

EFL TEACHERS' EVALUATION ON "SKILLFUL - TEACHING WRITING AND READING 02"

Le Xuan Mai¹, Nguyen Thi Tu Quyen², & Le Thanh Thao^{3*}
^{1,2,3} Can Tho University, Can Tho, Viet Nam

¹lxmai.ctu.edu.vn

ABSTRACT

In case that many reforms in learning and teaching English in Vietnam were implemented, exploring the effectiveness of different coursebooks was raised to be a sufficient need. This research is more qualitative than quantitative in its nature, aiming to investigate EFL teachers' evaluation of the coursebook Skillful – Reading & Writing 02 in a specific educational institution in the Mekong Delta. Thirteen teacher participants using the books were invited to participate in this study. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected by using two instruments, questionnaires and semi-interviews. The study provided a new checklist for evaluating materials in teaching and learning reading and writing. The findings showed that (1) the merits of the coursebook Skillful – Reading & Writing 02: e.g. colorful illustrations, numerous online learning resources accompanying online accounts, suggestive topics, updated contents, and impressive study skills component; and (2) demerits of the book in terms of writing section which does not match the general objectives of the program. Likewise, (3) the cons are regarding quite small font size and long listening activities of the coursebook. Additionally, some implications were suggested in this study to enhance the effectiveness of using sufficient materials for higher educational institutions.

Keywords: Coursebook Evaluation, Coursebook Evaluation Criteria, Coursebook Evaluation Checklist, Teaching Writing and Reading, EFL Teachers' Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

The current study was conducted in a preeminent university in higher education in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. Imposed in No.1269/CP-KG, which commissioned these institutions the task of designing "advanced curricula" and using English as a medium of instruction, the university has become one of the first nine universities nationwide to pilot the curricula in the academic year 2006-2007. The institution has officially started the project "Advanced training programs at some Vietnamese universities in period 2008-2015", approved by the Prime Minister in Decision 1505/QD-TTg. From an urgent and practical need of using English as a medium of instruction, the English bridging program or the English Foundation Program has been implemented. Selecting appropriate teaching materials is the very first stage.

Admittedly, teaching materials or coursebooks, contributing as a mediating means between educational inputs and expected outputs, have an essential role in language

teaching in the classroom (Riazi, 2002). Besides English coursebooks published by the Vietnam Ministry of Education and Training, there is also a wide range of other English reference books, communication books, and skill development books. In Vietnam, higher education institutions are allowed to choose the coursebooks which they think are suitable for their students. Coursebooks are freely opted based on students' proficiency and communicative purposes, which create favorable conditions for students to develop their English skills, especially communication skills. In other words, any educational practices apart from the ones strictly governed by the Education of Ministry in terms of the selections of a specific material to teaching circumstances, which means these education practices are given a certain amount of autonomy, the choices on coursebooks used in particular contexts are mainly learner-driven.

In the Mekong Delta, the majority of English coursebooks used in higher education institutions and English centers are written by authors in English-speaking countries, which seem reliable and effective in teaching English for communication. So does the current university, teaching materials are freely selected for the English Foundation Program, which requires a process of refinement and regularly changes to suit practical conditions. In reality, it will be objective to conclude that there is a book entirely fitting the requirements of a program, the needs and capabilities of learners, teachers' objectives, etc. As an inevitable result, teachers, contributing as active stakeholders in the process of realizing assigned objectives, are critically required to make adaptations to the opted coursebook. It is assumed that the teacher plays an essential role in developing the quality of the coursebook used and making changes when possible. Therefore, to figure out the pros and cons of a coursebook, teachers should be allowed to be involved in the coursebook evaluation process. From this view of point, the study was conducted to provide teachers an opportunity to raise their voices and increase their sense of empowerment in their teaching.

"Skillful - Reading and Writing 02" was used as the materials for evaluation in this study. It was written by Louis Rogers and Jennifer Wilkin and published in London by Macmillan Publishers. This coursebook, which follows a skills-based approach, consists of 10 units. According to the publishers, the book supplies students "with practical guidance and support, touching on new life skills such as time management, organization, and preparation, while building confidence for independent learning throughout their university career."

This research proposed a new checklist for the evaluation regarding teaching reading and writing coursebooks, basically adapted from the checklists in preceding studies, such as AbdelWahab (2013), Mukundan et al. (2011), Litz (2005), Alamri (2008), and Vietnamese MOET (2015). The brand-new checklist was grouped under four basic domains: (1) Physical and utilitarian attributes, (2) Efficient layout of objectives and supplementary materials, (3) Learning-teaching content, and (4) Language types and skills.

