to coursebook use

Duration	n	Evaluation Mode			
		Unweighted		Weighted	
		$\overline{X}$	ss	$\overline{X}$	ss
10-15 min	20	69.9	21.05	-27.3	69.5
15-20 min	23	79.8	22.7	15.08	75.6
20-30 min	22	86	22.7	26.5	78
30-40 min	20	73.7	20.9	-12.4	71.6

In Table 15, their evaluation scores were categorised with respect to their amount of textbook use within a class hour. It was observed that 22 teachers used it for more than half of the lesson (20-30 min), and their unweighted and weighted evaluation scores were considerably higher ($\overline{X}$=86; $\overline{X}$= 26.5).

According to the results of Kolmogorov Smirnov test in Table 16, the data collected from different duration groups had a normal distribution (p>0.05), for the weighted scores of the teachers with 30-40 minutes of textbook use could also be considered to have a normal distribution by looking at their skewness (1.217) and kurtosis (1.143) values.

Table 16. The results of normality tests for duration groups

Unweighted Scores	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
			Statistic	sd	p	Statistic	sd	p
10-15 min	.028	-.765	.109	20	.200	.952	20	.402
15-20 min	-.640	-.346	.121	23	.200	.939	23	.174

20-30 min	-.669	-.385	.153	22	.197	.939	22	.185
30-40 min	.228	-.747	.120	20	.200	.953	20	.423
Weighted Scores	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
			Statistic	sd	p	Statistic	sd	p
10-15 min	.247	-.849	.106	20	.200	.962	20	.590
15-20 min	.396	-.549	.137	23	.200	.960	23	.471
20-30 min	-.134	-.870	.197	22	.026	.940	22	.200
30-40 min	1.217	1.143	.214	20	.017	.879	20	.017

Consequently, one-way variance analyses were conducted in both evaluative modes to decide if their total scores were affected by the duration of their textbook use, and the results were tabulated below.

Table 17. Relationship between teachers' evaluation scores and coursebook use

Evaluation Mode		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p>0.05
Unweighted	Between Groups	19275.2	3	6425.08	1.1	.096
	Within Groups	462747.1	81	5712.92		
	Total	482022.4	84			
Weighted	Between Groups	38633.7	3	12877.9	2.3	.078
	Within Groups	443388.6	81	5473.9		
	Total	482022.4	84			

Table 17 indicated that the teachers' unweighted and weighted scores were unaffected by the change in the amount of class time they spared for coursebook use across all four groups: $F(3, 81)= 1.1$, p (.096)>0.05; $F(3, 81)= 2.3$, p (.078)>0.05. In other words, the teachers' amount of textbook use did not influence their perceptions of the coursebook's efficiency.

3.3. Student users' overall evaluation of Sunshine 7

500 seventh-graders were administered a 21-item checklist to evaluate their local coursebook's efficiency in six areas: i. visual design, ii. cultural awareness, iii. student needs, iv. overall construction, v. self-instruction, and vi. authenticity. The first three items on the student form questioned how they viewed the general organisation of illustrations; i.e. their density, relation to activities, and the rationale behind use. The distribution of their responses was shown below.

Table 18. Student views on the coursebook's visual design

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. It is hard to follow the order of the activities.	152	30.4	111	22.2	97	19.4	57	11.4	83	16.6
2. The coursebook pages look disconnected.	174	34.8	96	19.2	94	18.8	56	11.2	80	16
3. The page design is confusing.	158	31.6	97	19.4	104	20.8	53	10.6	88	17.6

Table 18 demonstrated that the visual design was appealing to over 50%, since they responded positively to all three items. 54% admired the link between the pages of the coursebook, and 52.6% liked the easily traceable sequencing of activities. Furthermore, 51% did not find the page design confusing at all.

The second point of comparison concerned the capacity for raising cultural awareness. The following items in Table 19 assessed how good the local English coursebook was at introducing different cultures or informing about countries different from their own.

Table 19. Student views on the coursebook's cultural awareness

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
4. I learn a lot about the countries I haven't known before.	140	28	79	15.8	98	19.6	97	19.4	86	17.2
5. The coursebook provides information about various cultures.	126	25.2	92	18.4	107	21.4	89	17.8	86	17.2

As can be understood from Table 19, the local English coursebook was found far from being satisfactory when it came to promoting cultural awareness. For 43.8%, no new country was being introduced, whereas 43.6% found it unsuccessful at giving information on a variety of cultures.

As shown in Table 20 below, the next seven items on the student form determined the extent to which it met such consumer needs as sensitivity to their level, practice opportunities for grammar and vocabulary, support for creativity and skills mastery.

Table 20. Student views on the coursebook's responsiveness to their needs

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
6. It is difficult to understand listening texts.	137	27.4	83	16.6	103	20.6	72	14.4	105	21
7. The coursebook provides opportunities for creative thinking.	133	26.6	78	15.6	110	22	92	18.4	87	17.4
8. I sometimes find it difficult to understand the grammar structures.	91	18.2	82	16.4	115	23	98	19.6	114	22.8
9. There are so many grammar structures that I sometimes get tired of following the lesson.	125	25	89	17.8	101	20.2	75	15	110	22
10. There are so many unknown words that I am tired of searching in the dictionary.	120	24	88	17.6	102	20.4	72	14.4	118	23.6
11. All we do as an activity is fill-in-the-blanks.	160	32	90	18	104	20.8	66	13.2	80	16
12. I sometimes do not follow the lesson, as some units do not appeal to me.	122	24.4	63	12.6	110	22	53	10.6	152	30.4

According to Table 20, the coursebook did not please students in three areas. 42.4% found its grammar structures above their level of proficiency. 42.2% did not believe that their creative thinking was being supported. Moreover, 41% expressed feelings of loss in the lessons due to a lack of interest in some units. Yet, half were happy with the variety of the activities, whereas 44% appreciated the compatibility of the listening texts with their language level. A similar number also reported their satisfaction with the amount of grammar rules (42.8%), and unknown words (41.6%). However, they voiced learning difficulties experienced due to the level of the chosen items.

In relation to student needs, they evaluated the opportunities provided for progressing without the help of a teacher, and the findings from their responses were provided in Table 21.

Table 21. Student views on the coursebook's capacity for self-instruction

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
13. I'd like to have educational CDs with the coursebook.	64	12.8	53	10.6	65	13	56	11.2	262	52.4
14. I'd like to have vocabulary posters to hang in my room.	73	14.6	54	10.8	61	12.2	68	13.6	244	48.8

15. I wish grammatical explanations were given in each unit.	94	18.8	57	11.4	101	20.2	69	13.8	179	35.8

Table 21 indicated that the students as a whole wanted extra materials for self-study, but the local English coursebook proved unhelpful. Among all the materials for individual study, the most demanded were the accompanying educational CDs (63.6%). This was followed by vocabulary posters (62.4%) for their study rooms. Nearly half of them asked for the explanation of grammar structures (49.6%). The students seemed eager for continuing language study at home; however, it did not meet their expectations in this regard.

