

# Development of English Worktext in English 101

Yolanda D. Reyes<sup>1</sup>, Rowell G. De Guia<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Bataan Peninsula State University

**Abstract:** *This study aimed to develop a worktext that can be adapted as an instructional material for teaching Oral/Diagnostic English (English 101). It used the descriptive method of research which involved the construction and evaluation of a worktext in English 101 using the instrument adapted from Abencillo (2008) and Ilagan (2009). The worktext developed was evaluated for its Acceptability; Content, Clarity, Appeal, and Originality by 10 Instructors/Professors of English 101 at Bataan Peninsula State University. To determine the acceptability level of the worktext, weighted mean was used. It was found out that the acceptability level for the Content has the Mean score of 3.24 with the descriptive value Acceptable; for Clarity, the obtained mean was 3.34 with the descriptive value of Acceptable; for Appeal of the worktext to target users, the obtained mean was 3.4 with the descriptive value Acceptable; and for Originality, the obtained mean was 2.66 with the descriptive value Acceptable. Moreover, it is recommended by the evaluators and researchers that consistencies on the number of unfamiliar words be observed and the length of each lesson should be uniform. To summarize, all the respondents agreed that the worktext is acceptable as an effective and efficient Instructional Material for English 101.*

**Keywords:** worktext, development, assessment, Instructional Material

## 1. Introduction

The teachers' competence can be jeopardized by the deteriorating quality of effective instructional materials (IM) available such as textbooks and workbooks. Once again the teachers' creativity and resourcefulness in the design and use of IMs is put into a test. Therefore, the need to organize and develop IMs that suit the changing landscape of ESL learners and pedagogy in the country must definitely be one of the serious concerns.

This research anchored on the thrusts of ESL education in Bataan Peninsula State University (BPSU) and the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), aims to cater the needs of approximately twenty thousand students of the six campuses of BPSU in learning English. This study delves into the development and evaluation of a worktext in English 101 (Oral/Diagnostic English), a general education course offered on the first semester of every academic year in all degree and non-degree programs offered at BPSU.

This study recognizes the empirical framework of the process of language teaching and learning. As mentioned in the Task-Based Language Teaching Administration website (2008), it is needless to say that one thing in common among second language teaching researches is the desire to make the acquisition of a foreign or second language as efficient and effective as possible. However, unveiling the effectiveness of one second language teaching methodology is not an end but another beginning for language teaching practitioners and material designers.

Task-based approach has recently gained popularity among researchers, language teachers, and instructional material designers. Primarily, this might be due to the report that advocates of task-based language teaching such as Long and Crookes (1992) claim that such a teaching approach is compatible with current second language acquisition theory. It has also been claimed that many studies have produced evidence which is in support of the effectiveness of this approach, specifically the use of tasks, in facilitating SLA. There are two main sources of evidence which justify the

use of tasks in language classes. As Lynch and Maclean (2000) mentioned, the first source of justifications for Task-Based Learning is the belief that the best way to promote effective learning is by setting up classroom tasks that reflect as far as possible the real world tasks which the learners perform, or will perform.

This implies that we need to find ways to use tasks to lead learners to vary the type of processing they use, and to integrate their capacity for fluent processing of accurate and complex language. The big challenge – for language teaching in general as much as for task-based teaching – is how this can be done in second language classrooms. Hence, this research is directed towards the assessment of validity and acceptability of a Task-Based Instructional Material designed for teaching Oral/Diagnostic English (Eng 101).

This study functions within the parameters of structuring, organizing, designing, and evaluating classroom tasks for teaching Eng 101. The tasks in all the lessons are evaluated by teachers of Oral Diagnostic English in the first semester of academic year 2010-2011 of Bataan Peninsula State University.

To determine the acceptability level of the worktext, the researchers adopted the questionnaire of Abencillo (2008) and Ilagan (2009). However, some modifications were done to suit the evaluation of the present IM.