Figure 1. Checklist for evaluation on teaching reading and writing coursebooks

Physical and utilitarian attributes

- The cover of the book
- The font size and type
- The white space for achieving clarity
- The price
- The layout and design of the book
- The content page
- The glossary
- The illustrations
- The organization of the contents
- The book's mistakes

Learning-teaching content

- The complement of topics and features
- Students and the world around link
- Students' perspectives elicitation
- Diversity of topics
- The degrees of interestingness of contents
- Developing students' sub-skills strategies
- Variety of meaningful and mechanical tasks
- Variety of communicative tasks
- New life skills related
- The distributions of tasks
- The degrees of clearliness in instructions
- The degrees of comprehensible contexts
- Guides for multicultural interaction
- Positive views of sensible topics

Efficient layout of objectives and supplementary materials

- The book and the course objectives link
- The book and student's level link
- Audio and visual materials access
- Instructions for using
- Supporting resources for teachers
- Students account for online supplements
- The updated version
- Student-centered approach orientation
- Guides for catering students' differentiation

Language type and skills

- The amount of new vocabulary
- The presense of levels of new vocabulary
- The contextualization of grammar points
- The manner and difficulty of grammar
- Tasks and students' levels link
- Presence of skill tasks
- Sub-skills suggestions
- The authenticity in reading passages
- The length of reading passages
- The diversity of types and topics in writing
- The requirements of writing tasks

Relevant studies have been conducted to evaluate textbooks, such as Daoud and Celce-Murcia's (1979), Williams (1983), Hutchinson and Waters' (1987), Sheldon (1988), McDonough and Shaw (1993), Cunningsworth (1995), Griffiths (1995), Tomlinson (1998), McKay (2000), Celce-Murcia (2001), Çakit (2006), Jolly and Bolitho (2011), Grabe and Stoller (2013), Mukundan and Nimehchisalem (2015), or England (2017). These studies have created proof of criteria for concluding whether a book is extraordinary or bad. Based on them, many studies have been conducted to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of various coursebooks for teaching and learning. In other words, many factors have been investigated to identify which book is successful or failed. Specifically, the "American English

File” series, evaluated in the study of Hashemi and Borhani (2015), have many strong points, namely the appropriateness for teachers and language institutes’ objectives.

Besides that, Chegeni et al. (2016) evaluated “Four Corners” as one of the most reliable book series. Furthermore, according to Riasati and Zare (2011), the “New Interchange” coursebook series are specifically suitable for the Iranian context. Moreover, it was highly appreciated for the reasonable price, good accessibility, the availability of a teacher’s guide, and audiotape. In addition, Litz (2005) evaluated “English Firsthand 2” whose strong points are its appeal, clear and logical organization, quality of multi-skills training, and communicative quality. Besides the strengths, some of the weaknesses were pointed out. The “New Interchange” series’ shortcomings are a shortage of supplementary teaching materials, the unsuitable level of language, and cultural issues (Riasati and Zare, 2011). The “English Firsthand 2” book’s weaknesses are the lack of activity variation, insufficient meaningful practice, and the shortage of realistic discourse, etc.

This study desires to investigate the teachers’ evaluation on the specific coursebook “Skillful” level 02 for Reading and Writing skills based on the framework (See Figure 1) so that the teachers could maximize the usefulness of the coursebook in their particular context as well as in some similar teaching and learning environment.

METHODOLOGY

Despite exploiting more qualitative than quantitative in its approach, this study is still descriptive, mixed-method research, using both quantitative and qualitative approaches (Fraenkel et al., 2012). However, due to the nature of the limited number of available participants who have been using the coursebooks, the findings of this study will mainly depend on qualitative data. More specifically, questionnaires included in the quantitative method, and interviews included in the qualitative method were combined to answer the research question: What is EFL teachers’ evaluation of the coursebook “Skillful – Reading & Writing 02”?

To investigate EFL teachers’ evaluation of the book, a questionnaire adapted from the previous studies presented above was delivered. There are 44 closed-ended items, divided into four clusters with 12 sub-categories. The questionnaire items use the five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree to (5) strongly agree.

In terms of interviews, to gain further insights into participants’ perceptions of the aforementioned issues, the interviews were carried out with 9 teacher participants including three EFL teachers of reading (Teacher 1, 2, and 3) and three others for teaching writing (Teacher 4, 5, and 6). Names of the interviewees were presented under pennames for confidential purposes. The interviews were guided by a list of questions in accordance with the research question. The interview lasted from 15 to 20 minutes with each respondent.

The research was conducted at a university in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. All 13 teacher participants who have been using Skillful 02 in their English Foundation Program classes in the school year 2018-2019 were invited to participate in this study. The characteristics of participants are described deliberately in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Summary of the personal information of participants for the questionnaire

Personal information		Number (N=13)	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	1	7.69
	Female	12	92.31
Age	26-30	1	7.69
	31-39	3	23.08
	40-49	7	53.85
	Above 50	2	15.38
Professional Qualifications	M.A degree	12	92.31
	Doctorate degree	1	7.69
	From 6 to 10 years	2	15.38
Years of experience	From 11 to 20 years	4	30.77
	More than 20 years	7	53.85

Table 2. Participants for the interviews

Variables	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3	Teacher 4	Teacher 5	Teacher 6
Gender	Female	Female	Male	Female	Female	Female
Age	26 - 30	31 - 39	40 - 49	40 - 49	>50	40 - 49
Professional qualifications	M.A	M.A	M.A	M.A	M.A	Doctorate
Teaching experience	6 - 10	11 - 20	>20	>20	>20	11 - 20
Subjects	Reading	Reading	Reading	Writing	Writing	Writing

First of all, the questionnaires were piloted with 30 teachers sharing some similar characteristics with the actual participants. The reliability coefficient Cronbach's Alpha of piloting data was $\alpha = .81$. It proved that it was acceptable to use the questionnaire in research with a large population. Accordingly, the questionnaire was sent to 13 EFL reading and writing teachers via Google Form.

