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ABSTRACT
The article presents a critical and retrospective narration of the developmental stages of a checklist for evaluating a set of coursebooks taught in Bangladesh from the micro-narrative perspective of the evaluator. Attempts have been made to substantiate the argument that the readily available checklists might not be completely usable and useful for the evaluation in the emerging contexts; yet they might offer support in various aspects in different ways. The main challenges of developing checklists i.e. incorporating the historical awareness in the checklist and contextualizing it where it is going to be operated are pointed out in a subjective but empirical manner by means of firsthand experience and observation of fact.

Keywords: Coursebook evaluation, micro-narrative, evaluation checklist, historical awareness

Introduction

Checklist is a widely used instrument for analyzing and evaluating a coursebook systematically. Despite the availability of the materials evaluation checklists or portfolios in abundance, it has not been possible to do away with the ideas like modifying or adapting the existing portfolios, or re-writing or re-creating a new checklist for the particular needs of the evaluator. While doing my doctoral research (Kabir, 2012), I did not find any of the existing checklists to be directly relevant to my purpose and the types of materials (English for Today, 2001 and English Grammar and Composition, 2005) I was dealing with. Therefore, I had to create my own checklist
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(see appendix) for evaluating the materials ensuring its reliability, validity and practicality. In the following sections of this article, my attempt will be to critically look at the theories pertaining to materials evaluation in the light of subjective and professional experiences of developing a materials evaluation checklist. This article approaches the field of materials evaluation from the perspectives of micro-narrative, as opposed to that of the macro-narrative, which is usually adopted in many educational research papers.

Coursebooks and Their Evaluation

The default features of a coursebook include two contradictory aspects. One is the static nature of the book that the book is destined to carry with it in terms of certain format and design following certain ideologies of language, learning, teaching, education etc. (Kabir 2011, 189-190). On the flipside, the other comprises the context of its use and the diverse nature of its users that together make the use of the book quite unpredictable:

The nature of human interaction in a specific context on specific issues being highly dynamic and unpredictable, the nature of such constantly evolving dynamism cannot be fully assumed in advance through the predetermined nature of the course book—unchanged while in use and static when printed" (Kabir, 2012, p. 138).

Hence, the coursebook in its printed form and as an object of use by users may have different consequences and meanings. This fact has serious implications for designing the evaluation checklist. At the outset, it needs to be clarified if the checklist is going to evaluate the fixed aspects of the coursebook i.e. the printed document irrespective of its use or its continuous aspects i.e. the document in relation to the context of its use. The latter one might invite subjective elements in designing the checklist for coursebook evaluation for we know that contexts and users are different. This aspect is
crucial as it justifies why the need to create or re-create a new checklist or even modify or adapt the existing one is inevitable and rational.

A sensible resemblance, thus, can be observed between the coursebook and the checklist for evaluating it. Just like the earlier one, the latter one is, on the one hand, developed as a printed set of criteria that can be used to evaluate the materials, and, on the other hand, can be adjusted in terms of the books it is supposed to evaluate. To ensure the validity and reliability of the coursebook evaluation, it is necessary to create checklist in relation to the book that is going to be evaluated.

**Understanding Evaluation**

‘Coursebook analysis’ and ‘coursebook evaluation’ are often interchangeably used. They often create confusion. However, a consensus regarding their use has been reached when Littlejohn (1998, pp. 191-205), McGrath (2002, p. 22) and Tomlinson (2003, p. 16) differentiated ‘analysis’ from ‘evaluation’ delineating that ‘analysis’ is objective and ‘evaluation’ is subjective. In analysis, yes/no questions are used whereas in ‘evaluation’ questions with the continuum of ‘very unlikely’ and ‘very likely’ most often with numerical value are used (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 16). However, Littlejohn (1998) suggests mixture of analysis and evaluation which Tomlinson (2003, p. 17) prefers as well. The focus of analysis is limited to the descriptive analysis of the materials in terms of what they have and do not have. On the other hand, evaluation is a more inclusive term in terms of if the materials should be effective for the users within the limits of the contexts or not. Evaluation, thus, includes analysis.

