

ELT Materials Evaluation: A System and Criteria

Ali Işık

Istinye University, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract—This study aims at proposing a 3-stage materials evaluation system and separate checklists for screening and detailed analysis and testing their effectiveness. The checklists were developed at two stages: First they were developed by 113 trainees as the requirement of the materials evaluation training program and evaluated by 43 ELT teachers. Later both the system and the checklists themselves were piloted and tested in real-life by 11 ELT teachers when adopting ELT materials for their students. The data was collected through 5-point Likert scale questionnaires. The results indicated that the system allows for the quick disqualification of the inappropriate ones and saves enough time to focus on the candidate ones in detail. The checklists themselves are found to be both reliable and valid.

Index Terms—ELT materials, materials evaluation checklists, language education

I. INTRODUCTION

ELT materials establish the backbone for English language education (Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2017). Generally speaking in many language programs they function as the de facto syllabus and dictate what to teach, in what order to teach, even the density and pace of teaching (AbdelWahab, 2013; Allen, 2015; Garton, & Graves, 2014; Mishan & Timmis, 2015). Thus, they provide a common ground for both learners and teachers in an institution and besides determining the content they also control what to and how to teach and test. Not only do they regulate content but also how to implement and realize language education (Harwood, 2014; McGrath, 2013). Each ELT material is based on a language teaching philosophy (approach) which guides how to realize its principles in actual use via materials (Richards, 2006). In other words, ELT materials are more than content, they impose a teaching methodology on both teachers and learners (Hart, 2003; Işık, 2011, 2013a, 2013b, 2018; Tomlinson, 2010). When they are adopted, language teaching methodology get adopted together with them, too. It is highly likely to say that the degree to which the methodology is in congruence with the overall goal of a language program, decides the success of a language education program (Harwood, 2010). Likewise, they are of a great help for especially novice teachers (Garton & Graves, 2014; López-Medina, 2016). If they are based on a sound methodology, they are likely to guide and scaffold teachers to be efficient teachers. The tasks and teaching tips help them get to be equipped with the knowledge and skills to be self-sufficient, even maybe, exploratory teachers. They also orient learners about how to learn a second/foreign language through the tasks they provide. Even some ELT materials have specific tasks on language learning strategies to train learners to become successful learners. Furthermore, they are the main source of language input for learners. Nowadays learners can have access to ample amount of input on the internet (Allehyani, Burnapp & Wilson, 2017) however, being exposed to the relevant materials at the appropriate level of cognitive and linguistic difficulty is a problem. The ELT materials, in that sense, ensures to provide learners with the appropriate materials. ELT materials are accompanied by the periphery; audios, videos, workbooks, assessment packs, projects packs, I-tools, etc. which all create a variety of texts and tasks and enrich languages activities both in and out of the classroom. This variety also helps to address different needs and interests and individualize activities especially outside the class. I-tool applications engage students and facilitate comprehension of the texts and tasks. Together with the I-tools, online applications take learners beyond the boundaries of schools and integrate them with the rest of the world (Allen, 2015; Kukulka-Hulme, Norris & Donohue, 2015). Moreover, they pave the way for creating a global community in which learners get engaged in real, authentic interaction with others. Some materials, in addition, are conducive for self-regulated learning. They create online platforms for both teachers and learners by which teachers follow what activities their students do, how much time they spend doing those and how successful they are in task completion. The same feedback is also given to learners themselves. Those platforms also provide progress checks at the defined intervals. Both the activity reports and progress checks provide invaluable feedback to teachers and learners to diagnose their weaknesses and strengths and behave accordingly (Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2017). To sum up, ELT materials are essential for any language education programs and they set the ground for the language teaching/learning process (McGrath; 2006, 2016; Tomlinson, 2008).

The effort to emphasize the pivotal role of materials evaluation has abounded (Tomlinson, 2013). It has aimed to guide the stake holders to consider it a data-driven, disciplined and informed decision-making process. The pioneers in the field not only set the theoretical ground but also carried out research and came up with practical implications, even with materials evaluation checklists (Brown, 1995; Cunningsworth, 1995; Dubin, & Olshtain, 1986; Ellis, 1997; Graves, 1996, 2000; Grossman, & Thompson, 2008; Guyer, & Peterson, 1988; Hargreaves, 1989; Harmer, 2003; Hirsch, 1988; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Johnson, 1989; Krahnke, 1987; Letter, 2000; Littlejohn & Windeatt, 1989; McDonough & Shaw, 1993; McGrath, 2002; O'Neill, 1982; Purgoson, 1991; Richard-Amato, 1988; Sheldon, 1987; Skierso, 1991;

Tomlinson, 2003; Willis, 2000). The theoretical and practical knowledge and data about materials have been accumulated and raised the awareness of stake holders about the issue. That knowledge has spread out and contributed to make the materials evaluation a global concern (McGrath, 2016; McDonough, et al., 2013; Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2017). In turn the research on it has also flourished globally and researchers all around the world have contributed to the ever-growing body of knowledge in the field (Garton & Graves, 2014). That concern even gave birth to the birth of a professional association, The Materials Development Association (MATSDA) which has offered courses, organized conferences, and provide services. The knowledge accumulated in the field, however, needed to be streamlined and put into practice to meet local needs.