In terms of interviews, before the conduction of actual interviews, three teachers (out of 30 teachers participating in the pilot questionnaire) were invited to participate in pilot interviews. Thanks to that, the questions was readjusted to make them more understandable. After that, the actual interviews were conducted face-to-face with 6 EFL teachers to investigate their evaluation of the coursebook. To guarantee the reliability and the intelligibility of the questions, the interviews were conducted in Vietnamese. The interviews were planned as informal chats and conducted face-to-face in quiet places. Each interview lasted 15 – 20 minutes and was carefully recorded by the researcher. Then, the researcher transcribed and reported the data. To assure reliability, English responses were confirmed by the interviewees to check whether they had the same meaning as their Vietnamese answers. Following thematic analysis was used to analyze the data. Particularly, the researcher made a protocol to familiarize and coded the data in specific themes. Similarities and differences among teachers' responses were recognized. Evidence for each

theme was provided by using direct citations of the interviewees' answers which were double-checked by the supervisor and an experienced educator.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Physical and Utilitarian Attributes

Table 3 analyzes 10 first items in the questionnaire, including general appearance and practical consideration (1-4) and layout and design (5-10). These items represent the teachers' evaluation on the physical and utilitarian attributes of the coursebook.

Table 3. EFL teachers' evaluation of physical and utilitarian attributes

Items	SD (%)	D (%)	Neu (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
1. Informative and eye-catching cover	.00	.00	30.77	53.85	15.38
2. Appropriate and legible font type and size	.00	15.38	15.38	61.54	7.69
3. Enough white space to achieve clarity	.00	7.69	46.15	38.46	7.69
4. The reasonable price	.00	7.69	61.54	30.77	.00
5. Appropriate and clear 'layout and design'	.00	.00	15.38	84.62	.00
6. A clear overview of content page	.00	.00	.00	84.62	15.38
7. Appropriate glossary	.00	.00	30.77	69.23	.00
8. Varied and attractive illustrations	.00	.00	15.38	76.92	7.69
9. Logical and effective organization	.00	7.69	23.08	69.23	.00
10. Free of mistakes	.00	23.08	23.08	46.15	7.69

Note: SD=Strongly disagree, D=Disagree, Neu=Neutral, A=Agree, SA= Strongly agree

As shown in Table 3, it was acceptable to state that the physical and utilitarian attributes of the book are fine. Still, the illustrations are attractive and eye-catching, and the layout is clear and reasonable. One of the interviewees said,

I'm pleased with the coursebook's appearance. Its cover, font type and size, etc., I like them all: its layout, design, illustrations... The books we use are authentic, so the illustrations are clear, beautiful and colorful, which is really helpful when you look at the pictures for writing ideas (Teacher 4; Female; M.A; Writing)

It is in line with Griffiths's (1995) criteria, who indicates that interesting, eye-catching, multicolor, well-illustrated coursebooks are more beneficial for learners. Moreover, the finding is consistent with Sheldon (1988), who indicated that illustrations could be regarded as the most significant feature in coursebook design.

However, some negative comments were pointed out in the interviews, such as the font type and size. For example, one interviewee said:

I feel the text and the font are a bit small while authors are ambitious to put so many things on one page. It makes the book a little difficult to read. I mean that it is not very reader-friendly. (Teacher 6; Female; Doctorate; Writing)

It is converse with Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) framework in which a successful coursebook should possess suitable layout, format, typography, and graphics, and Daoud and

Celce-Murcia's (1979) one in which typeface size should be consistent with the intended users.

Following up, the teachers did not highly evaluate the white space for achieving clarity. Simultaneously, all the teachers also agreed that the white space of the coursebook is not enough for students to take notes. One stated:

And the second one, for example, they have to fill in the blanks, the gap for them to fill in is too small if it is directly worked in the book. (Teacher 2; Female; M.A; Reading)

It is different from Sheldon's (1988) requirements for a good book, who recommended that there would be more convenient for students with enough white space to note throughout the lessons.

However, one of them clarified that the white space is not a problem because students should write their notes in their textbooks.

Those who say that there is not enough space to take notes are wrong. It's students' duty to take notes in their notebooks. (Teacher 4; Female; M.A; Writing)

Therefore, it depends on different teachers' perspectives that they think students should do their exercises in the coursebook or their textbooks.

Efficient Layout of Objectives and Supplementary Materials

Table 4 continues to report the results of second cluster, efficient layout of objectives and supplementary materials. This cluster includes three sub-clusters, namely objectives (11-12), supporting resources (13-16), and teaching methods (17-19).

Table 4. EFL teachers' evaluation of Efficient layout of objectives and supplementary materials

Items	SD (%)	D (%)	Neu (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
11. Close connection with the general objectives of the curriculum	.00	7.69	15.38	76.92	.00
12. Compatibility with the level of the students	.00	15.38	15.38	69.23	.00
13. Assessable accompanying audio and visual materials	.00	7.69	38.46	46.15	7.69
14. Clear and detailed instructions.	.00	7.69	38.46	53.85	.00
15. Online accompanying supporting resources for teachers to develop positive and effective teaching	.00	7.69	23.08	61.54	7.69
16. Students' online accounts to access the supplementary resource to practice, self-study and self-assess.	.00	.00	30.77	61.54	7.69
17. The latest teaching methods	.00	15.38	46.15	38.46	.00
18. Student-centered methods	.00	.00	15.38	76.92	7.69
19. Categorizing mix-ability students and classes of different sizes	.00	23.08	23.08	46.15	7.69

Note: SD=Strongly disagree, D=Disagree, Neu=Neutral, A=Agree, SA= Strongly agree

EFL Teachers' Evaluation of Objectives

As observed in Table 4, the teachers highly agreed that the coursebook matches the curricula objectives and students' levels. One stated that the coursebook virtually matches the general objectives of the curriculum and almost compatible with the level of the students. The actual words were:

In my opinion, it is appropriate, the program's objective will be B1, and for students, the majority of students have a relatively suitable input language, and if any of them need to develop vocabulary and structures, they can pick up a lot of useful vocabulary and structures from the reading. (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

It satisfied the requirements of Cunningsworth (1995) that coursebooks should compatible with students' language proficiency and matches the objectives of the course.