The penultimate category of overall construction aimed to elicit the students' views on the variety of subject matter, amount of pairwork, and appropriateness of instructions.

Table 22. Student views on the coursebook's overall construction

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
16. I sometimes feel as if we were covering the same topic over and over again.	97	19.4	92	18.4	93	18.6	95	19	123	24.6
17. There are activities that I can do with my deskmate.	89	17.8	75	15	79	15.8	130	26	127	25.4
18. I find it difficult to understand the workbook instructions.	111	22.2	89	17.8	123	24.6	71	14.2	106	21.2

In Table 22, 43.6% were merely unhappy about the repetition of subjects. Yet slightly more of them were satisfied with the amount of opportunities for pairwork (51.4%). As for the comprehensibility of instructions, 40% found them clear enough for their present level of proficiency.

Finally, the students examined Sunshine 7 for the relevance of the activities, real-likeness of its visuals, and meaningfulness of the topics for presentation.

Table 23. Student views on the coursebook's authenticity

Items	SD		D		NS		A		SA	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
19. The topics are chosen from real life.	71	14.2	86	17.2	114	22.8	124	24.8	105	21
20. I can use the activities in my daily life.	154	30.8	79	15.8	96	19.2	82	16.4	89	17.8
21. Real photos are used in the coursebook.	155	23	82	16.4	115	23	96	19.2	92	18.4

Table 23 displayed that 46.6% regarded the textbook deficient in providing activities that can be used in daily life. The illustrations were, too, criticised for being inauthentic by 39.4%, as they were not real

pictures. The only thing 45.8% found positive was the choice of real-life topics. In conclusion, the following deficiencies typical of locally-produced ELT materials were listed from the perspective of the student users: i. neglect of cultural variety, ii. lack of creative thinking activities, iii. incompatibility with their level of English, iv. absence of supportive materials for self-study, v. inauthenticity of visuals and activities.

3.4. Student users' weighted evaluation of Sunshine 7

In the same way as their teachers, the students identified their preferential coursebook features. After weighted item frequencies were calculated, the items on the student form were also reordered in a descending order of importance. As can be seen from Table 24, four items emerged as the students' primary evaluative criteria: providing a vocabulary poster (Item14: 60.4%) along with educational CDs for self-study (Item13: 57.6%), choosing interesting topics (Item12: 50.8%), and using clear instructions (Item18: 50.4%).

Table 24. Weighted item frequencies for the student form

Item Number	Important		Very Important		Most Important	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
14	93	18.6	105	21	302	60.4
13	114	22.8	98	19.6	288	57.6
12	138	27.6	108	21.6	254	50.8
18	121	24.2	127	25.4	252	50.4
17	138	27.6	119	23.8	243	48.6
15	131	26.2	127	25.4	242	48.4
5	137	27.4	132	26.4	231	46.2
7	123	24.6	147	29.4	230	46
10	169	33.8	103	20.6	228	45.6
6	149	29.8	126	25.2	225	44.8
8	141	28.2	136	27.2	223	44.6
16	156	31.2	123	24.6	221	44.2
2	159	31.8	126	25.2	215	43
9	150	30	139	27.8	211	42.2
4	160	32	130	26	210	42
19	124	24.8	168	33.6	208	41.6
20	158	31.6	136	27.2	206	41.2
21	149	29.8	147	29.4	204	40.8
11	152	30.4	145	29	203	40.6
3	175	35	134	26.8	191	38.2
1	166	33.2	151	30.2	183	36.6

When the student responses were reassessed according to their own prioritised criteria as in Table 24, Sunshine 7 could prove sufficient only in the clarity of its instructions, while all the other important demands of the students were almost disregarded in this local English coursebook.

In Table 25, the students' unweighted and weighted scores were classified into three satisfaction levels to be able to determine the extent of their contentment with the coursebook's performance overall, and in their self-determined, highly-rated criteria for materials evaluation.

Table 25. Distribution of students' evaluation scores according to satisfaction levels

Satisfaction Levels	Evaluation Mode			
	Unweighted		Weighted	
	f	%	f	%
High (65-105)	228	45	2	1
Medium (43-64)	24	5	0	0
Low (21-42)	248	50	498	99
Total	500	100	500	100

It can be observed from Table 25 that the rate of low satisfaction scores dramatically rose from 50% in the unweighted mode to 99% in the weighted mode, while the rate of high satisfaction scores drastically fell from 45% to 1% after importance-weighting. In other words, the coursebook might have been found adequate by 45% with respect to the general evaluative criteria in the checklist, but 99% expressed their disappointment with its performance in their primary focus (prioritised) areas. In conclusion, the majority of the student users seemed to be struggling to learn English through an instrument insensitive to their real needs.

4. Discussion

The particularised coursebook checklist (PCC) resulted in a more accurate reflection of the teachers' and students' opinions on the effectiveness of Sunshine 7 in that: (i) user-prioritised coursebook features were identified both individually and collectively; (ii) the performance of the locally-produced ELT material was assessed in the users' primary focus areas; and (iii) most urgent coursebook deficiencies were diagnosed for the Turkish context.

The teacher evaluation revealed serious weaknesses in almost all conceivable areas of coursebook design. Among all the coursebook deficiencies concerning the teaching context, insensitivity to students' interests, proficiency, and readiness levels came in first. Previous evaluations of similar local English coursebooks provided contradicting results in Turkey. Like Sunshine 7, Unique 6 in Ertürk's (2013) study was found incongruent with learner interests, and language level by most of the Turkish teachers, whereas Spotlight on English and Time for English 4 received admiration in these regards (Acar, 2006; Arıkan, 2008). This deviation in the reception of local English coursebooks can be related to the fact that no standard criteria have been collectively agreed, and consistently abided by neither during the design stage of the coursebook content nor through the selection process of final drafts, while publishers' promotions (e.g. computer donation) may be the main determining factor in Turkey (Durukafa, 2000; İnal, 2006; Şimşek & Dündar, 2016a; Şimşek & Dündar, 2017).

Still, the teachers in this study were contented that Sunshine 7 did not diverge from the principles of the seventh-grade curriculum. In Özdemir's (2007), Kırkgöz's (2009), Ulum's (2014), and Dülger's (2016) studies, teachers of different grade levels were convinced that their local English series (e.g. Time for English 4, Texture, Trip 1, Yes You Can) closely followed the national English curriculum for Turkish EFL classes. The compatibility of locally-produced ELT materials with the given English curriculum was previously detected in Alamri's (2008), Ariebowo's (2014), and Alharbi's (2015) examination of teacher views from the sixth-grade onwards in the Indonesian, and Saudi contexts.

Another area where the coursebook failed to meet the teachers' standards was about following the principles of accepted approaches to the teaching of English on the national and international scale. Like their colleagues in this study, Ertürk's (2013), and Dülger's (2016) participants found their local English coursebook incapable of presenting current methods and trends in ELT, regardless of grade levels. In his content analysis, Işık (2011), too, maintained that Turkey's textbooks for fourth- and fifth-graders were following structuralist and behaviourist principles of language and learning. Three other studies from Iran and Saudi Arabia illustrated that the adopted teaching methods in local English coursebooks were traditional, old-dated, and not learner-centred at all in view of their teachers (Ahmadi & Derakhshan, 2015; Alamri, 2008; Golpour, 2012).