The approach adapted in the checklist comes much closer to the definition of ‘evaluation’ in its inclusive connotation as the intent of evaluation in this case was to both find out the
haves and have-nots of the coursebook and how effective it was while in use in the classrooms. Therefore, attention was given to find out how the book had been written and was used in the real classrooms.

**Agents of Evaluation**

Coursebooks can be evaluated by any stakeholders at any point of time for any reason. The materials writers (Jolly & Bolitho, 1998, pp. 91-112), the teacher-analyst (Lilttlejohn, 1998, p. 195), teachers, and students, all stakeholders of materials (Chambers, 1997, p. 34) can, in fact, evaluate coursebooks. However, most of the time it is found that teachers and students are included in evaluation and “other sample groups like parents, administrators, authors, and publishers were either underrepresented or not represented at all” (Şimşek & Dündar, 2017, p. 969). Evaluation by one group may not serve the purpose of others (Allwright, 1981, p. 7). Evaluation by one group can come up with a biased outcome as well. Hence, using more evaluators is suggested and preferred by Tomlinson (2003, p. 32) and McGrath (2002, p. 52). Thus, evaluation by different stakeholders of materials is usually safer to arrive at a more unbiased and inclusive evaluation.

In the study (Kabir, 2012), teachers were requested to participate in checklist evaluation. The researcher evaluated coursebooks using the same checklist for further comparison in future. Teachers evaluated the coursebooks because they were one of the sources of the primary data required for the research. The researcher did the same thing to fulfill the requirements of the research. The checklist was developed by the researcher. Therefore, the actual agent of evaluation was the researcher himself though both the researcher and the practicing teachers took part in evaluation. It is to note that the participants in evaluation are not necessarily the agent of evaluation all the time.
Purpose(s) of Evaluation

Evaluators can have different purposes for evaluation. Attempts are made to classify different types of materials evaluation in three broad categories: pre-use evaluation, while-use evaluation and post-use evaluation (McGrath, 2002, pp. 14-15; Tomlinson, 2003, pp. 23-26). Using different terms to refer to the same thing, Rubdy (2003) says that evaluation can have different perspectives (e.g. prospective, ongoing and/or retrospective). However, in the pre-use evaluation, coursebooks are evaluated before its actual use. In the while-use phase, evaluation and implementation of the coursebooks occur simultaneously. In this case, the outcome of evaluation is immediately incorporated into the materials. In the post-use evaluation, evaluators usually employ retrospective evaluation of the materials both in terms of materials as a set of fixed documents and as a set of documents in use. This kind of evaluation is more complicated and time consuming, yet more fulfilling in the sense that it is able to perceive a more comprehensive view of the materials.

While developing my own materials evaluation checklist, I was concerned primarily with two things: (i) I was going to evaluate coursebooks, which had been being used for more than 10 years, and (ii) the practicing teachers were going to evaluate the books that they teach through my checklist. The researcher, in this regard, had to step into the shoes of the teachers and on some occasions into those of the materials writers.

Content of Evaluation

Content of language coursebooks includes linguistic and non-linguistic elements and chiefly involves issues like theories of language and learning, Second Language Acquisition, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of language
education. All these aspects have been considered in the available checklists of some renowned experts. While explaining teaching materials needed for the teaching purposes to the publishers, Allwright (1981, pp. 6-10) uses the terms goal, content, method and guidance. Dubin and Olshtain’s (1986) ‘Inventory Approach’ includes integration of grammar and notion, themes and topics, and communicative and sociocultural functions. Chambers’ checklist (1997) includes pedagogical factors like suitability for the age group, cultural appropriateness, methodology, teacher’s book, variety, pace, personal involvement etc. McGrath’s checklist (2002) is chiefly based on linguistic and non-linguistic issues. His ‘first glance evaluation includes evaluation of learning contexts and learner needs, content, design, language content, subject matter, and practical considerations. Rubdy’s evaluation checklist (2003, pp. 51-54) takes pedagogical validity, psychological validity, and process and content validity into consideration. Shave’s checklist (2010) includes the evaluation of the coursebook along with the syllabus, the methodology, the context of learning, and the background of the learners. Shave’s checklist emphasizes pedagogical and process aspects. Content has been defined and redefined in numerous ways in different checklists.