## 2. Literary Survey

Textbooks play a pivotal role in language classrooms in all types of educational institutions - state schools, colleges, language schools – all over the world. According to Lamie (1999), that is why despite the development of new technologies that allow for higher quality teacher-generated materials, demand for textbooks continues to grow, and the publishing industry responds with new series and textbooks every year. According to Razmjoo (2007) many students working with a textbook feel secure and have a sense of progress and achievement. Cunningsworth (1995) also argues that textbooks are an effective resource for self-

directed learning, an effective resource for presenting materials by the teachers, a source of ideas and activities, a reference source for students, a syllabus that reflects pre-determined learning objectives, and support for less experienced teachers who have yet to gain in confidence. According to Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979), information on textbook selection is useful since it is sometimes part of the ESL/EFL teacher's responsibility to select the textbook she/he will use in a given class. Such a decision should be made carefully and systematically, not arbitrarily. They add that even in countries where the choice of the textbook does not directly involve the teacher, teachers may be asked to submit reports on the usefulness of the textbooks they are already making use of. Several possible criteria and procedures for carrying out a sound selection of appropriate textbooks have been suggested. However, selecting an appropriate textbook is not a wholly objective process. While many guidelines are suggested, the individual subjective judgments of the teachers are central to it.

Tomlinson (2001) contends that textbook evaluation, on the other hand, is an applied linguistic activity through which teachers, supervisors, administrators and materials developers can make sound judgments about the efficiency of the materials for the people using them. Cunningsworth (1995) and Ellis (1997) declare that textbook evaluation helps teachers move beyond impressionistic assessments and it helps them to acquire useful, accurate, systematic, and contextual insights into the overall nature of textbook material.

Evaluation is also seen as "an activity of gathering information to be used in making educational decisions" (Genesee and Upshur, 1999: 140). There are three components of the evaluation process. The first one is the collection of information, bearing in mind factors such as students' background, learning processes, and instructional factors. The second component is the interpretation of the information and comparing it with some desired state of affairs, goals, or other information that you think is relevant to your decisions. And the third one is the decision-making process about instruction, students, textbooks, etc. (Becerra, 2006:33).

Evaluation is a wider term, entailing assessment, but including other processes as well. These additional processes are designed to assist us in interpreting and acting on the results of our assessment. Evaluation is not simply a process of obtaining information, but also a decision-making process (Nunan, 1998:118). The basic purpose of evaluation in school is to bring about quality improvement in education by providing feedback regarding pupils learning, classroom teaching, appropriateness of curriculum and course content.

### 3. Problem Definition

This study has two-fold general objective: (1) To develop an instructional material, a worktext, for Oral/Diagnostic English (Eng 101) and (2) To evaluate the worktext developed for Oral/Diagnostic English (Eng 101).

Specifically, this research attempts to answer the following questions:

- a) What is the level of acceptability of the worktext developed for English 101 in terms of its Content?
- b) In terms of its Clarity, what is the level of acceptability of the worktext developed for English 101?
- c) What is the level of acceptability of the worktext developed for English 101 in terms of its Appeal to the target users?
- d) In terms of its Originality, what is the level of acceptability of the worktext developed for English 101?

### 4. Methodology

This chapter presents the first phase of the study which includes the procedure in the development of the task-based instructional material for English 101 and its evaluation. The considerations in the organization, construction and design of task-based lessons for English supported by its underlying principles are briefly discussed.

Then the second phase of the study presents the research population and sampling, research instrumentation and the detailed method of the development and evaluation of the English 101 worktext.

The respondents of this study are the BPSU instructors handling English 101 for the Academic year 2010 2011. The total number of English teachers at BPSU is 36, 8 are male and 28 are female. Only 10 English teachers validated and evaluated the worktext because they are the only ones who are handling English 101. The researchers provided each of the respondents a copy of the worktext. After a semester, the researchers requested the instructors/professors of English 101 to evaluate the worktext based on the Acceptability of its Content,

Clarity, Appeal, and Originality. Prior to this, the researchers sought permission from the chairman of the textbook committee to let English teachers use the worktext in English 101. Also, the researchers interviewed the teachers about their comments and suggestions on the English 101 worktext.

#### Research Design

The study is descriptive research that uses qualitative and quantitative approaches. The study was carried out in two phases; the development of the IM and evaluation of the responses through the questionnaire in order to determine the level of its acceptability.

#### Research Instrumentation

The researchers followed several phases and stages in developing and evaluating the worktext.

#### Phase 1. Development of the Worktext

Stage 1. Preparation of Matrix of Construct includes the selection of lessons, listing of appropriate activities, and enumerating objectives.

Stage 2. Writing includes the encoding of selected lessons and activities.

Stage 3. Editing includes the correction of grammatical forms, spelling, and other concerns.