Besides the context variables, the teachers of this study faced further disappointment with exercises and activities, which were found neither interesting nor suitable for the targeted level, and also unable to create an authentic environment for learning, and creative thinking. Many more Turkish teachers of English in Ezici's (2006), Aytuğ's (2007), Oflaz's (2009), Çelik's (2011), Özeş' (2012), and Taylan's (2013) studies unanimously agreed that the exercises and activities in local English coursebooks (e.g. Breeze 9, New Bridge to Success 3, Spot on 8, Time for English 5) could not motivate learners, attract attention, and foster creative thinking. Likewise, 45 Korean teachers in Park and Suh's (2003) research found the tasks and activities too complicated, difficult, and time-consuming to implement in the classroom, and acknowledged the lack of authenticity in their five newly published local English textbooks for the revised seventh-grade curriculum. When the Iranian teachers of English were surveyed on the same issue, they expressed dislike for the abundance of mechanical exercises (e.g. gap-filling, matching, multiple choice tests) in their locally-produced EAP textbooks (Danaye-Tous & Haghighi, 2014; Rezaeian & Zamanian, 2015).

Although consensus was not achieved over the attractivity of its topics, the lack of grammatical explanations, and a good pronunciation model in listening texts constituted major problems for the teachers in the current study. The same issue of topicality along with deficit of grammar, and pronunciation work had been repeatedly detected in Acar's (2006), Tekir and Arıkan's (2007), Çelik's (2011), Kayaoğlu's (2011), and Özeş's (2012) research, where the teachers evaluated varied English coursebooks produced in Turkey. Studies in different contexts have shown much the same results. Whereas Law's (1995) ten secondary school teachers in Hong Kong were dissatisfied with the design of exercises, and explanation of grammar structures, Nemati's (2009) 26 English teachers in India reported lack of interesting topics, and pronunciation practice in their locally-produced prep coursebooks. Aftab's (2011) 14 sixth-grade teachers in Pakistan were, too, worried about: i. limited grammar structures below the students' level of English, ii. mechanical activities hindering the development of creative thinking skills, and iii. lack of authentic language use. In four consecutive studies of the Iranian context, teachers were displeased with the teaching of grammar and sound system, and the absence of interesting topics in their locally-produced L2 materials (Ahour, Towhidiyan & Saeidi, 2014; Golpour, 2012; Rahimpour & Hashemi, 2011; Rezaeian & Zamanian, 2015). In Indonesia, Ariebowo (2014), as well as Faujiah and Floris (2015) examined seventh-grade teachers' views on the two editions of the same local English textbook, and did not come up with very different results from the present study, when it came to the issues of grammar and sound practice.

From the perspective of these teachers, the next weakness lies in its presentation of different sexes and cultures. Like Diktaş (2010), who drew attention to the gender discrimination experienced by female characters in his content analysis of local and global English coursebooks, the teachers of this study believed that gender equality was being disregarded throughout the local English coursebook. Moreover, they criticised it for not giving enough information about the target and other world cultures. This finding was supported by Aytuğ (2007), Özdemir (2007), Arıkan (2008), Iriskulova (2012), Özeş (2012), and Ertürk (2013), where similar English series produced in Turkey (i.e. New Bridge to Success 9, Time for English 4, Unique 6, Spot on 8) were found incapable of presenting a variety of cultural information on inner, outer, and expanding countries. In Chao's (2010), Juan's (2010), and Alfahadi's (2012) studies, local English coursebooks from Taiwan, China, and Saudi Arabia were also disapproved for presenting an unbalanced distribution of cultural elements between source and target cultures, and required adaptation for developing intercultural communicative competence (ICC).

When the material's organisation and visual design were evaluated, the sequencing of the activities turned out to be the only positive thing about Sunshine 7. On the other hand, the main sources of teacher dissatisfaction were the poor quality of illustrations, incoherent arrangement of units, unhelpful content page, and unclear instructions. Independent of what title they had (e.g. An English Course for Turks, Breeze 9, Let's Speak English 7, Spotlight on English, Time for English 5), the teacher users of similar local ELT textbooks in Turkey had indicated their discontent with the attractiveness and number of visuals, and their integration into coursebook pages (Acar, 2006; Aydoğanlı, 2006; Çelik, 2011; Kayaoğlu, 2011; Oflaz, 2011; Tekir & Arıkan, 2007). Having investigated the teacher views on the visual design of local English coursebooks, Alamri (2008), Nemati (2009), Chao (2010), Golpour (2012), Nguyen (2015), and Sabrina (2016) obtained very similar findings in teaching contexts, ranging over Algeria to Vietnam.

Finally, the teacher's book was at the center of their disapproval, as it severely lacked the kind of alternative activities, and amount of support expected from supplementary materials. In the same way, Ezici (2006), Özdemir (2007), Sümen (2008), and Çelik (2011) surveyed how Turkish EFL teachers found the teacher's book provided by three local series (New Bridge to Success, Time for English, and Breeze), and found that the teacher's book was more of an answer key than a manual, while they demanded extra activities, tests, online, and methodological support, especially on the teaching of target culture, and methods of assessment. In Park and Suh's (2003), Chao's (2010), Al-sowat's (2012), and Nguyen's (2015) studies, the locally-produced teacher's manual was likewise criticised by various teacher groups for failing to provide useful information on ICC development, further instructions over pair/group work, additional exercises for skills practice and vocabulary expansion, and tips on teaching and assessment techniques.

Since both teachers and students in the current study were regarded as clients/end-users with unique needs and preferences, the real value of their local coursebook experience/service could be soundly measured, when their overall satisfaction scores were complemented by importance-weighting. Therefore, a comparison of the teachers' unweighted and weighted evaluation scores showed that they cared most about the variables of the teaching context; i.e. the coursebook's compatibility with the type, age, level, and interests of the specific learner group. This was followed by their concerns for: i. organisation and visual design, ii. exercises and activities, iii. textbook content, and iv. sociocultural issues respectively.

The kind of coursebook these Turkish teachers had expected is one that can: i. serve different proficiency levels, ii. give comprehensible workbook instructions, iii. accommodate activities for diverse learner types, iv. ensure harmony between units, v. have a useful content page, vi. provide careful sequencing of activities, vii. appeal to learner interests of the age group, viii. embody activities for large classes, ix. develop creative thinking skills through its activities, x. model good pronunciation in its

listening texts, xi. comply with the students' proficiency level, xii. supply enough explanation on grammar, and xiii. respect gender equality in the distribution of coursebook characters. However, out of these 13 most desirable features, Sunshine 7 managed to embody only one, the ordering of activities. On average, half of these teachers could not get what they most wanted from their local English coursebook, while their gender, professional experience, and amount of coursebook use did not affect how they assessed its efficiency in the present study. Tekir and Arıkan (2007) in Turkey, Aqel (2009) in Palestine, and Al-sowat (2012) in Saudi Arabia researched whether the teachers' evaluation scores changed with respect to gender and teaching experience, and except in Al-sowat's (2012) study, they obtained similar results, where neither gender nor experience had a significant effect on the teachers' coursebook assessment. Unlike Al-sowat (2012), who detected a difference only in terms of gender, Jamalvandi (2013) in Iran did not observe a change with respect to gender, either.