Materials can be evaluated through the inclusion of different features of a coursebook (e.g. the technical aspect, linguistic aspect, pedagogical aspect, psychological aspect, content aspect, and even process aspect). The checklist that I developed attempts to include as many aspects as the research work (Kabir, 2012) demanded.

Kinds of Evaluation

Based on differences in purposes, evaluators, modality and time, evaluations can be of different types (Tomlinson, 2003, pp. 23). In earlier section, discussion on pre-use, while-use and
post-use evaluation has already been presented. In addition to that, McDonough and Shaw (2003) and Ellis (1997) suggested the use of predictive and retrospective evaluations. Ellis’s (1997) retrospective evaluation is carried out through empirical evaluation collating data from learners’ diaries, workbooks, daily notes, and continual assessment. Evaluation also includes other important factors like scale (narrow or broad, that is, a coursebook for one semester at a KG school or a coursebook for one academic year for the entire nation), and financial facilities.

In the light of the related factors, I made an attempt to combine the features of the while-use and the post-use evaluations during developing the evaluation checklist chiefly because the users of the coursebooks had been using them for a long time (more than a decade). The checklist attempts to take into consideration the empirical knowledge of the teachers. Therefore, the perspectives of the checklist are inclusive of the prospective and retrospective aspects.

**Evaluation Tools**

Materials evaluation tools can be of different types: checklist, questionnaire, pro forma etc. It can be structured, semi-structured or unstructured. Tools can include statements or different types of questions like multiple-choice questions, yes/no questions, and open-ended questions. Allwright’s checklist (1981, pp. 17-18) includes only statements. Cunningsworth developed two checklists. His earlier checklist (1984, pp. 74-79) includes different types of questions. Later on, he used only yes/no questions in another checklist (Cunningsworth, 1995, pp. 2-4). Dubin and Olshtain’s (1986) checklist is replete with questions on basic assumptions, and shape and design. Sheldon’s (1988) checklist is chiefly based on factual details and other assessment criteria. Chambers’ (1997) pro forma progresses through rated and weighted
stages. McGrath (2002) uses both open and close statements. Questions are placed under the heading of general criterion in Rubdy’s (2003) checklist. Tomlinson (2003) prefers descriptive questions in his checklist.

It is found that the construction of the tools of evaluation could be of various types. Different evaluators made them in different ways based on their purposes, time and manner of evaluation. In my checklist, I have used a combination of statements with 4-point Likert scales along with different types of short questions (e.g. yes/no, MCQs, and open-ended questions). It emphasizes statements with Likert scales to collect specific information with variations in degrees. Other types of questions are set to elicit answers that are more detailed. The statements or questions are set under different specific areas. At the end of each area, one common question phrased as ‘any other comments’ are asked to capture any unanticipated issues. As the coursebook package for evaluation consists of two textbooks written upon two different principles, I had to set different questions to evaluate them. Hence, my checklist has two parts, and is rather longer.

Measures of Evaluation

Different aspects of a coursebook need to be measured against certain features including linguistic, non-linguistic, pedagogical, psychological, technical features etc. The main hurdle is to be able to select them and grade them. Ur (1999, p. 81) left the issues of selection and gradation of criteria to evaluators who must agree on them. Different experts have presented different types of categorization of criteria. This proves that there are no fixed set of criteria. In fact, there are no universal criteria (McDonough & Shaw, 2003; Rubdy, 2003, p. 44; Tomlinson, 2003, p. 27). Often, experts like Cunningsworth (1995) and Sheldon (1988) are found to suggest reducing the number of criteria. The issue of selecting
and sequencing criteria is chiefly based on the purposes of evaluation.

While developing my evaluation checklist, I have incorporated both universal and local aspects of a coursebook in terms of construction and implementation. The elaborate discussion is presented in part II.

