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Abstract
English language course-books are inevitable in English language classes. Teachers often find English language course-books very helpful. The evaluation of English language course-books will make the course-books more effective. This study evaluates 'English for Undergraduates'- a course-book prescribed for English language classes at University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan (UOSJP). The framework of Alan Cunningsworth (1995) is partially adapted to evaluate the book on the criteria of reading skill, writing skill, representation of culture and the organization of its contents. This research study is exploratory, based on survey research design using quantitative method. This study performs post-use evaluation of ‘English for Undergraduates’ using checklist method. Questionnaire based on adapted criteria checklist is used as a data-collecting instrument. Twenty-seven (27) English language teachers of University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan (UOSJP) are the sample of this study. Data obtained is analyzed through SPSS (version 23.0) and interpreted through descriptive statistics technique. The findings of this study reveal that ‘English for Undergraduate’ meets the low degree of evaluation on the criteria of reading, culture and organization; however, criteria of writing skill meets the moderate degree of evaluation.
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1. Introduction
1.1 Background
English language has a growing prestigious status in Pakistan. It has predominantly pervaded overall education system of Pakistan from primary to higher education. Higher Education Commission (HEC) in Pakistan has made English language teaching mandatory in almost all undergraduate disciplines. Following the guidelines of Higher Education Commission (HEC), University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakista (UOSJP) revised English language syllabus and introduced two new course books- ‘English for Undergraduates’ by D. H. Howe, T. A. Kirkpatrick, and D. L. Kirkpatrick and ‘Oxford Practice Grammar’ by John Eastwood in 2006. Since then, these course-books have been used in English language classes in almost all undergraduate degree programmes. There are some research studies done related to English language programme in University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakista (UOSJP), but no independent study is yet to be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the course-books.

English language textbooks are the officially recommended course-books for teaching English. The term textbook and course-book are often used synonymously. According to Sheldon (1987) a ‘textbook’ may be loosely defined as a published book, most often produced for commercial gains whose explicit aim is to assist foreign learners of English in improving their linguistic knowledge and communicative ability.

Course-books are inevitable part of English language teaching especially in the contexts of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Moreover, it is widely believed that course-books provide a great help to the teachers. Course-books usually represent the curriculum and syllabus of English language. They reflect the general policies, approaches and guidelines. Teachers often follow lesson planning from the prescribed course-books. Thus, the outcome of any English language programme predominantly rests upon the effectiveness of the course-books. Without course-books, English language programmes are thought to be incomplete.

As there is a great diversity of the published course-books available for teaching English, it becomes very confusing that which book to choose. If any language programme has its own in-house course-books, it is even essential to weigh their effectiveness in the context of their use. Course-books if used injudiciously without measuring their effectiveness can negatively affect the outcome of English language programme. There is no denying the fact that course-books are to stay in English language programmes, and it seems almost difficult to
replace them. Hence, there is a dire need of the course-book evaluation against the set criteria for making them more effective. If the course-books are inevitable so is their evaluation. This study evaluates ‘English for Undergraduates’ - a course-book used by English language teachers in all English compulsory classes at University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan (UOSJP). The book is evaluated on the criteria of reading skill, writing skill, representation of culture and the organization adapted from the framework of Cunningsworth (1995).

1.2 Research Questions
This research study asks three following questions:

1) How do English language teachers at UOSJP evaluate linguistics aspects, i.e. reading and writing of ‘English for Undergraduates’?
2) How do English language teachers at UOSJP evaluate non-linguistics aspects, i.e. representation of the culture in ‘English for Undergraduates’?
3) How do English language teachers at UOSJP evaluate the organization of ‘English for Undergraduates’?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Textbook

English language textbooks are the officially recommended course-books for English language teaching. The term textbook and course-book are often used synonymous. Merriam Webster (2003) defines textbook as a book used in the study of a subject as one containing a presentation of the principles of a subject or as a literary work relevant to the study of a subject (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/textbook). According to Sheldon (1987) a ‘textbook’ may be loosely defined as a published book, most often produced for commercial gains whose explicit aim is to assist foreign learners of English in improving their linguistic knowledge and communicative ability. English language teaching publishing is a multi-million pound business (Sheldon, 1988). A great number of English language books are sold worldwide. Some textbooks merely grow from or imitate other textbooks and do not admit the winds of change from research methodological experimentation or classroom feedback (Sheldon, 1988). Institutions often prescribe course-books without much consideration of their relevance to the teaching-learning situation. Course-books written by native authors and published by well-reputable publishers are mostly preferred. Teachers are mostly supposed to deliver what is suggested by the course-books without bringing any amendments.