However, a mismatch was observed in the interview. Two teachers admitted that the objectives of the coursebook suit the students' proficiency but do not match the objectives of the curriculum. In other words, this coursebook is useful in terms of knowledge and the input language yet not appropriate for VSTEP exam orientation. In particular, one stated:

Honestly, it doesn't suit the objectives because we have been trying to orient students to VSTEP, with the outcome is targeted at Level B1. Throughout this coursebook's contents, from the first one till the last one, it provides various skills and topics, but it doesn't match the B1 format of VSTEP. (Teacher 4; Female; M.A; Writing)

It was failed to meet the criteria of Cunningsworth (1995) that neither does the coursebook suit the students' level nor match the general objectives of the curriculum. To be more precise, the coursebook is not suitable to prepare for the VSTEP exam. These maybe bring troubles to writing teachers; hence, some adjustments should be considered to fit in specific teaching and learning circumstances.

EFL teachers' evaluation of Supporting resources

Next, Table 4 also indicates that the teachers had a good source for developing their teaching. One interviewee stated,

In terms of learning materials, firstly, there are online resources for the student's book's sections, the answer keys, various types of tests, videos. Then, the book also provides good teaching resources for teachers to carry out the activities at ease. (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

Furthermore, it is believed that the students had online accounts to access the supplementary resource to practice, self-study and self-assess. One stated,

In my opinion, it is useful because the trend of using digital books helps students have very good access. These online resources divided the exercises into 2 parts, one is to help students

review the exercises in the book, another one is extra practice for students to do those things with a different appearance, so it is useful. (Teacher 5; Female; M.A; Writing)

This book was successful in terms of providing supplements for both variables, the teachers and their students. Sheldon (1988) also indicated that the supplementary are considered very useful and adequate.

On the other hand, the comment below illustrates the reasons for teachers' limited implementation of online resources:

In fact, I teach writing, so its implementation couldn't be much because writing consists of grammar, and giving feedback to students' online work is time-consuming. That's why I don't apply it. (Teacher 6; Female; Doctorate; Writing)

Moreover, teacher 3 considered that although there are enough online accompanying supporting accounts for teachers and students in every coursebook, for some of the following reasons, its use is still inadequate:

There is an account in the book, but when I asked for the teacher and student's online accounts before, the course organizers did not instruct it. So I think the online resources are supplementary and helpful, but there was no instruction on online learning and online learning evaluation. The fact that I did not track students, so I did not have a grasp of them. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

In stark contrast to the above reasons, teacher 1 confirmed that implementing these online accounts is quite easy and effective, and she has no difficulty in guiding students, in carrying out policy to assess the student's passing course requirement, to in checking the student's progress. Teacher 1 stated:

I seemed to be the first person who found out the online accounts and sent student accounts to do ... I have no problems and I still follow up right from the first week and urge students to do, so the students studied with me all completed those online work. (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

There is a dissimilarity both amongst teachers and amongst students in applying these online resources, in particular using online accounts to access online supplementary of the coursebook. In other words, while some EFL reading teachers were satisfied with these online resources, the EFL writing teachers did not take advantage of these supporting sources because of time consumption and technique issues. It is somewhat consistent with the criteria of Çakit (2006), who claimed that teachers did not make use of the supporting resources due to the time allocated for the course. It is extremely important to have an agreement on the use of accompanying supplementary of the coursebook to avoid wasting these great supporting resources and enhance additional practice.

EFL Teachers' Evaluation of Teaching methods

Table 4 highlights that the majority of teachers well evaluated the student-centered orientation of the book. Furthermore, most of the interviewees agreed that the coursebook

could support them in teaching English using active methods - the learner-centered approach. For example, one interviewee said:

It gives students a topic, and a sample. Then, it asks them to write about a similar topic. I would let the students read first, then elicit ideas and ask them to think of a possible topic that they could write about and design their own mind-map - it's up to them. (Teacher 6; Female; Doctorate; Writing)

To be more precise, the teachers had clearer explanations of the teaching methods they have used for this coursebook, such as questioning and answering, discussing, and presenting. Firstly, teacher 3 said:

The teaching method I use is mainly asking - answering, discussing, and presenting reports, because of the purpose of the book, the reading sections are for students to express their ideas so it focuses on discussing and reporting. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

Besides that, teacher 1 added some more techniques and explained in details such as:

Depending on the lesson, I often use discussion and production rather than input. That means students will be led into vocabulary and elicit questions... Then, after their curiosity is raised, students begin to read the text to answer those questions. After that, students read once and I will begin to teach students the skills for searching details, finding bridge questions, finding mind-map for ideas, advantages, disadvantages, or others... (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

Regarding teaching English using active methods, the teachers have their techniques when using this coursebook and can be generalized as below:

I think it also supports quite well for positive teaching methods, but teachers need to dig deeper. For example, in my classes, students have to do a lot because all tasks revolve around what they have to do, so it can be considered student-centered. (Teacher 2; Female; M.A; Reading)

The findings revealed that there are various teaching methods as well as teaching techniques that have been flexibly applied by teachers to convey this book. The teachers are satisfied that learner-centered teaching methods can be used to apply in their classrooms. It has concurred with the requirements of Williams (1983), who stated that the latest teaching procedures might not be inevitably the most suitable method for the target learning-teaching context. Thus, for the coursebook, the EFL teachers can apply positive and compatible teaching methods to different types of students, and student-centered learning is still a priority for teachers.