As the knowledge about materials evaluation has developed and evolved, so has materials development (Garton & Graves, 2014; McGrath, 2016). ELT materials are either developed locally or adopted from among the ones which are on the market developed by the international publishers. The ideal one is developing materials unique for each program; custom-made ones arise from the needs analysis and context analysis to realize the goal(s) of a particular language education program. However, it is a huge task requiring expertise, time, energy, money, and team work. Since materials development is to be a data-driven, disciplined and systematic process, setting the goal(s) of a program, carrying out need and context analysis, preparing interim goals, objectives, determining content and related tasks and following the necessary steps to develop materials, first of all, necessitate expertise (McGrath, 2006; 2016). Materials developers are to be equipped with required knowledge and skills about the materials development and language teaching. It is a demanding task a single person cannot handle, thus, it requires a team. Moreover, they are needed to be accompanied by a team of experts, psychologists, applied linguists, pedagogues, information technology specialists, designers, script writers, directors, etc. All these obviously call for a budget. In short, it is a long process which is time, money and energy consuming and much above the shoulder of a teacher. The logical one is to adopt ELT materials and adapt them for the context in which they are implemented. The adopting process is not an easy one, it necessitates a data-driven, disciplined decision making. Teachers are to collect data through needs and context analysis and then implement evaluation criteria to choose the most appropriate materials (Kostka & Bunning, 2016). Since the ELT materials developed by publishers, especially international ones, are developed for a broad spectrum of learners, comprehensive, well-designed criteria get in action to choose the best. Evaluation criteria need to be customized as well to serve the specific needs of specific contexts. Obviously, evaluation criteria include items of global use as well as local one; in other words, the criteria must be customized for local use

In Turkey, as in other countries in the world, English is the key for a job, promotion, more income, and pursuing an academic career. There is an English fever (Krashen, 2006) and a great demand to master English. In formal education, the English education starts at the kindergarten and continues at the tertiary level. Besides, there are plenty of private institutions offering English courses. In short, huge amount of time, money, and energy is spent on English, thus, learners are to be provided with appropriate materials. Naturally it can be provided with a sound evaluation process. To make sound, informed, disciplined decisions there is a need for both comprehensive evaluation criteria and a systematic approach for materials evaluation. An approach to evaluate the materials are important because there are plenty of ELT materials in the market and it is impossible to evaluate all the possible materials in detail. To be practical the candidate materials are needed to be screened from among the possible ones and evaluated in detail.

To the knowledge of the researcher, there are only few studies on proposing ELT materials evaluation checklists and testing their efficiency in the new millennium. Reinders & Lewis (2006), Angell, et al. (2008), Shave (2010), Işık & Atışdört (2010) and AbdelWahab (2013), López-Medina (2016) developed ELT materials evaluation checklists. Reinders & Lewis (2006) developed a checklist to evaluate self-access materials and López-Medina (2016) for content language integrated learning (CLIL). Only Işık & Atışdört (2010) and AbdelWahab (2013) both developed checklists and tested their effectiveness. Moreover, none of them included a part on “software evaluation” yet it is accompanied by almost any ELT materials. There is definitely a need for a comprehensive checklist as well. In addition, its validity and reliability must be verified and data about its real-life use is to be provided. To sum up, the literature review has indicated the pivotal role of materials evaluation to come up with the most effective ones for each context. Although materials evaluation has aroused global concern, the research on materials evaluation checklists and proposing new checklists is not so common. Besides, since each context is unique it is mandatory to customize the evaluation process for each specific context. Moreover, the proposed checklists are no different from one another and a systematic approach to the ELT materials evaluation process has not been offered to make it more efficient and save time to focus more on the possible candidate ELT materials. In short, this study aims at proposing a 3-stage ELT materials evaluation system to create an efficient evaluation process and suggest detailed comprehensive checklists that can be exploited while forming ones for each specific ELT context.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Aim

The aim of the study is to develop comprehensive materials evaluation checklist in a two-stage fashion and to test its effectiveness.

B. References

Three groups of subjects participated in the study. The first group consisting of 113 trainees prepared the items for the criteria. The second group consisting of 43 English teachers tested the effectiveness of the items in the criteria. The third group, 11 teachers piloted the checklists.

C. Treatment

A 12-week training program was designed for the trainees who met three hours a week (see Appendix 1). In the first three weeks they study the articles on ELT materials to have a general perspective about the topic. The following three weeks they focused on materials evaluation and examined checklists. Each week, the trainer divided the class in groups and each group raised a real-life issue about topics of the week and offered solutions for them. In the 7th and 8th weeks they worked in groups to develop their own checklists. The trainer functioned as a member of each group and provided continuous feedback. At the end of the 8th week the groups shared their checklists with the others online and came to class evaluating them in the 9th week. In that week each group presented their checklists to the class and first other trainees (classmates) and then the trainer gave feedback about them. Upon receiving the feedback the group revised their checklists during the week after the class. In the 10th week in the class, the same groups started to evaluate the ELT materials used in their schools. The trainer again worked with each group. The process continued in the 11th week. At the end of the week, each group posted their evaluation to the whole class to get feedback about their evaluation. In the 12th week each group presented their evaluations and received feedback from their friends and teachers. Based on the feedback they received, they were required to revise their projects and submit them to the trainer within two weeks. The training program lasted two years with the participation of different trainees.