These findings stood in direct contrast to Chow's (2004) study, where the overall perceptions of 555 teachers in Hong Kong were reported to be meaningfully influenced by gender, qualifications, experience, and teaching levels. Conflicting results are present in the coursebook literature, when it comes to the comparison in similar contextual factors as the workplace, educational level, and type of teachers. For instance, the comparison between the scores of native and non-native teachers, or among school districts yielded no significant differences in Song's (1991), Çelik's (2011), and Aqel's (2009) studies. Tekir and Arıkan (2007) determined interaction between the teachers' evaluative responses, and academic degrees, while Aqel (2009) found none.

As for the student evaluation of Sunshine 7 through PCC, their first concern was about the visual design. They seemed satisfied with the page layout, order of activities, and transition between pages. In Arıkan's (2008), Kırkgöz's (2009), Özeş's (2012), and Ertürk's (2013) studies, most Turkish students, studying local English series such as Time for English 4, Trip 1, Texture, Unique 6, and Spot on 8 admired the visuals, organisation, and layout. The great majority of Arabic, and Algerian students, too, gave most of the positive responses to the visuals in Al-Yousef's (2007), Alhamlan's (2013), and Sabrina's (2016) evaluations.

In the same way as their teachers, these students looked with disfavour on the limitedness of cultural information, for their local English coursebook could not offer new knowledge on the countries other than their own or they would like to familiarise with. Although few studies in Turkey had elicited student views, and even fewer examined their opinions of the cultural content, this problem did not go unnoticed by Iriskulova's (2012) 177 eighth-graders, seeking a blend of native, target, and world cultures in the locally-produced Spot on 8. Whether it was the Costa Rican fourth-graders in Angulo and Miranda's (2014), Chinese university students in Xiao's (2010), their Taiwanese or Persian counterparts in Chao's (2010), Mahboudi and Javdani's (2012), or Zohrabi, Sabouri and Behroozian's (2012) studies that were being surveyed, there was a palpable demand among the greater part of all student users for cultural diversity in their L2 materials.

As to the students' needs, Sunshine 7 was found successful at providing a variety of activities, listening texts, and vocabulary at appropriate level. On the other hand, the choice of grammatical items, and subject matter in units were regarded problematic to such an extent that the students referred to losing track of the lesson due to comprehension difficulties and boredom. In a recent study by Demirci and Tavil (2015), Turkish students similarly listed the choice of vocabulary, and listening texts among the major sources of their local textbook's inefficiency (Yes You Can). Another locally-produced material in Turkey, Let's Speak English, and its Persian counterpart, English Book 1-2-3 series, were found inadequate by students in the same respects; however, unlike those of the current study, they were also dissatisfied with the language level, and activity variety of the evaluated materials (Alani & Jahangard, 2015; Alhamlan, 2013; Ravelonanahary, 2007; Tekir & Arıkan, 2007; Vahdany, 2015). In addition, the Turkish students in this study were displeased with the absence of opportunities for

developing creative thinking skills, which had been brought up by the students using general and vocational English coursebooks produced in Iran (Alani & Jahangard, 2015; Hooman, 2014; Shabani & Nejad, 2013; Vahdany, 2015).

Unlike Angulo and Miranda's (2014) fourth-graders, enjoying their local textbook's facilities for independent work, the majority of the Turkish students in the current study demanded extra materials such as educational CDs, vocabulary posters, grammatical explanations, and reported that such opportunities for self-instruction were missing in their local English coursebook. These results were parallel to the ones in Al-Yousef's (2007), Rohmah's (2009), Çelik's (2011), Hooman's (2014), Demirci and Tavil's (2015), Nguyen's (2015), and Vahdany's (2015) studies, where EFL learners negatively evaluated the quantity and quality of supplementary resources (workbook, copiable worksheets, audio-visuals).

As for its overall construction, the students in the present study appreciated the amount of pairwork, and clarity of workbook instructions as in Sümen's (2008), Özeş's (2012), Ertürk's (2013), and Taylan's (2013) evaluations of similar English coursebooks produced in Turkey. In fact, these students merely complained about the boredom caused by the repetition of the same topics. Depending on the course material under assessment, variations do exist in students' attitudes towards topical quality, yet local English coursebooks appear to be more fraught with problems than global or UK/US-produced coursebooks in the related literature (e.g. Alani & Jahangard, 2015; Ezici, 2006; Guilani, Yasin & Hua, 2011; Korpela, 2007; Tekir & Arıkan, 2007; Vahdany, 2015).

When they eventually evaluated the material's authenticity, it was revealed that over half of these students (including the undecided ones) had reservations about the relevance of its topics. They made it clear in PCC that the activities were not transferable to real-life situations. Furthermore, the visuals, not having been made out of real photos, were found as much responsible for the lack of authenticity. Other studies can be found in both domestic and foreign literature, where EFL learners criticised the topics and activities in their locally-produced ELT materials for being invariable, and dissociated from their daily experiences and the real world (Alani & Jahangard, 2015; Çelik, 2011; Ezici, 2006; Maleki, Mollaee & Khosravi, 2014; Ravelonanahary, 2007; Shabani & Nejad, 2013; Tekir & Arıkan, 2007).

As the second party of consumers, the students assessed the material's performance against the whole set of evaluation criteria, and also in their preferred areas of importance. According to Cummins (1997), importance and satisfaction are the two constructs that can be independently experienced. In fact, the students in this study were highly satisfied with such aspects of their local English textbook as the activity order, and page design, either of which they had not given much thought in general. Even though they gave the highest priority to the availability of supplementary resources, Sunshine 7 proved inefficient in that feature. From the perspective of these student users, the two most immediate areas that needed revision involved adding self-study components, and replacing irrelevant unit content with appealing alternatives. Another area of higher precedence concerned the clarity of instructions, but this emerged from their responses as a strength of the textbook. This righteous demand for more supplementary materials, and careful attention to topical attractiveness has already been identified by other researchers both in Turkey, and other EFL/ESL contexts like Finland, Indonesia, Iran, and Jordan, where locally-produced course materials were similarly in use (Al-Momani, 1998; Dahmardeh, 2009; Guilani et al., 2011; Güreli, 2008; Hooman, 2014; Karimi & Biria, 2016; Korpela, 2007; Rohmah, 2009; Zohrabi et al., 2012).