Learning-Teaching Content

The results of cluster No.3 are presented in Table 5. This cluster consists of 14 items representing three sub-clusters, namely subjects and contents (20-25), activities and tasks (26-30), and social and cultural contexts (31-33).

Table 5. EFL teachers' evaluation of Learning-teaching content

Items	SD (%)	D (%)	Neu (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
20. The complement of L/S coursebook through parallel topics and features	.00	.00	15.38	69.23	15.38
21. The encouraging topics about the English language and the world around	.00	.00	7.69	76.92	15.38
22. The encouraging topics for expressing students' own views	.00	.00	7.69	84.62	7.69
23. A variety of topics from different fields	.00	.00	.00	84.62	15.38
24. Interesting, challenging and motivating 'subject and content' of the coursebook	.00	.00	23.08	61.54	15.38
25. Provision of study skills helping students be confident for independent learning throughout their university career	.00	.00	38.46	61.54	.00
26. Provision of a variety of meaningful and mechanical tasks and activities to practice language items and skills	.00	15.38	23.08	61.54	.00
27. Provision of communicative tasks and activities that enable communicative in real life	.00	7.69	7.69	76.92	7.69
28. Provision of tasks for new life skills	.00	.00	38.46	61.54	.00
29. Appropriate amount of tasks and activities	.00	15.38	46.15	38.46	.00
30. Clear instructions of tasks	.00	7.69	15.38	76.92	.00
31. Comprehensible social and cultural contexts	.00	.00	7.69	92.31	.00
32. Content encouraging the interaction of students about new culture	.00	.00	15.38	84.62	.00
33. Positive views of ethnic origins, occupations, age groups, social groups and disability	.00	.00	15.38	84.62	.00

Note: SD=Strongly disagree, D=Disagree, Neu=Neutral, A=Agree, SA= Strongly agree

EFL teachers' evaluation of Subjects and Contents

Table 5 indicates that a great percentage of teachers agreed on a great number of topics from different fields. However, the interviews provided data that were not similar to what Table 5 has showed. Most teachers said that the topics of the coursebook are rather abstract while the other teacher was satisfied with the diversity of them. In particular, one teacher said:

The subject of the book is rich, well-illustrated, and has some provocative questions for students to discuss. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

In contrast, some others had common perceptions with relatively abstract topics, which is somewhat unclear but not something so unpleasant. To be more precise, teacher 2

stated that the topics could achieve a catchy effect, but its messages are not very clear enough. Teacher 2 said:

Actually, for a topic, it needs to be short so it is easy to remember, so I think it achieves effective goals... but maybe the topic that I said is abstract... there are some sections... maybe its message... is not very clear... But if we focus on the reading skills only... it is not influenced much. (Teacher 2; Female; M.A; Reading)

Likewise, Table 5 also shows that most of the teachers highly appreciated the contents of the book which can improve students' critical thinking. Specifically, teacher 3 supplemented that the contents of the coursebook encourage students to think more about the world around them as below:

Our usual topics are rarely about things like adventure, but they help students understand history or adventurer's journey. So that is also interesting. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

Next, most of the teachers highly evaluated that the coursebook complements each other through parallel topics and features. Moreover, they also highly rated the interestingness of the contents presented in the book. Specifically, teacher 1 expressed satisfaction with the useful content presented in this coursebook. One teacher valued the contents of the coursebook as comments below:

The topics are interesting and close to readers. The input vocabulary is even closer to the practical setting of students because this is a fairly new coursebook. (Teacher 6; Female; Doctorate; Writing)

Furthermore, teacher 2 has both well rated the contents in terms of building up reading proficiency. However, this teacher also pointed out some of its small shortcomings, such as the duplication of contents of tasks in some units:

I think the content of the lesson is pretty good because it builds up from each question type, which means it builds up each skill for the reading section, and this book will more focus on the reading of IELTS. However, I think these sections overlap. (Teacher 2; Female; M.A; Reading)

The findings revealed that the majority of the teachers are highly satisfied with the updated and somewhat abstract topics and the rich contents of the book, which prompt students to think more about the world around them. It satisfied the requirements of Tomlinson (1998) that the students' curiosity, attentiveness, and notice should be triggered by the coursebook's diversity, engaging presentation, and provocative content.

EFL Teachers' Evaluation of Activities and Tasks

What can be seen in Table 5 show that the majority of teachers well evaluated of the coursebook provides communicative tasks and activities that enable communicative in real life. A common view amongst interviewees was that the tasks of the coursebook are meaningful and authentic in general. To be more precise, one interviewee said:

Some tasks have been adjusted to be suitable for students, so if we talk about the level of authentic... yes... but they are not actually 100% authentic. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

It shares a similar feature in Cunningsworth (1995) that authentic materials can convey greater practicality to enhance students' motivation.