D. The Materials Evaluation System

A three-stage materials evaluation process is adopted; screening stage and a thorough detailed analysis stage. There are numerous ELT materials on the market it is too time- and energy consuming to evaluate each book in detail. The two-stage evaluation helps to ease the burden. In first stage “the quick evaluation checklist” is employed to screen the books to determine the candidate ELT materials for further detailed analysis. In other words, this stage eliminates the unqualified ones and delimits the number of ELT materials to be evaluated in the second stage. The evaluation approach is unique in a sense that it spares enough time to focus on the candidate books in detail in the second stage. The screening (quick evaluation) checklist is employed in the first, detailed evaluation checklist is used in the second stage.

E. The Item Development Process

The aim is to come up with two checklists, one for the screening to determine the candidate materials, and a comprehensive one for further detailed evaluation. The subjects started to work with a trainer who has evaluated, adapted, and developed materials, worked as a freelance materials evaluator for international publishers since 1989, and offered courses on ELT materials since 1999. After discussing the materials in the course pack in order to form the theoretical basis of materials evaluation, the trainees grouped in the groups of three or four. Each group was required to come up with two sets of items one for the quick evaluation checklist one for the comprehensive one. The tasks were carried out both in and out of the classroom and the trainer acted as a member of each group and provided feedback when necessary on the spot. The groups worked on their checklists for two weeks and revised them. Finally, they submitted their checklist to the trainer. The trainer worked on each checklist and created one checklist for screening (quick evaluation) and one for comprehensive detailed evaluation composed of different subcategories such as external evaluation, internal evaluation, face validity, approach, teacher-related factors, etc.

After the trainer had come with the checklists, judgmental evaluation was carried out by 43 English teachers who evaluated the quality of each item in the checklists using a 5 Likert scale. With an open-ended item in the questionnaire they are also asked what other items they would add to the checklist. In addition, to elicit their ideas about the general evaluation of the checklist another questionnaire was administered to the teachers. Depending on the feedback from the teachers, the reliability and validity of the checklists was carried out item by item. Some items were deleted, revised and added in the checklists. They were revised considering the feedback and suggestions given by the teachers and they were finalized. In other words, they got ready for piloting- the actual use (see Appendix 2).

During the judgmental evaluation teachers also answered the open-ended item. One teacher indicated that the deliberate focus on target language culture had to be looked for in materials evaluation. In the same vein, three teachers demanded native speaker standards in pronunciation. Since English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) approach has been widely adopted and it is hard to determine which target culture and dialect (American, British, Australian, etc.) are to be taught, that suggestion was realized in the item related with ELF. Two teachers suggested an item about the size of the coursebooks and offered A4 size so that they could fit in a student school bag. It was thought about and decided that size is important and that suggestion was revised and added in the checklist. One teacher offered a hardcover-related item. Since hardcover might add extra cost for the materials and it is unlikely to find hardcover ones on the market, that suggestion was disqualified. One teacher offered that materials should have an extra booklet in which the parts in the materials students are required to write would be transferred there and student materials could be kept clean and used again and again. As providing compact materials is more convenient, that suggestion was not put into practice while developing the checklist.

F. Data Collection and Data Analysis

Use The data were collected at two stages, initial evaluation and piloting. The first step was judgmental and the second practical. The first stage was carried out with 43 teachers to learn their ideas about the checklists and the approach. The second stage was actually a real-life one as it was implemented to choose course materials by eleven teachers. The teachers were supposed to adopt new course materials for the following academic year and they exploited the approach and the checklists. For both stages the evaluation criteria were given to the teachers and the data was collected through a five-point Likert. SPSS was used to analyze the data.

G. Validity of the Questionnaires

The use of an expert panel to provide critical feedback served to facilitate the development and refinement of the checklist application in the second investigation. In addition, the expert panel was considered an integral design element to demonstrate content relevance and representativeness along with the substantive and consequential aspects of validity.

H. Reliability of the Questionnaires

Internal consistency of the survey instrument was estimated by using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. In this particular study, coefficient alpha ranged from .78 to .79, suggesting a high estimate of reliability based on the mean inter-item correlation.

III. RESULTS

First trainees were asked to evaluate the training program and the results are as follows.

None of the trainees indicated any options but "highly satisfactory". With no exception all the trainees marked the "highly satisfactory" option.

TABLE I
THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY ON THE TRAINING PROGRAM

	Highly unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Neutral	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory
Ideas about the training					100%

The data about the checklists were collected at two different stages, judgmental evaluation and practical (piloting) evaluation.

A. Judgmental Evaluation

The results obtained from the teachers who evaluated the effectiveness of the checklist are summarized in the tables below:

Screening: Table 2 summarizes how teachers evaluated the screening checklist.

TABLE II
RESULTS OF THE SCREENING

	Mean	Min.	Max.	Var.	Cronbach Alpha
Screening	3.98	3.51	4.09	0,02	0,93

The reliability for the screening component of the proposed system is found to be within the acceptable range.

B. Detailed Evaluation

The results of the detailed evaluation are presented in two subcategories, external evaluation and internal evaluation.

C. External Evaluation

In Table 3 the external evaluation subcategory results indicate that teachers found it effective. The Cronbach Alpha values about each external evaluation subcategory are also very high, the reliability of this subcategory is quite high.