Interpreting Evaluation

Interpretation of data collected from the checklist is another important and integral issue to think about while developing an evaluation checklist. Depending on the needs and purposes of evaluation and the features and limitations of different interpretation technique, experts have adopted different types of interpretation technique in their checklists. Sheldon (1988, p. 242), McGrath (2002, pp. 49-50) and Rubdy (2003, p. 54) used rating though in different ways. Sheldon (1988, p. 242) used asterisks (*), McGrath (2002, pp. 49-50) used 4-point scale, and Rubdy used Likert scale. Rubdy (2003, p. 54) and Tomlinson (2003, p. 32) suggest using comments along with rating scale and their score average. Tomlinson (2003, p. 32) suggests using comments at the end of each category. Ur (1999, pp. 81-82) uses tick, question and cross. Some evaluators are nowadays using emoticons in their checklists:

As the sole use of comments can be biased and unsystematic to interpret and the sole use of scoring by adding numerical value fails to capture important aspects, qualitative in nature, a blend of both may well solve the riddle balancing neutrality and capturing all the possible aspects in a systematic way (Kabir, 2012, p. 144).

In the checklist, I have included a 4-point scale, short questions, and comments at the end of each category to get a more comprehensive picture. I have also tried to make my checklist free from mono-methodic biases.
Compromises

Any attempt to evaluate the course materials is time-consuming, expensive and often difficult to execute. Generally, impressionistic evaluation or analysis is applied for evaluating the coursebook. For saving time, energy and money, experts like Littlejohn (1998, p. 196) and McGrath (2002) suggest choosing some units for close evaluation, and then one task from the unit for analysis and evaluation. Other experts like McDonough and Shaw (2003, p. 61) and Ur (1999) suggest evaluation of tasks, texts, and administration. Littlejohn (1998) and Rubdy (2003, p. 42) approach tasks from prospective, ongoing and retrospective perspectives (i.e. they attempt to evaluate tasks both as product and process).

I had only one set of materials and I found Littlejohn’s (1998) and Rubdy’s (2003) suggestions more useful for my research. In my checklist more emphasis was given to the ongoing and retrospective aspects.

Limitations of a Checklist

From the above discussion, it can be surmised that it is not possible to develop one single checklist suitable for evaluation of all kinds of coursebooks. The evaluation frameworks or checklists mentioned earlier are essentially contexts-bound, or at least the outcome of the framework designer’s perception of language, learning and teaching and the role of materials.

Another point that has been established from the discussion is that no checklist is perfect and conclusive. In fact, all checklists have their own characteristics, strengths and limitations. For example, Dubin and Olshtain’s (1986) framework for evaluating communicative materials may fail to evaluate the recently produced communicative materials as the definition of the term ‘communicative’ is still evolving.
Chambers’ (1997) framework is time consuming. McGrath (2002) points out how two textbooks can have similar or same scores, yet, can differ in qualities. It can be argued that the checklist developed for a particular context might be more suitable for evaluating those specific coursebooks than any other checklists developed for other contexts.

The checklist used in my research (Kabir, 2012) is developed for evaluating communicative materials but the definition of the term ‘communicative’ has been chiefly drawn from the underpinnings of theoretical approach towards the term, as adopted in the curriculum (NCTB, 1995). This checklist is specifically customized for evaluating this particular set of materials used in Bangladesh. However, the process of its construction is based on the universal features of checklist evaluation.

II

Description of the Checklist

The checklist has four sections. The first section captures the personal details while three subsequent sections focus on evaluating different aspects of the coursebook. The first section includes the name, age, sex, school, experience, contact details of the evaluator and the date. It also includes instructions for using the checklist written in a very simple language. As it has been mentioned earlier that the coursebook package under evaluation has two separate books written upon two different principles, the checklist also attempts to address issues related to both of them. Since some of the features across those books are common and some other features are entirely different, three more sections are developed: for book I and book II together, for book I, and for book II. These three sections, altogether, had 90 points of different kinds, which are
statements, short questions (e.g. MCQs, yes/no questions) and open-ended questions.