Textbooks are mostly considered an important element in English language teaching. Hutchinson (1994) rejects anti-textbook position as narrow and unsupported. McDonough & Shaw (2013) consider materials as the core of a particular programme and the most visible representation of what happens in the classroom. Grant (1987) opines that it is difficult to teach systematically without a textbook. Learners see the textbook as a ‘framework’ or ‘guide’ (Hutchinson, 1994). Course-books are perceived by many to be the route map of any ELT programme (Sheldon, 1988). Hutchinson (1994) stated that English language course-books are almost universal element of teaching, and no teaching-learning situation, it seems, is complete until it has its relevant textbook. They provide sense of security and confidence and are good value for money (O’Neil 1982). They are useful source (Ahour et al., 2014) and most important component after the teachers (Davison, 1975 as cited in Ahour et al., 2014). They are route map for both teachers and learners (Tomlinson, 2010) and more effective than teachers’ prepared materials (O’Neil 1982). Textbooks are the visible heart of any ELT programme, more credible than teachers’ designed material and helpful for controlling large classes (Sheldon, 1988). A textbook can serve different purposes for teachers: as a core resource, as a source of supplemental material, as an inspiration for classroom activities, even as the curriculum itself (Garinger, D. 2002).

The research into the English Language textbooks situation in Pakistan has been by and large scanty and insubstantial (ASMA AFTAB, 2011). From writing, publishing and selecting the textbooks, almost no substantial research is undertaken in Pakistan. Most of the teaching material is written by native writers and published by foreign publishers who are ignorant of the needs of the learners and unaware of the teaching-learning situations. Textbooks related to higher education are published and marketed by private sector publishers or concerned universities (Mahmood & Iqbal, 2009).

2.2 Textbook evaluation

Textbook evaluation measures the effectiveness of the book. It is an under-researched area (Mohammadi & Abdi, 2014) and has received a belated recognition among applied linguists as an independent field (ASMA AFTAB, 2011). In past, it was treated as part of methodology (Tomlinson, 2003). Cunningsworth (1984) with his views on course-book evaluation and selection laid the foundations of this emerging field. McDonough and Shaw (2003) have called for serious consideration in textbook evaluation. Material evaluation is a complex matter (Cunningsworth, 1995) as innumerable implicit and explicit factors are involved. It involves not only assembling information but also interpreting that information for making value judgments (Nunan, 1992). Material evaluation is a procedure that involves measuring the value (or potential value) of a set of learning materials (McDonough &
Shaw, 2013). Hutchinson and Waters (1993) define evaluation as a “matter of judging the fitness of something for a particular purpose”. Textbook evaluation reveals the strength and weakness of a particular textbook for future adaptation by textbook writers, teachers and administrators (Litz, 2002). It is required to select locally and culturally appropriate textbook (Ahour et al., 2014). Sheldon (1988) stated that textbook evaluation enables the managerial and teaching staff of a specific institution or organization to discriminate between all of the available textbooks in the market. It is useful for teachers’ development (Cunningsworth, 1995). It is an important professional activity for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers (McDonough & Shaw, 2013).

2.3 Criteria for Textbook Evaluation
Criteria are defined as a set of items against which a textbook is evaluated. Tomlinson (1394) states that there is no definite criteria operative in English language teaching contexts worldwide. Sheldon (1988) has also stated that there is no definite yardstick for textbook evaluation. McDonough and Shaw (1993) contend that textbook evaluation cannot involve a universal touchstone, implying that the factors which are relevant in one educational situation may not apply in another context.