Stage 4. Final Output includes the final organization and design of each lesson and the production of its final manuscript.

**Phase 2. Evaluation of the Worktext**

- Stage 1. Distribution of copies of English 101 worktext to English instructors
- Stage 2. Use of the Worktext for one (1) semester
- Stage 3. Construction of research instrument/questionnaire
- Stage 4. Validation of research instrument/questionnaire
- Stage 5. Floating of questionnaire
- Stage 6. Retrieval of questionnaire/ Interview with the respondents
- Stage 7. Analysis of results

**Statistical Treatment**

To determine the level of acceptance of the worktext, the researchers used the weighted mean formula:

$$WM = \frac{4f+3f+2f+1f}{N}$$

Where:

WM = weighted mean

F = frequency of responses

The Acceptability of the worktext was interpreted using the scale for acceptability rating scale by Abrencillo (2008):

N = member of respondent

**Development of Acceptability Questionnaire**

To determine the acceptability level of the worktext, the researchers adapted the questionnaire of Abencillo (2008) and Ilagan (2009). Modifications were done to suit it with the present IM. The instrument was then validated through a pilot floating and answering of the questionnaire designed.

**Presentation and Analysis of Data**

This chapter presents the data used in the study in order to evaluate the worktext developed for English 101. In order to systematize the presentation of the results, the various features of the worktext being evaluated are summarized into tables followed by the descriptive analysis of each table.

**Table 1:** Evaluation of the Content of the Worktext

Print score	Range interval	Descriptive Rating
4	3.51 – 4.00	Strongly Acceptable (SA)
3	2.51 – 3.50	Acceptable (A)
2	1.51 – 2.50	Fairly Acceptable (FA)
1	1.00 – 1.50	Not Acceptable (NA)

Table 1 contains five (5) items that lead to the evaluation of the worktext in terms of the acceptability of Content. For item 1, out of 10 respondents, five (5) responded Strongly Acceptable, four (4) responded Acceptable, one (1) responded Fairly Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable. For item 2, four (4) responded Strongly Acceptable, four (4) responded Acceptable, two (2) responded Fairly Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable out of 10 respondents. For item 3, out of 10 respondents, three (3) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, two (2) responded Fairly Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable. For item 4, two (2) responded Strongly Acceptable, six (6) responded Acceptable, two (2) responded Fairly Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable out of 10

respondents. For item 5, five (5) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, and zero (0) for Fairly and Not Acceptable with a total of 10 respondents.

**Table 2:** Weighted Mean on the Acceptability Level of Content

B. Content	Weighted Mean	Descriptive rating
1. The topics are well arranged to provide clear sequence understanding	3.4	A
2. The different parts aid the students in grasping the concepts of English lesson in a systematic way	3.2	A
3. It provides sufficient reception of learning through examples to easily understand the concept	3.1	A
4. It provides variety of exercises from simple to complex manipulation for mastery of concepts	3	AA

**Table 3:** Evaluation of the Clarity of the Worktext

B. Clarity	Strongly Acceptable (SA)	Fairly Acceptable (FA)	Acceptable (SA)	Not Acceptable (NA)
1. The lessons are organized and clear	4	5	1	0
2. Directions are understandable and easy to follow	5	5	0	0
3. Lessons are well explained and become the preparatory stage for exercises	3	5	2	0
4. The ideas and concepts are well expressed	6	4	0	0
5. The flow of activities is coherent and non confusing	3	6	1	0

Table 3 contains five (5) items that lead to the evaluation of the worktext in terms of the acceptability of its Clarity. For item 1, out of 10 respondents, four (4) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, one (1) responded Fairly Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable. For item 2, five (5) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, while zero (0) responded Fairly and Not Acceptable out of 10 respondents. For item 3, out of 10 respondents, three (3) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, two (2) responded Fairly Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable. For item 4, six (6) responded Strongly Acceptable, four (4) responded Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Fairly and Not Acceptable out of 10 respondents. For item 5, three (3) responded Strongly Acceptable, six (6) responded Acceptable, and one (1) responded Fairly Acceptable with a total of 10 respondents.