Second section for both the books has 6 points in the form of statements where the first 4 has yes/no options, the fifth one uses Likert scale and the last one is open-ended. All these points address the issues of analysis of physical aspects of both the books. These criteria are universal in nature.

Third section for book I has 2 points related to visual representations. The first one has yes/no option. Point 8, the second one, has 5 sub-points in the form of short questions except the last one with yes/no option.

Points ranging from 9 to 28 address general issues related to book I. Points ranging from 9 to 60 are related to the analysis of linguistic, pedagogical, psychological, content, and process aspects. Whereas points 14, 18 and 19 have yes/no options, point 20 is an MCQ. Except the last two points (which expect open-ended answers), all other points are set in the form of statements with 4-point rating scale. Point 11 has 3 sub-points where responses are to be expressed through the rating scale. Point 14 also has 2 sub-points where the second sub-point asks the respondents to rank-order. All these points are set on the entire book I (*English for Today*, 2001).

The second subsection of the third section is on unit evaluation. Unit 11 is chosen as it is located at the central point in the book. Points ranging from 29 to 39 address issues focusing on unit and its evaluation. All the points except the last one (which expects open-ended answers) are set in the form of statements with the same rating scale.

The third subsection includes points ranging from 40 to 51 on issues related to specific tasks from unit 11 as this part is on task evaluation. All the points except the last one (which
expects open-ended answers) are set in the form of statements with the same rating scale. Point 42 has 3 subsections where responses are to be expressed through the same rating scale as well.

The final subsection of the third section titled ‘overall assessment’ has points ranging from 52 to 60 where all the points except the last one (which expects open-ended answers) are set in the form of statements with the same rating scale.

In the subsections of the final section on book II (English Grammar and Composition, 2005), points ranging from 61 to 90 are related to the analysis of linguistic, pedagogical, psychological, content and process aspects. Points ranging from 61 to 65 include general questions related to the book. All these points are on grammar and composition, and use the same rating scale.

The second subsection is on unit evaluation with prime focus on grammar. For this, unit 7 is chosen as it has a central place in the book. Points ranging from 66 to 78 address issues in terms of that specific unit with a focus on grammar. Points ranging from 67 to 70 use the rating scale; points ranging from 71 to 73 use MCQs; points 66a and 74 use yes/no options; and finally point 66b and points ranging from 75 to 78 invite open-ended answers.

The third subsection is on unit evaluation with a focus on composition. For this, unit 4 is chosen as it has a central place in the book. Points ranging from 79 to 84 address issues of that unit with a focus on composition. All the points here invite open-ended answers.

The final subsection titled ‘overall assessment’ has points from 85 to 90 where all the points except the last one (which
invites open-ended answers) are set in the form of statements with the same rating scale.

In the fourth section, task evaluation is not included. The reason for not including it is that, in book II, we did not find any task based on communicative principles. There were only grammatical exercises. Since things were evident, we did not include any point on task evaluation. Unit evaluation is done with two different foci on grammar and composition because the book is written in such a manner.

Apparently, the checklist is quite long with 90 points but the asymmetrical nature of two books of the same package can be mentioned to justify the length. Had the two books been produced in a similar manner, the hurdles for the researcher to construct the checklist and for the evaluators to use it would have been less, and the checklist would have been smarter.

Administration of the Checklist

Pilot report

The checklist was piloted. Two Bangladeshi teachers and one teacher of English from Gujarat were included. At first, they were asked to evaluate two sets of coursebooks: one set is the present one (*English for Today*, 2001 and *English Grammar and Composition*, 2005) and the other one is a set of materials including *Kumar Bharati* (1995) and *English Reader* (1994) from Maharastra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education. They were asked at first to evaluate them without any guideline. Later on, their evaluation reports were analyzed and they were given the earlier version of the checklist. They gave their feedback. Based on both the reports, slight linguistic changes were made and some points were reordered.
Administration Techniques

I gave the checklist to the practicing teachers. The teachers were given one week for returning the checklists with their critical comments and evaluative remarks. Arrangements were made for telephonic communication between the evaluator and the researcher over any issues or difficulties regarding using the checklist.