And more than half of the EFL teachers were satisfied with the variety of meaningful and mechanical tasks and activities to practice language items and skills from the book. One interviewee also added that there are various kinds of tasks in the coursebook, such as:

The reading exercises are quite diverse, including true-false statements, matching to find the heading of the paragraph, and also multiple choice A B C. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

The accompanying study skills section of the book, considered an outstanding finding, is excellent. It equips students with many new backgrounds for life skills and global skills to make them easier to complete the essentials of global citizens. They have concurred with the criteria of Cunningsworth (1995), who asserted that study skills train students in reference skills, advise students on study skills development, and reflect on various study techniques of students.

Nevertheless, the teachers indicated that the amount of tasks and activities is not distributed appropriately. In addition, the teachers also stated that hardly any books in the market can cater to different preferred learning styles, neither can this coursebook. For example, one teacher said:

Obviously, it is not diverse in learning style because the lesson units have the same format as well as the steps, such as global reading, then close reading, and then a discussion about the vocabulary before, so it is equal, it has no varies. (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

Moreover, the writing teachers also felt disappointed about the book's contents. One said,

The tasks in the book are not really appropriate. In general, they need to be adjusted. (Teacher 5; Female; M.A; Writing)

This finding is different from the requirements of Çakit (2006), who implied that materials developers should design materials that can serve a variety of preferred learning styles so that all students can benefit from different learning approaches. Besides that, many authors (McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Tomlinson, 1998; Celce-Murcia, 2001) confirmed that activities and tasks should show regard to different learning styles so that the lessons can come up with students' needs, interests and expectations.

EFL Teachers' Evaluation of Social and Cultural Contexts

Table 5 shows that the majority of teachers well evaluated the comprehensible social and cultural contexts in the coursebook. In the same vein, they also agreed that the coursebook content helps students be aware of how to interact using the language within a new culture that is often very different from their own and the coursebook expresses positive views of ethnic origins, occupations, age groups, social groups, and disability. These ideas were confirmed in the interviews. All interviewees agreed that the social and cultural

issues designed in the coursebook are diverse, understandable, and acceptable. The comment below illustrates the teachers' evaluation of these cultural aspects:

I think the social-cultural aspects are all right; I was relatively satisfied because it is quite understandable, helps the learners aware of different cultures. (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

It is in line with one of the requirements in McKay (2000), who claimed that using social and cultural issues can encourage students to have a positive learning attitude and enhance students' motivation.

Language Type and Skills

The last cluster was presented in Table 6. In the table, 11 items represent 2 sub-clusters, namely vocabulary and grammar (34-37) and reading and writing skills (38-44).

Table 6. EFL teachers' evaluation of Language Type and Skills

Items	SD (%)	D (%)	Neu (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
34. Appropriate amount of new vocabulary in each unit	.00	.00	15.38	76.92	7.69
35. Logical presence of new vocabulary	.00	.00	23.08	69.23	7.69
36. Contextualized grammar	.00	7.69	23.08	61.54	7.69
37. Logical presence of grammar	.00	23.08	23.08	46.15	7.69
38. Compatible skill tasks with students' level	.00	15.38	30.77	53.85	.00
39. Logical presence of skill tasks	.00	23.08	7.69	69.23	.00
40. Appropriate sub-skills	.00	.00	15.38	84.62	.00
41. Authentic reading passages at an appropriate level	.00	.00	7.69	69.23	23.08
42. Appropriate length of the reading texts	.00	.00	30.77	61.54	7.69
43. Diverse writing tasks with different types and topics	7.69	15.38	38.46	38.46	.00
44. Suitable writing activities for length, degree of accuracy, and amount of guidance	7.69	15.38	53.85	23.08	.00

Note: SD=Strongly disagree, D=Disagree, Neu=Neutral, A=Agree, SA= Strongly agree
EFL teachers' evaluation of Vocabulary and Grammar

In Table 6, a great percentage of teachers agreed on the appropriate amount of new vocabulary in each unit. Next, more than half of teachers highly evaluated the presence of new vocabulary, which moves gradually from simple to more complex. Whilst teacher 3 considered, "vocabulary is suitable for students' level", teacher 2 revealed that the vocabulary is quite academic; thus, it is more or less strange for some students. Details are as follows:

It seems that some students will feel quite disappointed. The reason is that they are non-English majored and its vocabulary is too much and academic at the very beginning. However,

if we looked at the academic purpose, grammar or vocabulary, it would be ok. (Teacher 2; Female; M.A; Reading)

In addition, teacher 3 has suggested that there are several types of exam questions as well as grammar and vocabulary that students can take advantage of from this book for their later B1 examination. Particularly, teacher 3 stated:

Actually, this book is for the IELTS exam. And if you want to use it to take the B1 exam, you can apply its vocabulary, the structure of grammar. And, there are also some same kinds of questions, but you have to have a connection, such as questions related to vocabulary. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

Additionally, more than half of teachers were satisfied with the contextualization of grammar. One example is,

Grammar is OK, in my opinion. It provides just some basic relevant grammatical rules. (Teacher 6; Female; Doctorate; Writing)

However, not many EFL teachers agreed with the logic and difficulty of grammar rules presented in the book. In general, all teachers evaluated the grammar of the coursebook as ordinary, understandable, and concise. For example, one teacher said:

Vocabulary is suitable for students' level; grammar is presented in simple, understandable, concise multiple-choice questions. It's fine. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

The findings above are consistent with the framework of Mukundan and Nimehchisalem (2015), who indicated that vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation components should be contextualized, engaging, and easy to follow.