**Table 4:** Weighted Mean on the Acceptability Level of Clarity

B. Clarity	Weighted Mean	Descriptive rating
1. The lessons are organized and clear	3.3	A
2. Directions are understandable and easy to follow	3.5	A
3. Lessons are well explained and become the preparatory stage for exercises	3.1	A
4. The ideas and concepts are well expressed	3.6	SA
5. The flow of activities is coherent and non confusing	3.2	A
WM	3.34	A

Table 4 shows the computed weighted mean of 3.34 which means that, in terms of Clarity, the worktext has the descriptive value Acceptable (A). The result demonstrates that the IM is user friendly and that the organization of ideas and the clarity of the presentation of concepts are clear enough to facilitate the performance of the different tasks in the worktext. The clarity of ideas and concepts as well as the understandability of instruction is very helpful to both students and teachers who are using the worktext.

**Table 5:** Evaluation of the Appeal of the Worktext to the Target Users

C. Appeal to the target user	Strongly Acceptable (SA)	Fairly Acceptable (FA)	Acceptable (SA)	Not Acceptable (NA)
1. It captivates the learner's interest	3	5	2	0
2. It stimulates the learner's interest in answering the different activities	4	6	0	0
3. It enables learners to develop their critical thinking	5	5	0	0
4. It strengthens the students positive attitude	5	5	0	0
5. It creates vicarious experience for group and individual learning	5	5	0	0

Table 5 contains five (5) items that lead to the evaluation of the worktext in terms of the acceptability of its Appeal to the target users. For item 1, out of 10 respondents, three (3) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, two (2) responded Fairly Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable. For item 2, four (4) responded Strongly Acceptable, six (6) responded Acceptable, while zero (0) responded Fairly and Not Acceptable out of 10 respondents. For item 3, out of 10 respondents, five (5) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, zero (0) responded Fairly and Not Acceptable. For item 4, five (5) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Fairly and Not Acceptable out of 10 respondents. For item 5, five (5) responded Strongly Acceptable, five (5) responded Acceptable, and zero (0) for Fairly and Not Acceptable with a total of 10 respondents.

**Table 6:** Weighted Mean on the Acceptability Level of Appeal to the Target User of the Worktext

C. Appeal to the target user	Weighted Mean	Descriptive rating
1. It captivates the learner's interest	3.1	A
2. It stimulates the learner's interest in answering the different activities	3.4	A
3. It enables learners to develop their critical thinking	3.5	A
4. It strengthens the students positive attitude	3.5	A
5. It creates vicarious experience for group and individual learning	3.5	A
WM	3.4	A

Table 6 shows the computed weighted mean of 3.40 which means that, in terms of Appeal to the Target User, the worktext has the descriptive value Acceptable (A). The result demonstrates that the worktext captivates the learners' interest, an essential feature of the IM that aids in the enhancement of the target skills. The result, moreover, illustrates that the worktext encourages critical thinking and improves the learners' positive attitude towards learning through simulation and other related activities. This implies that through the use of the constructed worktext in this study, the learners can be equipped to perform communicatively in real life situations where they will have the opportunity to assert the things they have learned courageously and confidently.

**Table 7:** Evaluation of the Originality of the Worktext

D. Originality	Strongly Acceptable (SA)	Fairly Acceptable (FA)	Acceptable (SA)	Not Acceptable (NA)
1. The design and appearance of the work text are exceptionally different from other work text	0	4	5	1
2. The material serves as the new approach in teaching English	0	3	6	1
3. It provides a variety of relevant evaluation measures	1	4	5	0
4. It enhances skills through authentic learning activities	1	6	3	0
5. It contains activities that lead to life-long learning.	0	7	3	0

Table 7 contains five (5) items that lead to the evaluation of the worktext in terms of the acceptability of its Originality. For item 1, out of 10 respondents, zero (0) responded Strongly Acceptable, four (4) responded Acceptable, five (5) responded Fairly Acceptable, and one (1) responded Not Acceptable. For item 2, zero (0) responded Strongly Acceptable, three (3) responded Acceptable, six (6) responded Fairly Acceptable and one (1) responded Not Acceptable out of 10 respondents. For item 3, out of 10 respondents, one (1) responded Strongly Acceptable, four (4) responded Acceptable, five (5) responded Fairly Acceptable and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable. For item

4, one (1) responded Strongly Acceptable, six (6) responded Acceptable, and three (3) responded Fairly Acceptable and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable out of 10 respondents. For item 5, zero (0) responded Strongly Acceptable, seven (7) responded Acceptable, three (3) responded Fairly Acceptable, and zero (0) responded Not Acceptable with a total of 10 respondents.