Process of Analysis and Interpretation

Different techniques were used to interpret the questions. Responses for ‘Yes/No/No Comments’ questions are presented using percentage, data from Likert scale are presented using descriptive statistics, and open-ended questions are analyzed through document analysis where attempts were made to find out broad patterns.

III

Learning Points for Checklist Writers

In the above discussion, I have presented a detailed discussion on the interaction between the theoretical and practical considerations regarding materials evaluation. Certain points from the discussion need to be highlighted for more effective and precise perception.

i. To be able to find out the suitable checklist that will serve my purpose, it was necessary for me to know about the existing evaluation checklists and their theoretical background. Though the existing checklists were not entirely useful for me, they were not unproductive for me either. I could gain some practical knowledge when I observed and examined them critically. I learnt about different formats of the checklist, about different ways of clustering and grouping questions and
statements under different categories, ways of grading and sequencing them, deciding upon the importance of criteria, using various types of questions (e.g. short questions, yes/no questions etc.), and the use of language for the respondents.

Because of the conscious reflection on past knowledge in my checklist, the checklist used in my research, to a significant extent, made a bridge between the legacy and the present context of operation. Containing the historical awareness, a checklist can claim for historical belongingness. My checklist, thus, becomes a part of the history and tradition as it did not happen in isolation.

ii. During developing the evaluation checklist for my research, I came across many checklists or pro formas. Most of them were developed in western contexts while I was going to conduct my research in Bangladesh. For this reason, I had taken into consideration the background of my sample, i.e. the Bangladeshi teachers in rural areas. I had to modify language and often questions keeping their cultural orientation and understanding about research based activities. I piloted the earlier draft of the checklist to incorporate appropriate changes (see the pilot report).

iii. Shave (2010) emphasized trialing of checklists before going for actual evaluation. In addition to Shave (2010), I would like to add that checklists can be trialed and evaluated in the while-evaluation and post-evaluation phases as well. For better results, any evaluation checklist needs to be constantly evaluated in the light of changes happening in the ever-evolving contexts. Cunningsworth developed his first checklist in 1984 and modified it in 1995. It implies that the checklist developer can modify her or his own checklist for effective evaluation.
Limitations and Conclusion

As part of my research, I needed to evaluate the coursebooks taught in classes IX and X. Surprisingly, or rather shockingly, the coursebook package had two different books written in two different ways. One book was written following communicative principles and the other followed structural principles, though the entire curriculum was based on communicative principles. Such unique situation demanded a different kind of evaluation checklist that was not found in literature. Therefore, I had to toil laboriously to develop a checklist for evaluating a structurally written book from communicative perspective as the curriculum, a superior and more inclusive document than the coursebooks, followed communicative principles (see points ranging from 61 to 90 in the checklist appended). The points, being more faithful to the curriculum, consider grammar and composition as process rather than product.

Furthermore, the checklist used in the research was influenced by the rationale and purposes of the research. It was one of the seven tools (Kabir, 2012, p. 172) used in my research. Hence, often the data collected from the checklist complemented the data collected from other tools or vice versa. However, care has been taken so that it can be independently used by other materials evaluators.

Though this checklist might not completely be pertinent for other evaluators later, the discussion presented above from the micro-narrative perspective would surely benefit them offering further insights. Recently, a new version of English for Today (2012), now book I, has been introduced and the approach towards grammar and composition teaching remains almost the same. According to the local contextual requirements, the present evaluators can use this checklist as it is (as the situation remains nearly unchanged), or can adapt by adding and
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deleting elements that they might or might not require. Here I present both the checklist and the micro-narrative account of its construction hoping that they will be useful for evaluating the coursebooks at present and offer a rich insight to the stakeholders.