5. Conclusions

The results obtained with PCC demonstrated that the real extent of consumer dissatisfaction was much greater than the overall evaluation alone had yielded (raising low satisfaction ratings from 74% to 99% among the teachers, and from 50% to 99% among the students), as the locally-produced English coursebook met the primary demands of neither user group, who were seeking a more learner-centred material – one that can appeal to the type, age, level, interests, and study needs of the particular class. Besides not getting what they most wanted from their local English textbook, the teachers' evaluations were yet unaffected by gender, teaching experience, and length of use.

Just as its top-ranked strength shifted from the curriculum compatibility in the teachers' case to a more superficial, visual design element in the students' case, so too the coursebook features the user groups used as a yardstick against which to measure the material's effectiveness. The top teacher-preferred criteria concerned its capacity for accommodating different proficiency levels, and learner types, whereas the top student-preferred criteria concentrated on the availability of supplementary resources, and thematic appeal in the current setting. This can be attributed to their knowledge and experience discrepancies in coursebook assessment. Previous research has shown that students took a relatively more practical, goal-oriented approach to determining evaluative criteria by focusing on such overt components as supplementary resources, and interesting topics, rather than fussing over matters requiring a teacher's professional expertise: e.g. the (mis)match between the course content and educational standards (e.g. Demirci & Tavil, 2015; Kim, 2004; Mazgon & Stefanc, 2012). While comprehensibility of instructions emerged as a shared critical concern, visuality turned out to be the last thing both these teachers and students chose to attend to while assessing their local ELT materials in use.

The list of the coursebook's deficiencies might in each case have been topped by the lack of authenticity, and supplementary resources for teacher guidance, and student self-instruction. But further overlaps did exist between their views over such serious weaknesses as the lack of: i. support for creative thinking, ii. topical attractiveness, iii. grammatical explanations, and iv. cultural diversity. The same debilitating deficiencies have been diagnosed by similar user groups in a large collection of local English coursebooks previously published in Turkey (Acar, 2006; Aytuğ, 2007; Çelik, 2011; Demir, 2008; Ertürk, 2013; Ezici, 2006; Güreli, 2008; Köroğlu, 2013; Oflaz, 2009; Özdemir, 2007; Özeş, 2012; Sarı, 2007; Sözen, 2007; Sümen, 2008; Taylan, 2013). In fact, these persistent coursebook concerns documented in Turkey have also been brought up by various researchers from other EFL/ESL contexts, where local English coursebooks were similarly at work (Ahour et al., 2014; Ariebowo, 2014; Dat, 2008; Prodromou & Mishan, 2008; Shabani & Nejad, 2013; Zohrabi et al., 2012). Considering the growing amount of evidence for the influence of educational content on both teacher efficacy and student achievement, this must rather be considered indicative of a more than alarming trend in local ELT materials.

As has been repeatedly suggested in this study and the coursebook literature, the real quality of ELT materials – whether local, global or glocal in origin – can be accurately assessed, and improved through contextually-relevant, user-preferred criteria, along with ongoing user feedback as in any form of customer satisfaction (Kim, 2004; Law, 1995; McGrath, 2002; Naumann & Giel, 1995; Sheldon, 1988; Roberts, 1996; Timmis, 2014; Tomlinson, 2008; Şimşek & Dündar, 2016a; Şimşek & Dündar, 2016b; Şimşek & Dündar, 2017). Therefore, the following solutions can be trialled by future EFL coursebook researchers, educational practitioners and policy-makers in order to provide effective foreign language textbooks that are tailored, in Lincolnian terms, as educational products of the local context, by the local context, and for the local context: i. the institutionalisation of particularised checklists for continuous (pre-, in- and post-use) evaluations of ELT materials, ii. the composition of coursebook drafts, and

periodic revision of their editions in line with the collective perspective of all relevant parties, including, but not limited to, teachers, students, and coursebook writers, iii. the adoption of a context-sensitive, synergistic model of materials evaluation, where the authorities rely more on the interactive partnership between coursebook writers, users, and experts than solely on the outcome of a panel session among a select few, and iv. the dissemination of experiential and empirical knowledge via supranational coursebook communities for ultimately developing algorithmic decision criteria.

References

AbdelWahab, M. M. (2013). Developing an English language textbook evaluative checklist. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education, 1*(3), 55-70.

Acar, A. (2006). *Designing an effective ELT primary school textbook model by means of evaluating the primary school ELT textbooks: A sample in the designated group and context* (Doctoral dissertation). İzmir: Institute of Educational Sciences, Dokuz Eylül University.

Aftab, A. (2011). *English language textbooks evaluation in Pakistan* (Doctoral dissertation). Birmingham: College of Arts and Law, University of Birmingham.

Ahmadi, A., & Derakhshan, A. (2016). EFL teachers' perceptions towards textbook evaluation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(2), 260-267.

Ahour, T., Towhidiyan, B., & Saeidi, M. (2014). The evaluation of English Textbook 2 taught in Iranian high schools from teachers' perspectives. *English Language Teaching*, *7*(3), 150-158.

Alamri, A. (2008). *An evaluation of the sixth grade English language textbook for Saudi boys* (Master's thesis). Riyadh: College of Arts, King Saud University.

Alani, A. & Jahangard, A. (2015). Analysis of teachers' and students' attitudes toward Iranian senior high school textbook series. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *5*(1), 23-43.

Alfahadi, A. (2012). *Saudi teachers' views on appropriate cultural models for EFL textbooks: Insights into TESOL teachers' management of global cultural flows and local realities in their teaching worlds* (Doctoral dissertation). Exeter: University of Exeter.

Alhamlan, S. (2013). *EFL curriculum and needs analysis: An evaluative study* (Master's thesis). Riyadh: King Saud University.

Alharbi, A. (2015). A descriptive-evaluative study of a Saudi EFL textbook series. *Cogent Education*, *2*(1), 1-26.

Al-Momani, N. F. A. (1998). *An evaluation of EFL textbooks (AMRA) for the first and second secondary classes in Jordan: Students', teachers' and supervisors' perspectives* (Doctoral dissertation). Irbid: TEFL Department, Yarmouk University.

Al-Sowat, H. (2012). An evaluation of English language textbook, Say it in English, for first year intermediate grade in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Studies in Curriculum and Supervision*, *3*(2), 332-413.

Al-Yousef, H. (2007). *An evaluation of the third grade intermediate English coursebook in Saudi Arabia* (Master's thesis). Riyadh: College of Arts Department of English, King Saud University.

Angulo, J. E. V., & Miranda, A. G. C. (2014). Evaluating a textbook's efficiency to enhance students' English proficiency in a Costa Rica's rural school. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, *20*, 395-425.

Ansary, H., & Babaii, E. (2002). Universal characteristics of EFL/ESL textbooks: A step towards systematic textbook evaluation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *8*(2). Retrieved on December 18, 2017 from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Ansary-Textbooks/

Aqel, A. R. A. Q. M. (2009). *An evaluative study of the Palestinian 11th grade English textbook from the teachers' perspective in Southern Nablus and Salfit districts* (Master's thesis). Nablus: Faculty of Graduate Studies, An-Najah National University.