2.4 Review of the criteria undertaken in this research studies
This research study undertakes the criteria of reading skill, writing skill, representation of culture and the organization of ‘English for Undergraduates’.

2.4.1 Reading Skill
Textbooks are often evaluated on the criteria of reading as reading is one of the most desired skills among second language learners. From a language acquisition point of view, reading can be a major source of comprehensible input (Krashen, 2004) especially in countries where English is rarely used outside the classroom (McDonough & Shaw, 2013). The researchers and linguists have emphasized on the different characteristics of reading texts in textbooks for improving reading skills among the learners. Williams (1994) has classified reading texts into (1) getting general information from a text, (2) getting specific information from a text, and (3) for pleasure or for interest (as cited in McDonough & Shaw, 2013). Iwai (2007) emphasized on the authentic text for improving reading skills of the learners as authentic texts are more motivating and engaging. McDonough & Shaw (2013) stated that so-called traditional reading materials do not provide learners with useful texts or effective strategies to improve their reading abilities. Davies (1995) advised teachers to choosing reading passages that provide learners with a way of questioning and interacting with the text. Masuhara, (2003) has suggested that the reading texts should be “useful, interesting, engaging, involving, important and relevant to the students’ needs. Alderson (2000) has suggested that reading activities should involve responses similar to real life reading tasks as far as possible. Cunningsworth (1995) suggested that teachers should check if reading passages in the course-book are authentic and they can help improving grammar and vocabulary. Nunan (1999) considers identifying the linguistic elements i.e. grammatical items, lexis and discourse as one of the essential steps involved in designing reading courses. He also suggested ensuring the integration of reading skill with other skills in the book.

2.4.2 Writing Skill
Improving writing skill is one of the targeted goals of English language course-books for second language learners. There are different characteristics of writing skill’s tasks and activities emphasized in course-books. Pincas (1962) stated that writing tasks should emphasize on the accuracy (as cited in ASMA AFTAB, 2011). Cunningsworth (1995) pointed out that course-books normally have controlled and guided writing activities. Raimes (1983) and Zamel (1983) suggested that writing skill should follow productive composing process. Cunningsworth (1995) has stated that writing activities should be appropriate to the level and aim of the learners.

2.4.3 Cultural Representation
English language course-books are often blamed to propagate cultural biases. It is almost difficult to separate culture from language for its effective teaching. Prodomou (1988) and Alptekin (1993) stated that it is not really possible to teach a language without embedding it in its cultural base. Pulverness (2003) has stated that culture cannot be separated from language, and textbooks spread cultural awareness. Some linguists and researchers have suggested for incorporating the cultural values of the learners so that they can find the course-books relevant and interesting. Cunningsworth (1984), Phillipson (1992), Dat (2003) are in favour of the cultural compatibility of course-books with the learners. Cunningsworth (1984) has assumed that second/foreign language learners should be kept away from the unfamiliar target culture and be mainly exposed to their own culture in the target language class. Dat (2003) has also pointed out that some activities in course-books are not effective due to the representation of foreign culture. ASMA AFTAB (2011) has stated that many educators have feared that raising native culture posed threats to the cultural identity of the learners. Phillipson (1992) is also wary of the complex relationship between language textbooks and the target language culture but he sees the promotion of ‘Western’ (British) global textbooks as government-backed enterprises with both an economic as well as an ideological agenda. Contrary to the proponents of the cultural representation of the learners in textbooks, some linguists like McGrath (2002) and Pulverness (2003) have challenged the assumption of incorporating non-native culture in course-books. They
suggested the integration of both native and non-native cultures.

2.4.4 Organization
The organization of the course-book means the presentation of language items and activities in it (Litz, 2002). It states how details of the activities are arranged and mentioned in the introductory content table to help learners to locate activities. Learners can move to different activities within units and across the activities if the organization of the course-book is effective. Organization of additional items or activities such as vocabulary lists, glossaries and references are also helpful to learners. It saves time and energy of the learners to find the activities that they intend to work on.