Author’s Note

This article has been partially extracted from different chapters of my unpublished doctoral research work (Kabir, 2012). I have put writings from those chapters together, and updated them to be able to substantiate my points here. However, neither my thesis nor any part of this article is published anywhere.
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Appendix

*Checklist for Coursebook Evaluation*

Name:……………………………………………………………………………..Age…
……………………Sex………………..School:………………………………
……………………………Experience…………………………………………
Cell:…………………………………………………………………………Date
……………………/…………./20-

[For Book I (English For Today used for English Part I): Please read the preface, content, book map given in the beginning and syllabus and marks distribution given at the end of the book, have a quick glance at any unit or lesson of your own choice, and relate your understanding to your experience of using the course book while responding to the following questions and statements.

For Book II (English Grammar and Composition used for Part II): Please read the preface, content, given in the beginning and sample question paper and notes for teachers/question setters given at the end of the book, have a quick glance at any unit or lesson of your own choice, and relate your understanding to your experience of using the grammar book while answering the following questions and statements.

For answering these questions, have a quick glance at other units/tasks and remember your experience of teaching them.

Please tick on or circle around your choice. 4= very likely, 3=likely, 2=not likely, and 1=not likely at all. If you need to write more, please mention the question no. on the extra pages attached at the back and continue writing.]

For Book I and Book II

Analysis of Physical Aspects

1. All units are of same length     Yes/ No
2. Page quality is suitable for the learners of that age-group     Yes/ No
3. Printing is clear     Yes/ No
4. Pages have enough space at the margins for the learners to take notes     Yes/ No
5. Binding is durable for two years     4 3 2 1
6. Any other comments:

..........................................................................................
For Book I
7. Visual aids e.g. pictures, diagrams, charts, bubbles etc. are clear
   Yes/ No
8. Please look at the pictures from page 100 to page 126 and reply the following questions:
   a. How many men and how many women do you find?----------------------
   b. How many people of the learners’ age (any sex) do you find? ---------
   c. How many of them seem to be from rural and how many, from urban area---
   d. Do they represent any specific religion? If yes, which religion? -------
   e. Do they represent any specific class (e.g. lower class, middle class etc.)? Yes/No
   If yes, which class?------------------

Analysis of linguistic, pedagogical and psychological, content and process aspects
9. Topics can make bridge between the native culture and target culture
   4 3 2 1
10. Topics are relevant to learners
    4 3 2 1
11. Topics are interesting to learners—
    a. linguistically  4 3 2 1
    b. thematically    4 3 2 1
    c. culturally      4 3 2 1
12. The book provides learners with a variety of materials
    (e.g. reading texts, pictures, tasks)
    4 3 2 1
13. The tasks and activities are participatory
    4 3 2 1
14. a. All language skills i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing
    are given equal importance in every unit/lesson
    Yes/No
    b. If the answer is no, write them in order of priority
       1....................  2....................  3....................  4....................
15. Grammar content is integrated with language skills
    4 3 2 1
16. Grammar is presented contextually
    4 3 2 1
17. Vocabulary is presented contextually
    4 3 2 1
18. Vocabulary load is regular in every lesson
    Yes/No
19. Pronunciation is presented in terms of different aspects e.g. stress, intonation, accent (British vs American etc.)
   Yes/No
20. Which variety of English is followed:  a. British  b. American
    c. a mixture of both  d. Bangladeshi variety  e. Others
    (please specify)----------
21. Elements taught and learned can be related to real life situation
   4 3 2 1
22. The book is user-friendly (if it provides easy access to anything one is looking for)  4 3 2 1
23. The book is compatible with learner needs  4 3 2 1
24. The book is designed upon communicative principles (curriculum rationale)  4 3 2 1
25. The book reflects curriculum aims and objectives
   4 3 2 1
26. The book can be completely finished in allocated time (considering class duration, number of classes every week and academic calendar)  4 3 2 1
27. Please comment on the sequence of topics in units and in lessons of a unit. Try to find out the link and principles underlying them. Please write in points: ……………………………………………………
28. Any other comments: ………………………