Arıkan, G. (2008). *Textbook evaluation in foreign language teaching* (Master's thesis). Adana: Institute of Social Sciences, Çukurova University.

Ariebowo, T. (2014). An evaluation study: The effectiveness of English language coursebook entitled, When English Rings the Bell. In *The 61st TEFLIN International Conference 2014 Proceedings Book 3* (pp. 377-381). Surakarta: Sebelas Maret University.

Aydoğanlı, S. (2006). *An analysis about the evaluation of the English textbooks based on the opinions of the first class of the vocational school of industry students, the English teachers and the administrators of the industrial vocational school* (Master's thesis). Gaziantep: Institute of Social Sciences, Gaziantep University.

Aytuğ, S. (2007). *An EFL textbook evaluation study in Anatolian high schools: New Bridge to Success for 9th grade new beginners* (Master's thesis). Ankara: Institute of Educational Sciences, Bilkent University.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2011). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem.

Byrd, P. (2001). Textbooks: Evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 415-427). Boston: Heinle.

Chambers, F. (1997). Seeking consensus in coursebook evaluation. *ELT Journal*, *51*(1), 30-35.

Chao, T. C. (2010). A retrospective evaluation of a local college English textbook from an intercultural perspective. In Y. J. Chen, S. J. Huang, H. C. Liao & S. Lin (Eds.), *Studies in English for professional communications and applications* (pp. 89-100). Taipei: Crane Publishing Co.

Chow, Y. W. F. (2004). *Teacher and learner perceptions of ELT textbooks in Hong Kong secondary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Leicester: School of Education, University of Leicester.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.

Cummins, R. A. (1997). *Comprehensive quality of life scale: School version - Grades 7-12*. Melbourne: Deakin University.

Cunningsworth, A. (1984). *Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching materials*. London: Heinemann.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Çelik, Ş. N. (2011). *Students', teachers' and inspectors' views about secondary school English coursebook Breeze 9* (Master's thesis). Ankara: Instiute of Social Sciences, Hacettepe University.

Dahmardeh, M. (2009). Communicative textbooks: English language textbooks in Iranian secondary school. *Linguistik Online*, *40*(4), 45-61.

Danaye-Tous, M., & Haghighi, S. (2014). Evaluation of ESP textbooks: Evidence from ESP textbook of computer engineering major. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *3*(2), 55-68.

Dat, B. (2008). ELT materials used in Southeast Asia. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials* (pp. 263-280). London: Continuum.

Demir, S. (2008). *An evaluation of thinking skills in ELT coursebooks at primary and secondary levels* (Master's thesis). Adana: Institute of Social Sciences, Çukurova University.

Demirci, D., & Tavil, Z. M. (2015). Are the skills really integrated in coursebooks? A sample case - Yes You Can. *Educational Research and Reviews, 10*(12), 1599- 1632.

Diktaş, M. Y. (2010). *Gender representations in EFL coursebooks: A comparative study of textbooks designed by ministry of education of Turkey and non-Turkish publishers* (Master's thesis). Istanbul: Institute of Social Sciences, Maltepe University.

Durukafa, G. (2000). Ders kitabı analizi ve analiz ölçütleri [Coursebook analysis and criteria]. *Çanakkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2*, 111–116.

Dülger, O. (2016). Evaluation of EFL coursebooks taught in Turkey based on teachers' views. *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching, 4*(1), 1-11.

Ertürk, H. (2013). *An EFL coursebook evaluation: Unique 6 teachers' and students' perspectives* (Master's thesis). Konya: Institute of Educational Sciences, Necmettin Erbakan University.

Ezici, I. Ç. (2006). *Evaluation of the EFL textbook New Bridge to Success 3 from the perspectives of students and teachers* (Master's thesis). Ankara, Turkey: Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Faujiah, E., & Floris, F. D. (2015). The evaluation of When English Rings A Bell (Revised edition): Teachers' perspectives. *Kata Kita: Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching, 3*(2), 13-19.

Gearing, K. (1999). Helping less-experienced teachers of English to evaluate teachers' guides. *ELT Journal, 53*(2), 122–127.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference (Fourth Edition).* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). *IBM SPSS Statistics 23 step by step: A simple guide and reference (Fourteenth Edition)*. New York: Routledge.

Golpour, F. (2012). Iranian junior high school English book series (Right Path to English) weighted against material evaluation checklists. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 1*(7), 170-179.

Guilani, M. A., Yasin, M. S. M., & Hua, T. K. (2011). Authenticity of Iranian English textbooks for schools. *English Language and Literature Studies, 1*(2), 25-30.

Güreli, N. (2008). *A study into Çanakkale science high school students' perceptions of an ideal English coursebook* (Master's thesis). Çanakkale: Institute of Social Sciences, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.

Hadley, G. (2014). Global textbooks in local contexts: An empirical investigation of effectiveness. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching textbooks: Content, consumption, production* (pp. 205-238). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. New York: Longman.

Harwood, N. (2005). What do we want EAP teaching materials for? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*(2), 149-161.

Heiman, G. (2011). *Basic statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Belmont: Cengage Learning.

Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comment on improved practice. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *66*(3), 393-416.

Hooman, Y. (2014). The evaluation of Iranian EFL textbooks from post method principles pedagogy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(5), 1026-1032.

Huang, S. (2011). *Ideal and reality of textbook selection: An interview- and questionnaire-based investigation in the Taiwanese tertiary context* (Doctoral dissertation). Coventry: Centre for Applied Linguistics, University of Warwick.

Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal, 48*(4), 315-328.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iriskulova, A. (2012). *The investigation of the cultural presence in Spot on 8 ELT textbook published in Turkey: Teachers' and students' expectations versus real cultural load of the textbook* (Master's thesis). Ankara: Institute of Social Sciences, Middle East Technical University.

Işık, A. (2011). Language education and ELT materials in Turkey from the path dependence perspective. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 40*, 256–266.

İnal, B. (2006). Coursebook selection process and some of the most important criteria to be taken into consideration in foreign language teaching. *Journal of Arts and Sciences*, *5*, 19-29.

Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*(2), 130-150.

Jamalvandi, B. (2014). ELT textbook evaluation in Iran: New insights. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, *3*(4), 1068- 1078.

Juan, W. U. (2010). A content analysis of the cultural content in the EFL textbooks. *Canadian Social Science*, *6*(5), 137-144.

Karamifar, M., Barati, H., & Youhanaee, M. (2014). Local evaluation criteria for global textbooks: A case study from Iran. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4*(5), 923-930.

Karamoozian, F. M., & Riazi, A. (2008). Development of a new checklist for evaluating reading comprehension textbooks. *ESP World*, *7*(19), 19-39.

Karimi, K., & Biria, R. (2016). A multidimensional critical evaluation of English coursebook used for Iranian high school first grader. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, *6*(6), 214- 232.

Kayaoğlu, M. N. (2011). A critical appraisal of the language textbook. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty*, *12*(4), 341-356.