4. Research Methodology
This research study uses quantitative research paradigm. Research paradigms are the theoretical and philosophical framework of any research. There is often crossover from method to paradigm (Hashemi, 2012). Quantitative research paradigm studies a phenomenon objectively through the opinions of others. This research study undertakes to evaluate ‘English for Undergraduate’ through the opinions of teachers. The quantitative methodology is suitable for this research study because it uses survey research design.

4.1 Framework
This research study adapts the framework of Alan Cunningsworth (1995) for the evaluation of ‘English for Undergraduates’. The framework of Alan Cunningsworth (1995) is found to be appropriate to the context of the study. Cunningsworth (1995) has comprehensively suggested the detailed checklists for the evaluation of English language course-books on multiple criteria. This research study has adapted four criteria i.e. reading skill and writing skill, representation of culture and the organization of the course-book.

4.2 Material
‘English for Undergraduates’ by D.H. Howe, T.A. Kirkpatrick & D.L. Kirkpatrick, published by Oxford University Press, 2006, prescribed by University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan (UOSJP) for undergraduate students is the material for evaluation in this research study.

4.2 Sample
English language teachers at University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan (UOSJP) are the targeted population of this research study. Twenty-seven (27) teachers are sampled through snowball sampling technique.

4.3 Data Collecting Instrument
Questionnaire is used as a data collecting instrument in this research study. Cunningsworth’s checklist items related to the criteria of reading skill, writing skill, representation of culture and organization are converted into questionnaire. Questionnaire consists of thirty six (36) closed-ended items. A five-point Likert scale is used to rate the items.

4.4 Data Analysis
Quantitative data obtained through questionnaire are analyzed through Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS-23.0 version). Data is interpreted through descriptive statistics. Mean and standard deviation of the data is performed. The degrees of evaluation suggested by Islam, M.M. (2013) are assigned to the undertaken criteria according to the percentage of the positive responses. Following degrees of evaluation suggested by Islam, M.M. (2013) are applied to infer the conclusions:

- (90 %) and more is an excellent degree of evaluation.
- (80-89.9%) is a good degree of evaluation.
- (70 - 79.9 %) is a moderate degree of evaluation.
- (60 - 69.9 %) is a low degree of evaluation.
- (Less than 60 %) is a very low degree of evaluation.

5. Results and Discussion
The results of this research study are based on the perceptions of the English language teachers at University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan (UOSJP) about four criteria i.e. reading, writing, culture and organization in ‘English for Undergraduates’.
5.1 Demographics of the Sample

- Size of the Sample: Twenty seven (27)

Table 1. Gender of the Sample

| Gender | Frequency | Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|
| Males  | 16        | 59.3    |
| Females| 11        | 40.7    |

Table 2. Teaching experience of the sample

| Teaching Experience | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1-5 Years           | 13        | 48.1    |
| 6-10 Years          | 5         | 18.5    |
| 11-15 Years         | 4         | 14.8    |
| more than 15 Years  | 5         | 18.5    |

Table 3. Qualification of the sample

| Qualification               | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|
| BS/M.A/equivalent to 16 years| 17        | 63.0    |
| MS/MPhil/equivalent to 18 years| 5         | 18.5    |
| PhD                         | 5         | 18.5    |
| Total                       | 27        | 100.0   |

5.1 Criteria of Reading Skill

Table 4: Means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages and degrees of evaluation of the criteria of reading skill