**Table 8:** Weighted Mean on the Acceptability Level of Originality

D. Originality	Weighted Mean	Descriptive rating
1. The design and appearance of the work text are exceptionally different from other worktext	3.3	A
2. The material serves as the new approach in teaching English	2.2	FA
3. It provides a variety of relevant evaluation measures	2.3	FA
4. It enhances skills through authentic learning activities	2.8	A
5. It contains activities that lead to life-long learning.	2.7	A
WM	2.66	A

Table 8 shows the computed weighted mean of 2.66 which means that, in terms of Appeal Originality, the worktext has the descriptive value Acceptable (A). The result demonstrates that the worktext possesses original features that make it different with other worktexts. The result also shows that the worktext introduces new approaches that enhance skills that lead to life-long learning.

## 5. Summary of Results, Recommendations, and Conclusion

This chapter presents the summary of the results of the study, some recommendations from the researchers, and the conclusion.

Based on the analysis of the data gathered in this study, the following are the results:

- 1) With the computed weighted mean of 3.24 which corresponds to the descriptive value Acceptable, the Content of the worktext, i.e. the concepts, discussion, and exercises in the worktext, is within the conventional level of teachers and students as evaluated by all 10 respondents of the study.
- 2) In terms of Clarity, the evaluation by all 10 respondents resulted to the average weighted mean of 3.34 which means that such feature of the worktext is Acceptable. The result demonstrates that the IM is user friendly and that the organization of ideas and the clarity of presentation of concepts are clear enough to facilitate the performance of the different tasks in the worktext. The clarity of ideas and concepts as well as the understandability of instruction is very helpful to both students and teachers who are using the worktext.
- 3) The evaluation of the worktext in terms of its Appeal to the Target users by the 10 respondents of the study resulted to the computed weighted mean of 3.40 which means that the worktext has the descriptive value

Acceptable (A). The result demonstrates that the worktext captivates the learners' interest, an essential feature of the IM that aids in the enhancement of the target skills. The result, moreover, illustrates that the worktext encourages critical thinking and improves the learners' positive attitude towards learning through simulation and other related activities. This implies that through the use of the constructed worktext in this study, the learners can be equipped to perform communicatively in real life situations where they will have the opportunity to assert the things they have learned courageously and confidently.

- 4) The result of the evaluation of the worktext's Originality by all 10 respondents shows a descriptive value Acceptable with the computed weighted mean of 2.66. The result demonstrates that the worktext possesses original features that make it different with other worktexts. The result also shows that the worktext introduces new approaches that enhance skills that lead to life-long learning.
- 5) Among the four evaluated features of the worktext, Appeal of the worktext to the target users has the highest Acceptability Level with the computed weighted mean of 3.40, second to the highest is Clarity with the computed weighted mean of 3.34, third is Content with computed weighted mean of 3.24, and last is Originality with the computed weighted mean of 2.66. This shows that in spite being Acceptable in all its features, the worktext has rooms for improvement.
- 6) Respondent A commented on the Word Bank, a section of the worktext that aims to develop the learners' vocabulary, and suggested that the number of words in the Word Bank section must be consistent. Respondent A sees the worktext as a helpful tool in improving academic vocabulary.
- 7) Respondent B commented on the length of the book as being realistic and on the discussion of language structures which, for Respondent B, must be present in every lesson. Respondent B thinks that the worktext is "comprehensive in terms of the scope of its topics, organized in terms of the development of concepts, and varied in terms of the activities".
- 8) Respondent C commented that the worktext is well thought of and suggested correction of some typographical errors. Respondent C perceives the worktext as a convenient material for classroom teaching.
- 9) Respondent D suggested that keys to answers be provided and that teachers be trained to write books.
- 10) Respondent E commented that some lessons have many activities while some have few and suggested for consistency in terms of the number of activities. Respondent E thinks that the book is helpful for both the teachers and the students.
- 11) Respondent F commented on the correspondence between unfamiliar words in the lesson and the graphics and suggested that more graphics be included in the lessons. Respondent F thinks that the worktext in itself is engaging but improvements are possible.
- 12) Respondent G commented that the number of lessons in the worktext is enough for one semester and suggested addition of more reading selections. Respondent G believes that the worktext is engaging and useful.