Kayapınar, U. (2009). Coursebook evaluation by English teachers. *Inönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 10*(1), 69-78.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy, 23*(5), 663-684.

Kim, H. D. (2004). Learners' opinions on criteria for ELT materials evaluation. *English Teaching*, *59*(3), 3-28.

Kitao, K., & Kitao, S. (1997). Selecting and developing teaching/learning materials. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *4*(4). Retrieved on January 8, 2018 from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kitao-Materials.html

Korpela, N. (2007). *If I were a textbook writer: Views of EFL textbooks held by Finnish comprehensive school pupils* (Master's thesis). Jyväskylä: Department of Languages, University of Jyväskylä.

Köroğlu, Z. Ç. (2013). *Language instructors' perspectives on textbook content in terms of intercultural communicative competence: Gazi University case* (Master's thesis). Ankara: Institute of Educational Sciences, Gazi University.

Law, W. H. (1995). *Teachers' evaluation of English textbooks: An investigation of teachers' ideas and current practices and their implications for developing textbook evaluation criteria* (Master's thesis). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.

Littlejohn, A. (2012). Language teaching materials and the (very) big picture. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *9*(1), 283–297.

Mahboudi, H. R., & Javdani, F. (2012). The teaching of English in Iran: The place of culture. *Journal of Language and Culture*, *3*(5), 87-95.

Mahfoodh, M. I. H. A., & Bhanegaonkar, S. G. (2013). New approach for evaluating EFLM (An eclectic developed checklist). *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 3*(10), 1-8.

Maleki, A., Mollaee, F., & Khosravi, R. (2014). A content evaluation of Iranian pre-university ELT textbook. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(5), 995-1000.

Mazgon, J., & Stefanc, D. (2012). Importance of the various characteristics of educational materials: Different opinions, different perspectives. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *11*(3), 174- 188.

McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Miekley, J. (2005). ESL textbook evaluation checklist. *The Reading Matrix*, *5*(2). Retrieved on November 9, 2017 from http://www.readingmatrix.com/reading_projects/miekley/project.pdf

Mukundan, J., & Ahour, T. (2010). A review of textbook evaluation checklists across four decades (1970-2008). In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp. 336-352). London: Continuum.

Mukundan, J., Hajimohammadi, R., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2011). Developing an English language textbook evaluation checklist. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, *4*(6), 21- 28.

Mukundan, J., Nimehchisalem, V., & Hajimohammadi, R. (2011). Developing an English language textbook evaluation checklist: A focus group study. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1*(12), 100-106.

Mukundan, J. & Nimehchisalem, V. (2012). Evaluative criteria of an English language textbook evaluation checklist. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 3*(6), 1128-1134.

Naumann, E., & Giel, K. (1995). *Customer satisfaction measurement and management: Using the voice of the customer*. Ohio: Thomson Executive Press.

Nemati, A. (2009). Evaluation of an ESL English coursebook: A step towards systematic vocabulary evaluation. *Journal of Social Sciences, 20*(2), 91-99.

Nguyen, C. T. (2015). *An evaluation of the textbook English 6: A case study from secondary schools in the Mekong delta provinces of Vietnam* (Doctoral dissertation). Sheffield: Department of English Language and Linguistics, University of Sheffield.

Nimehchisalem, V., & Mukundan, J. (2013). Usefulness of the English language teaching textbook evaluation checklist. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, 21*(2), 797-816.

Nimehchisalem, V., & Mukundan, J. (2015). Refinement of the English language teaching textbook evaluation checklist. *Pertanika Journal Social Science and Humanities, 23*(4), 761-780.

Oflaz, T. D. (2009). *Teachers' perceptions on coursebook Time for English 5: The 5th grade state schools* (Master's thesis). Gaziantep: Institute of Social Sciences, Gaziantep University.

Özdemir, F. E. (2007). *An evaluation of Time for English 4, the fourth grade English coursebook for public schools* (Master's thesis). Ankara: Institute of Social Sciences, Middle East Technical University.

Özeş, D. (2012). *Textbook evaluation in foreign language teaching: Spot on grade 8 from students' and teachers' perspectives* (Master's thesis). Bursa: Institute of Educational Sciences, Uludağ University.

Park, M. R., & Suh, K. O. (2003). An analysis of Korean high school English textbooks under the 7th curriculum. *English Teaching, 58*(4), 319-347.

Pizam, A., & Ellis, T. (1999). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality entertprises. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 11*(7), 326- 339.

Prodromou, L., & Mishan, F. (2008). Materials used in Western Europe. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials: A critical review* (pp. 193-212). London: Continuum.

Rahimpour, M., & Hashemi, R. (2011). Textbook selection and evaluation in EFL context. *World Journal of Education, 1*(2), 62-68.

Razmjoo, S. A. (2010). Developing a textbook evaluation scheme for the expanding circle. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 2*(1), 121-136.

Ravelonanahary, M. (2007). The use of textbooks and educational media: The Malagasy experience. In M. Horsley & J. McCall (Eds.), *Ninth international conference on textbooks and educational media* (pp. 166-175). Hogskolen: IARTEM.

Rezaeian, M., & Zamanian, M. (2015). Textbook evaluation: ELT teachers' perspectives on Learning to Read English for pre-university students. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 4*(2), 105-118.

Riazi, A. M. (2003). What textbook evaluation schemes tell us? A study of the textbook evaluation schemes of three decades. In W. A. Renanda (Ed.), *Methodology and materials design in language teaching* (pp. 52-68). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Center.

Richards, J. C. (2001). The role of textbooks in a language program. *RELC Guidelines, 23*(2), 12-16.

Roberts, J. T. (1996). Demystifying materials evaluation. *System, 24*(3), 375-389.

Rohmah, Z. (2009). EFL materials in Madrasah Tsanawiyah: What do they really need? *TEFLIN Journal, 20*(1), 104-117.

Sabrina, H. (2016). *The evaluation of the coursebook Spotlight on English One from teachers' perspectives* (Master's thesis). Biskra: Faculty of Letters and Languages, Mohammed Kheider University of Biskra.

Sarı, F. (2007). *The effects of coursebooks on the development of proficiency levels of Turkish learners of English* (Master's thesis). Istanbul: Institute of Educational Sciences, Marmara University.

Shabani, M. B., & Nejad, A. M. (2013). An evaluation of the third-grade high school English textbook: An Iranian case study. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, *2*(1), 67-80.

Shater, H., & Azargoon, M. (2012). Designing and developing a native checklist to evaluate general English coursebooks in Iran and comparing it with other existing checklists in the world (Paper presented at the *1st Conference on Language & Teaching: An Interdisciplinary Approach*). Retrieved on January 6, 2018 from http://confnews.um.ac.ir/images/41/conferences/llt/cd51.pdf

Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, *42*(4), 237–246.

Skierso, A. (1991). Textbook selection and evaluation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 432- 453). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Song, B. (1991). *A comparison of perceptions of EFL textbooks used in Chinese secondary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved on November 22, 2017 from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (Order No. 9216075).