TABLE III
THE PROPOSED SYSTEM EVALUATION RESULTS

	Highly unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Neutral	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory
It is practical		3%	12%	42%	43%
It is effective				49%	51%
It is time-saving			6%	43%	51%

D. Internal Evaluation

Table 4 indicates that the detailed internal evaluation part is found to be effective by the teachers. The reliability values of the subcategories of internal evaluation are within the acceptable range.

TABLE IV
RESULTS OF THE INTERNAL EVALUATION

	Mean	Min.	Max.	Var.	Cronbach Alpha
Aim	3.86	3.23	4.31	0.95	0.89
Approach	3.13	2.92	3.47	0.03	0.91
Syllabus	3.63	3.17	4.12	0.08	0.83
Linguistic Aspect	3.93	3.76	4.39	0.15	0.91
Teacher-related Factors	3.76	3.39	3.10	0.04	0.93
Student-related Factors	3.50	3.03	4.06	0.08	0.91
Classroom Organization	3.77	3.41	4.04	0.05	0.96
Instructions	4.09	2.93	3.23	0.02	0.93
Content	3.69	2.79	3.56	0.16	0.96
Culture	3.60	2.71	4.36	0.03	0.89
Lexis	3.89	3.37	4.43	0.09	0.91
Skills	3.15	2.95	3.65	0.03	0.87
Unit Format	3.57	3.23	4.12	0.07	0.86
Measurement and Evaluation	4.10	3.87	4.56	0.19	0.84
Software	3.77	3.56	4.09	0.05	0.93

E. The Overall Evaluation

The teachers are asked to evaluate the materials evaluation system (screening and detailed evaluation) in general. The results are as follows:

TABLE V
OVERALL EVALUATION RESULTS

	Highly unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Neutral	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory
It is practical			6%	46%	48%
It is effective				58%	42%
It is time-saving		3%	9%	52%	36%

F. Practical Evaluation (Piloting) Results

Table 6 presents the results of piloting. It indicates a high reliability of the checklist in general:

TABLE VI
PRACTICAL EVALUATION RESULTS

	Cronbach Alpha
Screening	0.93
External evaluation	0.87
Internal evaluation	0.89

G. Evaluation of the Proposed System

The teacher who piloted the checklists during their materials adaptation process were also asked given the questionnaire to elicit their overall all impression about the materials evaluation approach. Table 7 summarizes the results.

TABLE VII
THE PROPOSED SYSTEM EVALUATION RESULTS

	Highly unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Neutral	Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory
It is practical		3%	12%	42%	43%
It is effective				49%	51%
It is time-saving			6%	43%	51%

IV. DISCUSSION

Trainees seem to be satisfied with the content of the training and the tasks they carried out. Since ELT materials are vital in the language process, participating in such a training and fulfilling relevant tasks fostered their involvement.

The data obtained from the judgmental evaluation indicate that the Cronbach Alpha value for the screening checklist is very high and the reliability related with the screening is satisfactory. The results of the detailed evaluation are no different. The data related with the external evaluation indicated that the reliability values range from 0.88 to 0.94. They are within the acceptable range. The results of the internal evaluation show that the reliability values are also very high, the lowest 0.83 and the highest 0.96. The overall evaluation results are squeezed around "agree" and strongly agree" options and fall above the accepted value. 6% of the teachers are neutral about the practicality of the materials evaluation system, 46% of them find it "satisfactory" and 48% "highly satisfactory". 58% of the teachers indicated that the effectiveness of the proposed system is "satisfactory" and 42% "highly satisfactory". In terms of "time-saving" item,

the results are no different. 3% of the teachers find the proposed system “unsatisfactory, 9% neutral; whereas, 52% find it “satisfactory” and 36% “highly satisfactory”.

Practical Evaluation (Piloting) Results indicate that the proposed system is reliable. The reliability related with the screening checklist is 0.93, external evaluation 0.87, and internal evaluation 0.89. Overall evaluation results show that generally the teachers either go for the “satisfactory” or “highly satisfactory” options. When evaluating the practicality of the proposed system, 3% of them marked “unsatisfactory”, 12% “neutral” options; on the other hand, 42% of them chose “satisfactory” and 43% “highly satisfactory. In terms of effectiveness, 49% of the teachers found the system “satisfactory” and 51% “highly satisfactory. 43% of the teachers indicated that the system is “satisfactory” and 51% “highly satisfactory” with respect to the time-saving quality of the system, while 6% were remained neutral.

The results comply with the those of Işık and Atmışdört (2010) and AbdelWahab (2013). Işık and Atmışdört (2010) and AbdelWahab (2013) tested the validity and reliability of their checklists and revised them in relation to the data as it was done in this study. Adopting the most appropriate materials in English language is a must, and to do so developing reliable and valid checklists is a must as well. The research and literature about materials development issue are flourishing, yet the checklist development, which is one of the vital means of that process, requires more emphasis.

V. CONCLUSION

First of all, the checklists are the brain child of 156 ELT teachers, not a single expert. They collaborated to create the most sound, practical checklists that can be employed to evaluate ELT materials. This collaboration helped synthesize different perspectives in two-stage evaluation criteria which could be employed by other practitioners in the field.