- 13) Respondent H commented that the worktext can be a good language assessment tool and that it has a comprehensive content. Respondent H suggested the inclusion of assessment rubric for students' performances. Respondent H perceives that the worktext is easy to use and good for both classroom discussion and language practice.
- 14) Respondent I commented that, unlike other worktexts which are too thick or too thin, the length of the worktext developed in this study is sufficient for one semester. Respondent I suggested for the localization of the examples in the worktext. Respondent I believes that the presentation of concepts is suitable to the level of first year college students.
- 15) Respondent J commented that the strategies used in the worktext are vast so Respondent J suggested that teachers be trained to use the worktext so that they can execute the lessons properly. Respondent J thinks that the lessons in the worktext are very engaging.

### 5.1 Recommendations

Through the different insights gained during the conceptualization, conduct, and finalization of this study, the researchers consider more possibilities relevant to this research. Hence, the following are recommended:

- 1) Similar studies can be conducted with other courses or content areas of the different programs offered in Bataan Peninsula State University in order to develop a culture of pedagogical innovations and academic research.
- 2) Other components of instructional materials such as Objectives, Relevance, and Economy can also be explored by other researchers interested in evaluating worktexts and other learning tools.
- 3) As recommended by most of the respondents in this study, teachers may be trained on the construction and evaluation of coursebooks and/or worktexts relevant to their disciplines or specialization.
- 4) The worktext developed in this study may further be evaluated based on other aspects and from other perspectives such as the student-users.
- 5) Other auxiliary materials can be developed with the worktext in English 101 such as video/audio materials and other facilitative media.

### 5.2 Conclusion

After the tedious process of conducting this research, the following statements have relevant signification and implication to the purpose of this study:

- 1) The Acceptability Level of Content of the worktext developed for English 101 falls under the descriptive value Acceptable which implies a positive impression from the point of view of the teacher-users of the IM. However, the Acceptability Level of the worktext did not reach the highest possible level which is Strongly Acceptable. This implies that improvement, in terms of its Content, must be done by the IM developers.
- 2) In terms of Clarity, the Acceptability Level of the worktext falls under the descriptive value Acceptable and

did not reach, as well, the highest possible level of acceptability. On the one hand, it implies that the organization of ideas and the clarity of the presentation of concepts are seen as one of the positive features of the worktext. On the other hand, it signifies that a higher level of acceptability can be achieved if improvements in the organization of ideas and the clarity of the presentation will be done.

- 3) The Level of Acceptability of Appeal to the users of the worktext falls under the descriptive value Acceptable which implies that this feature of the worktext received a positive reaction from the respondents but not enough to reach the highest possible level of acceptability. Remarkably, compared with other features of the worktext, Appeal receives the highest level of acceptability.
- 4) In terms of Originality, the worktext falls under the descriptive value Acceptable which means that it falls short from the highest possible level of acceptability. Furthermore, among the four features evaluated in the worktext, Originality has the lowest level of acceptability which implies that this feature must equally be probed and improved by the IM developers.
- 5) The comments, suggestions, and assessment of the respondents reveal that, despite some necessary improvements, the worktext is a comprehensive, relevant, convenient, useful and engaging learning tool.

### References

- [1] Lamie, J. M. (1999). Making the textbook more communicative. *The Internal TESL Journal*, 5(1). Retrieved September 27, 2010, from [www.iteslj.org](http://www.iteslj.org).
- [2] Razmjoo, S.A. (2007). High schools or private institutes textbooks? Which fulfill communicative language teaching principles in the Iranian context? *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(4). 126-140.
- [3] Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinmann.
- [4] Daoud, A. & Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. In M. Celce-Murcia and L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 302-307). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- [5] Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 36-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/51.1.36>
- [7] Genesee, F. and Upshur, J. A. (1999). *Classroom-based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Becerra, C. (2006). *Materials Assessment: A Shared Responsibility among Teachers and Students*. National University of Colombia, Faculty of Humanities, Department of Foreign Languages, Vol.7, 31-45.
- [9] Nunan, David. (1998). *The learner-centered curriculum*. 8th Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Author Profile



**Yolanda D. Reyes**, School Affiliation: Bataan Peninsula State University. Degree: Doctor of Education Major in Educational Management



**Rowell G. De Guia**, School Affiliation: Bataan Peninsula State University