**Unit Evaluation: (for answering this set of questions, consider all the five lessons of the unit 11)**

29. The lesson objectives are honestly followed in the lesson  4 3 2 1
30. The lesson begins effectively to draw learners’ attention  4 3 2 1
31. The activities are interesting to engage them  4 3 2 1
32. Recapitulation of lessons learnt is practiced at the end of the lesson  4 3 2 1
33. Skills are presented in an integrated manner  4 3 2 1
34. Lessons are flexible for teachers to adapt if necessary  4 3 2 1
35. Objectives are brought down to teachable parts in the lessons  4 3 2 1
36. Lessons repeat what was taught before  4 3 2 1
37. Learners can perform the function(s) taught in the lesson in a real life situation  4 3 2 1
38. The other units share the same characteristics  4 3 2 1
39. Any other comments: ………………………
### Task Evaluation (Please look at three/four tasks of different lessons in the unit)

40. Tasks are learner centered  
41. Tasks are communicative  
42. Tasks are challenging—  
   a. linguistically  
   b. cognitively  
   c. functionally  
43. Tasks are authentic or life-like (e.g. bargaining for price) for learners  
44. Texts used for these tasks are authentic or life-like for learners  
45. Instructions for tasks are clear for learners  
46. Tasks can be administered ensuring the participation of each learner in class time  
47. Tasks provide enough scope for the teacher to give feedback to each learner  
48. Objective(s) is/are fulfilled at the end of the task  
49. Tasks objectives are congruent with curriculum objectives  
50. Other tasks share the same characteristics  
51. Any other comments:  

### Overall Assessment

52. Learners are bored of similar tasks and activities  
53. Tasks in the course book motivate learners to communicate in English  
54. Course book guides teachers to teach language communicatively  
55. They reduce teacher load  
56. The course book emphasizes accuracy  
57. The course book emphasizes fluency  
58. The course book supports learners to learn on their own (e.g. through glossary, teaching how to learn etc.)  
59. For teaching listening skill, auditory aids e.g. CDs, cassettes etc. are used  
60. Any other comments:  

---
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For Book II

Analysis of linguistic, pedagogical and psychological, content and process aspects
Grammar and composition are—
61. -- presented in context  4  3  2  1
62. -- presented with all skills                          4  3  2  1
63. -- presented using audio-visual aids     4  3  2  1
64. -- approached communicatively                  4  3  2  1
65. Grammar and composition is taught through topics 4  3  2  1

Unit Evaluation: Grammar (Unit 7)

66. a. Is the unit interesting?
Yes/No
   b. Why?........................................................................
67. The unit provides with enough scope for practice 4  3  2  1
68. Grammar is connected to real life use
        4  3  2  1
69. The level of grammar is compatible with learners’ level 4  3  2  1
70. The level of grammar is compatible learner needs
        4  3  2  1
71. It enhances – a. internalization through understanding
   b. memorization through rote learning
72. Grammar is presented – a. communicatively  b. structurally  c. Any other approach
73. The exercise is— a. Rule based  b. Meaning based  c. Both
74. On the basis of the sample questions provided, do you think the teaching of grammar matches with the testing of grammar?
   Yes/No
75. Why do you think so?....................................................
76. What do you like about the unit? ............
77. What do you dislike about it? ................
78. Any other comments: .................................

Unit Evaluation: Composition (Unit 4)

79. Describe how composition is taught on the basis of the unit? ...........
80. What do you like about it? ...............................  
81. What do you dislike about it? ............................
82. On the basis of the sample questions provided, do you think the teaching of composition matches with the testing of composition? ...............
83. Why do you think so? …………………
84. Any other comments: ……………………………

**Overall Assessment**

85. The book is self-sufficient for teachers for teaching grammar 4 3 2 1
86. The book is self-sufficient for learners for learning grammar 4 3 2 1
87. The book is self-sufficient for teachers for teaching composition 4 3 2 1
88. The book is self-sufficient for learners for learning composition 4 3 2 1
89. This book is compatible with the curriculum principles. 4 3 2 1
90. Any other comments: ………………….

*Thanks for your participation*