In addition, the process through which the trainees study ELT materials, materials evaluation and checklist preparation and develop checklist for evaluation is unique in itself. The trainees had no ELT materials evaluation background. First they received theoretical instruction about the topic, got familiar with approaches and discussions and examined checklists. After getting equipped with enough theoretical knowledge they came up with their own and employed it to evaluate ELT materials used in their schools. Some teacher may do the same task without having enough insights into the topic. Thus the training helps trainees have a wider perspective about the topic guides them to make informed decisions while developing their checklists and evaluating their own materials. Hence, the first implication of the study is that raising the awareness of teachers about the topic of interest can be an effective strategy to elicit reliable data about it.

Furthermore, the research indicates that the proposed materials evaluation system and related checklists can be used effectively for materials evaluation. The results about the reliability are found to be high and both the categories and subcategories of the checklists are employed dependably when evaluating materials. Thus, the research helps realize a reliable system for materials evaluation, concise screening checklist and the comprehensive detailed checklist for materials evaluation in language teaching.

Moreover, generally speaking teachers initiate the materials evaluation process directly with the materials evaluation checklist. In other words, it forms the first step of the process. The proposed 3-stage system for materials evaluation presents a unique perspective. First it directs the attention of teachers to context-related factors. It emphasizes the pivotal role of language teaching context in the materials evaluation process. Namely it raises the awareness of English teachers about the role of “the goal of the language program, the context in which it is implemented, the teachers and learners. The overall goal determines the syllabus (knowledge base and language content), the language skills, academic skills, etc. Likewise, the teaching-learning context is to be emphasized as well. It provides invaluable information about the role of English, whether it is a medium of instruction or one of the courses in the syllabus, length and frequency of the English class hours, class size, availability of course materials, technological equipment of classrooms, international trend, national policy, and expectations and attitudes of parents towards English. Furthermore, learner-related factors necessitate special attention. The demographic information about learners, their education background, their needs and interests, their linguistic and cognitive level, their language learning goals affect both affective and cognitive involvement of learners in the language education process. Finally, teacher-related factors need to be taken into consideration. Thus, the research highlights the vital role of context-related factors and reminds that it is the first inescapable step of the materials evaluation checklist development process.



Figure 1. Materials evaluation checklist development process

The proposed three-stage system is also found to be practical and time saving. Since there are numerous ELT materials on the market, it is not practical to evaluate each and every in detail. Hence, the system and the screening (quick evaluation) checklist speeds up disqualifying the inappropriate ones and saves enough time to focus on the qualified ones in depth.

Additionally, the detailed analysis checklist is composed of two main categories (external and internal) and nineteen subcategories, that is, it offers an extremely comprehensive checklist which pave the way for a thorough evaluation of ELT materials. To the knowledge of the researcher it is the most inclusive one developed so far. In other words, not only does the study propose a new perspective for materials evaluation, but a detailed checklist that may serve the ones who are in search of a thorough tool when evaluating their materials.

Finally, the detailed analysis checklist may appear to be too exhaustive and hard to implement. Because of the screening checklist, only few set of materials are to be evaluated and they deserve enough time and focus to adopt the most appropriate ones. Besides, it can function as a resource for teachers to choose from among to create their own checklists.

APPENDIX A. MATERIALS EVALUATION IN EFL

Objectives: This training aims to introduce prospective foreign language teachers to theoretical issues in materials evaluation. Trainees are required to evaluate the ELT materials for a specific group of learners. More specifically, they will

- a. gain insights into ELT materials and fundamental concepts and principles about them.
- b. gain insights into ELT materials evaluation

Products:

- a. Trainees will complete the real-life tasks specified for each week
- b. Trainees will come up with a materials evaluation checklist
- c. Trainees will evaluate materials

Course Outline

Week 1: Introduction

Week 2: ELT Materials

Nation and Macalister, 2010, Chapter I

Graves, 1996, Chapter 2

Long and Doughty, 2011, Chapter 17

Week 3: ELT Materials

McDonough & Shaw, 2005, Chapter 4

Byrd, 2002

Tomlinson, 2011, Chapter 1

Week 4: Materials Evaluation

Tomlinson, 2011, Chapter 8

Işık, 2013

Graves, 2000, Chapter 9

Week 5: Materials Evaluation

McDonough & Shaw, 2005, Chapter 5

Graves, 2000, Chapter 4

Graves, 2000, Chapter 8

Week 6: Materials Evaluation

McDonough & Shaw, 2005, Chapter 3

Tomlinson, 2011, Introduction

Week 7: Developing Materials Evaluation Checklists

Week 8: Developing Materials Evaluation Checklists

Week 9: Feedback on Checklists

Week 10: Evaluating ELT Materials Using the Developed Checklists

Week 11: Evaluating ELT Materials Using the Developed Checklists

Week 12: Feedback on ELT Materials Evaluation

APPENDIX B. MATERIALS EVALUATION CHECKLIST

I. SCREENING (QUALIFYING EVALUATION)

	completely unsatisfactory	unsatisfactory	neutral	satisfactory	completely satisfactory
Methodology					
Relevance of content					
Publication date					
Congruence with the aim of the course					
Age level					
Linguistic level					
Time (length of the course)					
Periphery					
Recent, innovative ideas					
Appropriacy to the context					
Software/internet support					
Universality					
Availability					
Technological requirements					
The quality and reliability of the publisher					
Price					
Compact nature of the learner book.					