Soori, A., Kafipour, R., & Soury, M. (2011). EFL textbook evaluation and graphic representation. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *26*(3), 481-493.

Sözen, B. O. (2007). *Significance of popular culture in English language teaching coursebooks* (Master's thesis). Istanbul: Institute of Educational Sciences, Marmara University.

Sümen, G. (2008). *An evaluation of the new English coursebook of the fourth grade of state schools in Turkey and preparing supplementary materials in reference with the new English curriculum* (Master's thesis). Ankara: Institute of Educational Sciences, Gazi University.

Şimşek, M. R., & Dündar, E. (2016a). Coming to grips with materials evaluation: Lessons learned from interviewing local coursebook users. In F. Uslu (Ed.), *Proceedings of INTCESS2016 3rd International Conference on Education and Social Sciences* (pp. 298-306). İstanbul: OCERINT. Retrieved on March 8, 2018 from http://www.ocerint.org//intcess16_epublication/papers/144.pdf

Şimşek, M. R., & Dündar, E. (2016b). Exploring the pros and cons of a local English coursebook in user preferences. In F. Uslu (Ed.), *Proceedings of INTCESS2016 3rd International Conference on Education and Social Sciences* (pp. 307-317). İstanbul: OCERINT. Retrieved on March 8, 2018 from http://www.ocerint.org//intcess16_epublication/papers/177.pdf

Şimşek, M. R., & Dündar, E. (2017). Investigating EFL coursebook research in Turkey: Trends in graduate theses of the 2001-2013 period. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *17*(3), 969-1014. Retrieved on March 8, 2018 from http://www.estp.com.tr/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/2017-3-0090.pdf

Taylan, H. (2013). *An evaluation of Breeze 9: The 9th grade English coursebook for Turkish public high schools* (Master's thesis). Çanakkale: Institute of Educational Sciences, Çanakkale 18 Mart University.

Tekir, S., & Arıkan, A. (2007). An analysis of English language teaching coursebooks by Turkish writers: Let's Speak English 7 example. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *4*(2), 1-18.

Timmis, I. (2014). Writing materials for publication: Questions raised and lessons learned. In N. Harwood (Ed.) *English language teaching textbooks: Content, consumption, production* (pp. 241-261). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tok, H. (2010). TEFL textbook evaluation: From teachers' perspectives. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *5*(9), 508-517.

Tomlinson, B. (2001). Materials development. In D. Nunan & R. Carter (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 66-71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2008). Language acquisition and language learning materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials: A critical review* (pp. 3-13). London: Continuum.

Tucker, C. A. (1975). Evaluating beginning textbooks. *English Teaching Forum*, 13, 355-361.

Ulum, Ö. G. (2014). Teachers' views on Yes You Can, the ninth grade English coursebook for public schools. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching, 2*(3), 132-148.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (1999). *A course in language teaching*: *Trainee book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vahdany, F. (2015). Evaluating PNU General English textbook from two perspectives: Science vs. humanities students. *International Journal of Asian Social Science, 5*(11), 678-693.

Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. *ELT Journal, 37*(3), 251-255.

Xiao, J. (2010). *Cultural contents of an in-use EFL textbook and English major students' attitudes and perceptions towards culture learning at Jiangxi University of Science and Technology, China* (Master's thesis). Songkhla: Prince of Songkla University.

Xu, I. H. (2004). *Investigating criteria for assessing ESL textbooks* (Doctoral dissertation). Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Zabawa, J. (2001). Criteria for FCE textbook evaluation: An attempt at questionnaire formulation. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia, 42,* 161-169. Retrieved on April 6, 2018 from https://www.ur.edu.pl/file/1221/sar_v2_17.pdf

Zohrabi, M. (2011). Coursebook development and evaluation for English for general purposes course. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 213- 222.

Zohrabi, M., Sabouri, H., & Behroozian, R. (2012). An assessment of strengths and weaknesses of Iranian first year high school English coursebook using evaluation checklist. *English Language and Literature Studies*, *2*(2), 89-99.

Malzeme değerlendirmede özelleştirilmiş kontrol listeleri: Türkiye'deki İngilizce sınıfları için bağlama duyarlı ölçüt geliştirilmesi

Öz

İngilizce öğretim malzemelerini değerlendirmede ana eğilim, geçmişteki kontrol listelerinden ödünç maddeler yardımıyla kullanıcıların genel memnuniyet düzeylerinin ölçülmesi olmuştur. Ancak bunların gerçek niteliği, bağlama duyarlı ölçütlerin kullanımıyla doğru olarak ölçülebilir. Bu araştırmada, 85 İngilizce öğretmeni ve 500 yedinci sınıf öğrencisi yerel İngilizce ders kitaplarının etkililiğini standardize edilmiş, özelleştirilmiş ve ağırlıklandırılmış Likert-tipi kontrol listeleri aracılığıyla değerlendirmiştir. Kullanıcıların ana odak alanlarındaki memnuniyetsizliğin, salt genel değerlendirmenin sağladığından daha büyük olduğu saptanmıştır. Öğretmenlerin değerlendirmeleri, cinsiyet, deneyim ve ders kitabı kullanım süresinden etkilenmediyse de en çok tercih ettikleri ölçütler, ders kitabının farklı dil düzeyleri ve öğrenici türleri ile uyumuna yoğunlaşmıştır. Öğrencilerin en çok tercih ettiği ölçütler ise yardımcı kaynaklar ve konusal çekicilik ile ilgilidir. Öğretmenlere rehberlik etmesi ve öğrencilere bireysel öğrenme imkanı vermesi açısından yardımcı kaynakların eksikliği ve özgünlüğün yoksunluğu, ders kitabının birinci sıradaki kusurlarındandır. Fakat kullanıcı görüşlerinin örtüştüğü diğer ciddi zayıflıkları ise şunlardır: yaratıcı düşünme için destek eksikliği, konusal çekicilik, dilbilgisi açıklamaları ve kültürel çeşitlilik yoksunluğu. Bu süreğen sorunları, yerel malzemelerin küresel (İngiltere/ABD-üretimi) muadillerine yeğlendiği ve İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği benzer bağlamlarda tanılandığından, İngilizce öğretim malzemelerini tasarlama, düzenleme ve değerlendirmede bağlama duyarlı ve sinerjistik bir model kullanımı önerilmiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kontrol listeleri; malzeme değerlendirme; önem ağırlıklandırması; yerel ders kitapları

AUTHOR BIODATA

Dr. Meliha R. Şimşek is currently an assistant professor of foreign languages at the University of Health Sciences (İstanbul, Turkey), and was previously a teacher trainer at the Faculty of Education, Middle East Technical University (Ankara, Turkey). Her research interests include applied linguistics, ELT methodology, materials evaluation and development, and teacher education.

Esin Dündar is currently a research assistant, and PhD candidate at the Department of Foreign Language Education, Anadolu University (Eskişehir, Turkey). Her research interests include ELT methodology, materials evaluation, and curriculum evaluation.