EFL Teachers' Evaluation of Reading and Writing Skills

As shown in Table 6, the majority of teachers highly evaluated the authentic (real-world) reading passages at an appropriate level. Especially the teachers taking responsibility for teaching reading, they were relatively satisfied with reading strategies, compatibility with students' level, and the use of authentic or real-world reading passages. It somewhat touched the requirements in Grabe and Stoller (2013) that students should be conscious of reading strategies to become strategic readers. Moreover, the findings are somewhat consistent with the requirements of Cunningsworth (1995) that reading passages should be authentic and meaningful at an appropriate level in order to facilitate students to improve their reading skills.

Moreover, most of the teachers were satisfied with the sub-skills (scanning, skimming, summarizing...) presented in the book. Teacher 1 evaluated the complexity of reading which requires higher critical thinking skills. The teacher said:

This book seems to have higher reading comprehension skills, which means it is more advanced with mapping ideas, organizing ideas, and so-called metacognitive strategies rather than usual strategies. (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

Likewise, the orders of the difficulties related to tasks and the length of tasks were not highly evaluated. Simultaneously, teachers 1 when asked whether the reading tasks move from simple to complex or not, said:

It's kind of theme following. It varies skills and does not move from easy to difficult level. I think it is organized by the level of thinking. (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

Furthermore, teacher 1 also supplemented the difficulties of mix-ability classes she faced in teaching reading, as below:

I have only one problem that is the mix-ability class. It means that some students will find this book relatively easy and they complete the tasks here quite well, but some students with low level will spend more time on it and the difficulty is that they do not have enough vocabulary to express ideas at a deeper and higher level. (Teacher 1; Female; M.A; Reading)

Similarly, teacher 2 also had difficulty in mixing-ability classes, and teacher 2 revealed that due to the heterogeneity of students' level, teachers had to spend time adapting activities according to each class in a flexible way. More specifically, she said:

Depend on the classes and students' attitude, there will be different tasks or activities for those classes in my lesson plans. Then, the second one is the course syllabus. Moreover, in specific cases, I spend time on various classes differently. The course syllabus for each of these classes has its own difficulties such as how to distribute so that it's exactly the same among all the classes, it's a bit difficult. (Teacher 2; Female; M.A; Reading)

Nevertheless, EFL teachers did not highly evaluate the diversity of different types and topics in writing tasks. Generally, writing skills received a lot of negative feedback. The teachers stated that writing tasks did not meet the overall objectives of the program, were not too compatible with student competencies, and did not give clear instruction to students. As a result, the writing teachers have to revise the activities to suit their classes.

When this book is first introduced, we used it to teach. After one semester, we find it not suitable for teaching writing, so we teachers prepare our own materials to teach writing for the English Foundation Program. For writing, in the 2nd semester, we stopped using it and switched to our own materials. (Teacher 4; Female; M.A; Writing)

The finding is different from the ideas of England (2017), who indicated that writing materials should provoke students to create high-quality productions and facilitate students in fostering higher-order thinking skills. Moreover, this finding is also different from what Jolly and Bolitho (2011) believed. They stated that supplying clear instructions to the activities and tasks is one of the most significant duties of the authors so that the book can meet the need of learning and teaching. It is implied that poor instructions of activities may curb the natural development of the classroom. In general, the coursebook offers students numerous reading and writing strategies, but the teachers have not taken advantage as well as effectively used these available inputs yet.

Further Findings from the Teachers' Voice

It was stated that it is hard to reconcile in using the same coursebook to teach by two language skill teachers because their progress is not the same. For this context, this comment of the teacher is completely new and special. However, teacher 2 also indicated the satisfaction with the interrelation between the reading and writing part of this coursebook, she confirmed that this correlation benefits both teachers and students. Teacher 2 commented:

First, the reading skills are built step by step specifically. And, there is a section at the end of each unit that summarizes the vocabulary needed. So that is the one that I feel quite good about this coursebook. Second, the writing and reading sections are interrelated. They also cover the contents of the reading section so that the students have more vocabulary and so do they in writing sections. (Teacher 2; Female; M.A; Reading)

On the contrary, teacher 3 expressed that there seems to be no trouble in using this coursebook to teach the reading skill, she explained:

The reading is designed suitably. Generally, I teach the contents of a passage each day, so time for both discussion and presentation is sufficient, appropriate. The topics are also meaningful, too. The syllabus is also suitable, and the preparation of lesson plans is generally not a problem because the book also has supplementary. (Teacher 3; Male; M.A; Reading)

In addition to the difficulties of students learning attitudes or the incompatibility of the coursebook with program objectives, a new finding of teaching issues is also mentioned, which is the difficulty of assigning teaching for reading and writing teachers. It is hard to reconcile in using the same coursebook to teach by two language skill teachers because their progress is not the same. For this context, this comment of the teacher is completely new and special.