II. DETAILED EVALUATION

a. EXTERNAL EVALUATION

	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly disagree
The information given in the front and back cover is informative enough					
The materials writer(s) is a well-known expert					
The materials are quantitatively sufficient for the language program					
Table of contents provides enough information about the materials.					
Face validity					
The face validity of the front and back cover is good					
Page design offers a colorful variety					
Variety in page design is provided throughout the materials					
Page design is not squeezed, clear					
Drawings, pictures, illustrations are used effectively					
The font is appropriate					
The use of colors is successful					
The size of the book does not disturb learners.					
The periphery					
They offer a learner book					
They offer teacher's book					
They offer a workbook					
They offer realia					
They offer an assessment tool/component					
They offer a project file					
They offer a resources file for teachers					
They offer extra authentic documents					
They offer online applications					
They offer an access code for teachers and learners for the internet resources					
They provide an international online platform through which teachers and learners interact					
Learners					
They are relevant to learner needs (needs, wants, lacks)					
They are relevant to learner cultural orientation					
They are learner-centered.					
Context-related factors					
They are practical and applicable in classroom					
The text/task/classroom organization requirements are met by the classroom context					
In-class time required to cover the coursebook is appropriate					
Out-class time required to cover the coursebook is appropriate					
Classroom meets the technological requirements of the materials					

b. Internal Evaluation

	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly disagree
Approach					
They are based on an up-to-date language teaching/learning philosophy					
Adopted language teaching/learning philosophy is observed systematically in the tasks					

They transfer recent scientific findings to materials development					
They aim at language acquisition not teaching of pre-determined linguistic structures					
They use language as means of learning, interaction					
Aim					
They meet the overall goal of the program					
They address learning needs of learners					
They meet the general expectations of all stake holders					
They lead learners to the goal in a carefully planned step-by-step fashion					
They provide interim goals					
Syllabus					
They are cross-curricular					
They teach language through content					
They reflect the adopted language teaching/learning philosophy					
They have enough number of texts to realize program goals					
They have a carefully-knitted smooth organization					
They are organized around multiple-intelligences					
They are real-life oriented					
They employ variety of tasks					
They employ variety of texts (from different genres)					
They require active participation of learners					
They have a holistic approach to language					
They avoid stereotypes and discrimination					
They favor world citizenship					
They provide ample amount of input					
They do not force learners to produce at the early stages of learning					
The modules/units are organized around the same goal					
Each unit has objectives to fulfill the ultimate goal					
There is a logical organization among the modules/units					
There is a transition between modules/units					
They exploit bodily-kinesthetic tasks					
They emphasize patterns (daily social language)					
They appreciate what learners bring to the class					
They achieve "fun"					
They foster cooperative learning					
They foster problem-based learning					
They favor experiential learning					
They are designed developmentally in terms of skills, content, and tasks					
If it is an ESP course					
They focus on specific language skills					

They focus on specific content					
They provide specific texts					
They provide specific tasks					
They exploit specific documents					
They provide specific terminology					
They teach specific symbols and acronyms					
They have real-life simulations					
They meet real-life workplace task demands					
Linguistic aspect					
They comply with CEFR					
They have appropriate intensity					
They have appropriate pace					
They are based on corpus					
They are appropriate to the linguistic level of learners					
They are divorced from traditional order of grammar items. The content determines the language forms not vice versa.					
They are language-awareness-oriented. They do not attempt to teach language forms in a classical sense.					
They present language with a context.					
They employ meaningful (not mechanical) tasks					
They are discourse-oriented.					
Teacher-related factors					
They empower and guide teachers					
They help teacher development					
They provide extra tasks					
They provide extra materials					
They provide extra ideas					
They have an interleaved teacher's book					
Teacher's book is easy to use					
Teacher's book grants initiative to teachers, does not strictly control them.					
Learner-related factors					
They exploit what learners bring to the learning context					
They are learner friendly					
They are easy to use					
They guide learners successfully about what to do					
They motivate learners					
They meet affective needs of learners					
They address learner differences					
Their cognitive load is manageable					
Their content is not too demanding					
They give choice to learners through a variety of texts/tasks					
They provide strategies for learning					
They help learners develop academic/study skills					
They make learners responsible for their own learning.					
They foster learners to question and investigate					
They orient learners about how to use the coursebook and the periphery					

They enlarge learner schemata					
They have an holistic approach to learners					
They are resourceful for learner differences (slow/fast, level, personality)					
Classroom management					
They employ a variety of classroom organization (individual, pair, group, class)					
They help class socialization through different classroom organization.					
They require active participation of learners in classroom organization.					
Instructions					
They set the scene, explain the activity and its goal.					
They are learner-friendly.					
They do not have an authoritarian voice.					
They clear and easy to follow.					
The symbols used are systematic and guiding learners					
Content					
They present language in a simple, meaningful manner					
They aim at real daily language					
All tasks are transferred from real life					
They focus on daily speech patterns (social language)					
They are functional					
The people and topics are not hypothetical					
The topics are interesting					
The topics and people are up-to-date					
They expand learner schemata					
They provide content knowledge from relevant areas					
They employ a variety of topics					
They are of optimal level of cognitive difficulty					
They address learners of different interest					
Each content has a reference (to show where it is taken and learners refer to further information)					
There is a fine balance between content and content related tasks					
The content between the units and within the same unit is developmentally organized					
The unit sticks to the same topic, does not jump from one to another					
They are age-appropriate					
The quantity of texts is enough					
Literature is exploited effectively					
The length of texts is appropriate					
The density of texts is appropriate					
The texts are authentic					
They exploit texts from different genres					
Culture					
They adopt English as Lingua Franca (ELF) approach					

They do not aim at imposing target culture					
They exploit local (our) and international culture					
They try to raise cultural-awareness					
They are not in conflict with our culture					
Lexis					
They have a lexical approach to teach new lexical items					
They emphasize collocations					
They emphasize associations					
They provide terminology from different relevant areas					
The load of lexical items are appropriate					
They recycle previously taught target lexical items systematically					
They present new items within a context					
Skills					
They have an integrated-skills approach					
They arrange the balance of the receptive vs productive skills depending on linguistic level					
They have a systematic plan to develop subskills of each skill.					
Format of a unit					
At the end beginning of each unit the objectives are stated					
At the beginning of each unit there is a pre-test about the content of the unit					
Warm-up					
The unit starts with a warm-up					
The warm-up sets the scene. Explain what is done so far and what will be done					
The warm-up aims at affective preparation					
The warm-up aims at cognitive preparation (activates or build up schemata)					
The warm-up aims at pre-teaching key lexis and grammar (if there is any)					
The warm-up gives a purpose to do the tasks in the unit, it creates an inner need					
The warm-up does something striking (exploits a short text and task, facts, data, visuals) to capture the attention of learners					
Body					
The body focuses on the content					
The content of each texts is exploited enough					
The body employs enough number of texts					
The body follows, "the warm-up, content-related tasks, personalization" sequence					
The task type is relevant to text type					
The body offers relevant tasks to learners					
The body exploits game-like, enjoyable tasks					
All tasks stem from the content covered					

The content of the task (cognitive load) is manageable					
The tasks have a gradual level of difficulty					
The tasks are not piled up, there is a logical organization					
The tasks are organized from simple to complex					
The tasks are organized from general to specific					
There are relevant (related with tasks learners are expected to carry out in their education or career)					
The tasks are meaningful, purposeful, not designed for the sake of carrying out tasks					
All tasks are integrated					
There is smooth transition from one task to another					
Tasks are age-appropriate					
Tasks foster cognitive involvement of learners					
Tasks foster affective involvement of learners					
Follow up					
They allow to put what is covered to put into practice					
They favor to carry out the tasks in different relevant contexts					
They allow field-trips					
They employ real-life tasks					
They employ simple experiments, practices					
They provide extension of the content (personalization and localization related to the content)					
They let learners choose from among different tasks					
They provide contextualized lexical practice stemmed from the content					
They provide contextualized grammar practice stemmed from the content					
They provide tasks to be done after the class					
They guide self-interest groups for extra activities after the class					
They provide a summary of the module/unit					
They provide self-evaluation					
They provide a post-test					
Measurement and evaluation					
They favor both alternative and traditional assessment					
They provide feedback to both teachers and learners to facilitate learning					
They have valid assessment procedures.					
They facilitate language program evaluation					
Software					
Software supports the coursebook (program goals)					
Software exposes learners to comprehensible samples of language					
Software provides rich extra materials/tasks for learners of different needs and interests					

Software offers a variety of materials/tasks for learners of different learning styles and types					
Software provides engaging and compelling materials/tasks					
Software is easy to use					
Software exploits multimedia					
Software has an interactive nature					
Software provides glocal interaction with other learners					
Software provides immediate feedback.					
Software provides evaluation for learner performance					

III. OVERALL EVALUATION

	are completely unsatisfactory	Are unsatisfactory	need a comprehensive adaptation	are satisfactory but need adaptation	are completely satisfactory but need minor adaptation
The materials					