CONCLUSION

Findings and limitations

Table 7 summarizes the findings of this study in terms of four different features of the evaluation, namely physical and utilitarian attributes, efficient layout of objectives and supplementary materials, learning-teaching content, and language type and skills.

Table 7. Summary of the findings

Evaluation features	Strengths	Weaknesses
Physical and utilitarian attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good cover - Attractive and eye-catching illustrations - Clear and reasonable layout - Well-organized content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small font size - Lack of white space - Unreasonable price
Efficient layout of objectives and supplementary materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriateness in developing knowledge and providing input - Helpful and sufficient online supplements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unsuitability for preparing for examination - Difficulty in accessing online supplements

Learning-teaching content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learner-centered approach focus - Various suggestions in teaching methods or techniques - Authentic and diverse topics - Various communicative tasks - Good integration of social and cultural issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unclear or unpleasant topics - The duplication of tasks - Lack of activities for catering different learning styles - Big concern for teaching writing by the book
Language type and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate new vocabulary - Various types of exam questions - Authentic reading passages - Good source for developing sub-skills - Good correlation between reading and writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unchallenging grammar exercises - Unsuitability for teaching mixed-level classes - Poor writing tasks

Besides the findings in Table 7, the most concern could be some flexible adjustments and supplementary compiled materials in writing section. However, the study just conducted with EFL teachers from a small population at the current university so it cannot be generalized to all cases. Although the findings of this study provide a further understanding of the coursebook Skillful 02, it left a need of further investigation.

Implications

Based on the findings of the current study, several pedagogical implications are proposed for stakeholders as course coordinators, teachers, and school administrators.

First, the writing section of the book may not meet the objectives of the English Foundation Program. Therefore, editorial materials for teaching writing should be reconsidered. Although the coursebook follows the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), it does not match the format of the 6-level language skill framework for Vietnamese. In other words, it is not compatible with the Vietnamese Standard Test of English Proficiency (VSTEP) exam format. However, regarding reading skills, the coursebook Skillful – Reading and Writing 02 is highly appreciated. It means this book is extraordinary in terms of teaching reading.

In the specific contextual setting, the process of teaching reading and writing skills amongst teachers of reading and writing is not the same but reading provides necessary language input for writing activities, so it is possible to reconcile reassignment or can assign one teacher to take responsibility for both skills.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Wahab, M. M. (2013). Developing an English language textbook evaluative checklist. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 1(3), 55-70.
- Alamri, A. A. M, (2008). *An evaluation of the sixth grade English language textbook for Saudi boys' schools*. Unpublished MA thesis, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.
- Çakit, I. (2006). Evaluation of the EFL textbook "New Bridge to Success 3" from the perspectives of students and teachers. *Unpublished MA thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey*.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Language teaching approaches: An overview. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 2(1), 3-10.
- Cunningsworth, A (1995). *Choosing Your Coursebook*. London: Heinemann.
- Chegeni, N., Kamali, B., Noroozi, A., & Chegeni, N. (2016). General English Textbook Evaluation: A Closer Look at "Four Corners". *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(12), 2325-2330.
- Daoud, A., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 2(3), 302-307.
- England, S. (2017). Skillful reading & writing 2. *The Language Teacher*, 41(3). Retrieved from <http://jalt-publications.org/node/16/articles/5856-skillful-reading-writing-2>.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research education (8th ed.)*. Boston, MA : McGraw Hill
- Grabe, W. P., & Stoller, F. L. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Reading*. Routledge.
- Griffiths, C. (1995, September). Evaluating materials for teaching English to adult speakers of other languages. In *ELT forum* (Vol. 33, No. 3, pp. 153-168).
- Hashemi, S. Z., & Borhani, A. (2015). Textbook evaluation: An investigation into "American English File" series. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 3(5), 47-55.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jolly, D., and Bolitho, R. (1998). A framework for materials writing. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 90-115). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Litz, D. R. (2005). Textbook evaluation and ELT management: A South Korean case study. *Asian EFL journal*, 48(1), 1-53.
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT*. Oxford: Brazil Blackwell.

- McKay, S. L. (2000). Teaching English as an International Language: Implications for Cultural Materials in the Classroom. *TESOL journal*, 9(4), 7-11.
- MOET (2015). *Quy định bộ tiêu chí đánh giá sách giáo khoa tiếng anh giáo dục phổ thông*. Retrieved from <https://thuvienphapluat.vn/van-ban/Giao-duc/Thong-tu-31-2015-TT-BGDDT-bo-tieu-chi-danh-gia-sach-giao-khoa-tieng-Anh-giao-duc-pho-thong-299108.aspx>
- Mukundan, J., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2015). Refinement of the English Language Teaching Textbook Evaluation Checklist. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 23(4), 761-780.
- Mukundan, J., Hajimohammadi, R., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2011). Developing an English Language Textbook Evaluation Checklist. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 4(6), 21-28.
- Riasati, M. J., & Zare, P. (2011). Textbook evaluation: EFL teachers' perspectives on "New Interchange". *Studies in Literature and Language*, 1(8), 54-60.
- Riazi, A. M. (2003). What do textbook evaluation schemes tell us?: A study of the textbook evaluation schemes of three decades. In *Methodology and materials design in language teaching: Current perceptions and practices and their implications* (pp. 52-69). SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT journal*, 42(4), 237-246.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, D. (1983). *Developing criteria for textbook evaluation*. *ELT Journal*, 37(3), 251- 255.