REFERENCES

- [1] AbdelWahab, M. M. (2013). Developing an English language textbook evaluative checklist. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education* 1.3, 55-70.
- [2] Allen, C. (2015). Marriages of convenience? Teachers and coursebooks in the digital age. *ELT Journal* 69.3, 249-263.
- [3] Allehyani, B., Burnapp, D. & Wilson, J. (2017). A comparison of teaching materials (school textbooks vs authentic materials) from the perspective of English teachers and educational supervisors in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research* 5.2, 1-14.
- [4] Angell, J., DuBravac, S. & Gonglewski, M. (2008). Thinking Globally, Acting Locally: Selecting Textbooks for College-Level Language Programs. *Foreign Language Annals* 41.3, 562-573.
- [5] Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- [6] Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- [7] Dubin, F. & Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course design*. New York: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal* 51, 36-42.
- [9] Garton, S. & Graves, K. (2014). Identifying a research agenda for language teaching materials. *The Modern Language Journal* 98.2, 654-657.
- [10] Graves; K. (1996). *Teachers as course developers*. Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses*. Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Grossman, P. & Thompson, C. (2008). Learning from curriculum materials: Scaffolds for new teachers? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 2014– 2026.
- [13] Guyer, E. & Peterson, P. W. (1988). Language and/or content? Principles and procedures for materials development in an adjunct course. In S. Benesch (ed.), *Ending Remediation: Linking ESL and content in higher education*. Washington, DC: TESOL Publications, 67-90.
- [14] Hargreaves, P. (1989). "DES-IMPL-EVALU-IGN: an evaluator's checklist". In R. K. Johnson (ed.), *The second language curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 35-47.
- [15] Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Longman.
- [16] Hart, I. (2003). The outsider's gaze: a learner-centred approach to language-teaching materials. *Educational Media International* 40.3-4, 287-292.
- [17] Harwood, N. (ed.) (2010). *Materials in ELT: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [18] Harwood, N.(ed.) (2014). *English language teaching textbooks: Content, consumption, production*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [19] Hirsch, Linda. (1988). Language across the curriculum: a model for ESL students in the content courses In S. Benesch (ed.), *Ending Remediation: Linking ESL and content in higher education*. Washington, DC: TESOL Publications, 67-90.
- [20] Hutchinson, T & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [21] Işık, A. (2011). Language education and ELT materials in Turkey from the path dependence perspective. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 40, 256-266.
- [22] Işık, A. (2013a). How are ELT materials chosen in high schools? Some suggestions. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 28, 28-1.
- [23] Işık, A. (2013b). To what extent does a university level English program meet workplace demands. *Education Journal* 2. 3, 98-107.
- [24] Işık, A. & Altmışdört, G. (2010). Yabancı dil öğretiminde malzeme değerlendirme. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 23.1, 221-238.
- [25] Johnson, R. K. (ed.) (1989). *The second language curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [26] Kostka, I. & Bunning, L. (2016). *Curriculum design in language teaching*. Washington, DC: TESOL Publications.

- [27] Krahnke, K. (1987). *Approaches to syllabus design for foreign language teaching*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- [28] Krashen, S. D. (2006). *English Fever*. Taipei City: Crane Publishing Company.
- [29] Kukulska-Hulme, A., Norris, L. & Donohue, J. (2015). *Mobile pedagogy for English language teaching: A guide for teachers*. London: British Council.
- [30] Letter, W. (2000). *A Coursebook Evaluation*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Centre for English Language Studies.
- [31] Littlejohn, A. & Wendeatt, S. (1989). Beyond language learning: perspectives on materials design. In R. K. Johnson (ed.), *The second language curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155-175.
- [32] López-Medina, B. (2016). Developing a CLIL textbook evaluation checklist. *LACLIL*, 9.1, 159-173. doi:10.5294/lacil.2016.9.1.7.
- [33] McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [34] McDonough, J., Shaw, C. & Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide* (3rd ed.). London: Blackwell.
- [35] McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [36] McGrath, I. (2006). Teachers' and learners' images for coursebooks. *ELT Journal* 60. 2, 171-180.
- [37] McGrath, I. (2013). *Teaching materials and the roles of EFL/ESL teachers: Practice and theory*. London: Bloomsbury.
- [38] McGrath, I. (2016). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [39] Mishan, F. & Timmis, I. (2015). *Materials development for TESOL*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [40] O'Neill, R. (1982). Why use textbooks? *English Language Teaching Journal* 36, 104-111.
- [41] Purgoson, K. B. (1991). Planning lessons and units. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle, 419-431.
- [42] Reinders, H., & Lewis, M. (2006). An evaluative checklist for self-access materials. *ELT Journal* 60. 3, 272-278.
- [43] Richard-Amato, P. (1988). *Making it happen*. New York: Longman.
- [44] Richards, J. C. (2006). Materials Development and Research—Making the Connection. *RELC* 37.1, 5-26.
- [45] Shave, J. (2010). A Teacher friendly process for evaluating and selecting ESL/EFL coursebooks. *The Internet TESL Journal* 16, 11.
- [46] Sheldon, L. E. (ed.) (1987). *ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development*. London: Modern English Publications.
- [47] Skierso, A. (1991). Planning lessons and units. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle, 432-453.
- [48] Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Developing materials for language learning*. London: Continuum.
- [49] Tomlinson, B. (ed.) (2008). *English language teaching materials: a critical review*. London: Continuum.
- [50] Tomlinson, B. (2010). What do teachers think about EFL coursebooks? *Modern English Teacher* 19.4, 5-9.
- [51] Tomlinson, B. (ed.) (2013). *Developing materials for language teaching* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum Press.
- [52] Tomlinson, B. & Masuhara, H. (2017). *The complete guide to the theory and practice of materials development for language learning*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- [53] Willis, D. (2000). *Syllabus and materials*. Birmingham: The Center for English Language Studies.



Ali Işık graduated from Bogazici University (Istanbul, Turkey) Education Faculty Foreign Language Education Program in 1989. He completed his MA in 1993 and Ph.D. 1999 at the same university and department. He completed his second MA at Gazi University (Ankara, Turkey) Educational Administration Program in 2006.

Between 1999-2016 he worked as a part-time lecturer at Bogazici University, Middle East Technical University, Hacettepe University, Yeditepe University, and Bogazi ğ University consecutively. He is currently the ELT program and materials development advisor and teacher trainer at Istinye University, Istanbul, Turkey. His research interests include language teaching methodology, teacher training, content-based instruction, materials development, measurement and evaluation.