| Items | *SD | *D | *N | *A | *SA | Means | Standard deviation | Degree of evaluation |
|-------|-----|----|----|----|-----|-------|-------------------|----------------------|
|       | **N/%| **N/%| **N/%| **N/%| **N/%|       |                   |                      |
| 1     | 1/(3.7%) | 2/(7.4%) | 0/(0%) | 19/(70.4%) | 5/(18.5%) | 3.9 | .91 | Good |
| 2     | 1/(3.7%) | 3/(11.1%) | 2/(7.4%) | 20/(74.1%) | 1/(3.7%) | 3.6 | .88 | Moderate |
| 3     | 0/(0%) | 3/(11.1%) | 4/(14.8%) | 14/(51.9%) | 6/(22.1%) | 3.8 | .90 | Moderate |
| 4     | 0/(0%) | 7/(25.9%) | 9/(33.3%) | 4/(14.8%) | 7/(25.9%) | 3.4 | 1.15 | Very Low |
| 5     | 1/(3.7%) | 1/(3.7%) | 1/(3.7%) | 16/(59.3%) | 8/(29.6%) | 4.0 | .91 | Good |
| 6     | 0/(0%) | 12/(44.4%) | 3/(11.1%) | 8/(29.6%) | 4/(14.8%) | 3.1 | 1.14 | Very Low |
| 7     | 0/(0%) | 7/(25.9%) | 2/(7.4%) | 15/(55.6%) | 3/ (11.1%) | 3.5 | 1.01 | Low |
| 8     | 0/(0%) | 5/(18.5%) | 7/(25.9%) | 13/(48.1%) | 2/(7.4%) | 3.4 | .89 | Very Low |
| 9     | 0/(0%) | 2/(7.4%) | 6/(22.1%) | 16/(59.3%) | 3/(11.1%) | 3.7 | .76 | Moderate |
| 10    | 0/(0%) | 3/(11.1%) | 4/(14.8%) | 16/(59.3%) | 4/(14.8%) | 3.7 | .84 | Moderate |
| 11    | 1/(3.7%) | 2/(7.4%) | 4/(14.8%) | 15/(55.6%) | 5/(18.5%) | 3.7 | .97 | Moderate |
| 12    | 0/(0%) | 2/(7.4%) | 7/(25.9%) | 16/(59.3%) | 2/(7.4%) | 3.6 | .73 | Low |
| 13    | 0/(0%) | 6/(22.1%) | 4/(14.8%) | 14/(51.9%) | 3/(11.1%) | 3.5 | .97 | Low |

*SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; N: Neutral; A: agree; SA: Strongly agree

Table 4 indicates the means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages and degrees of evaluation of the reading skill checklist items. Item 1: “Reading text in 'English for Undergraduates' is used for introducing new language items (grammar and vocabulary)” and Item 5: “English for Undergraduates' includes a great variety of reading texts from different genres” have received ‘good’ degree of evaluation. Item 2: “Reading material in ‘English for Undergraduates’ is linked to other skills work”; Item 3: “English for Undergraduates' emphasises on reading for pleasure”; Item 9: “The subject matter of reading texts in 'English for Undergraduates' is appropriate to the linguistic level of the learners”; Item 10: “The subject matter of reading texts in 'English for Undergraduates' is interesting”, and Item 11: “Reading material in 'English for Undergraduates' helps comprehension by giving pre-reading questions” have received ‘moderate’ degree of evaluation. Item 7: “Reading texts in 'English for Undergraduates' encourage intensiveness reading”; Item 12: “Literal (surface) reading comprehension questions are asked in 'English for Undergraduates'”, and Item 13: “Discourse-processing reading comprehension questions are asked in 'English for Undergraduates'” have received ‘Low’ degree of evaluation. Item 4: “English for Undergraduates' emphasises on reading for intellectual satisfaction”; Item 6: “English for Undergraduates' includes long reading texts”, and Item 8: “Reading texts in 'English for Undergraduates' are authentic” have received ‘very low’ degree of evaluation. Overall, the criteria of reading skill has received ‘low’ degree of evaluation and 68.08% of the respondents have either responded as agree or strongly agree that ‘English for Undergraduates’ represent reading skill adequately.
5.2 Criteria of Writing Skill

Table 5: Means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages and degrees of evaluation of the criteria of writing skill

| Item | *SD | *D | *N | *A | *SA | Means | Standard deviation | Degree of evaluation |
|------|-----|----|----|----|-----|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 14   | 0/(0%) | 1/(3.7%) | 5/(18.5%) | 19/(70.3%) | 2/(7.4%) | 3.8 | .62 | Moderate |
| 15   | 1/(3.7%) | 12/(44.4%) | 5/(18.5%) | 6/(22.2%) | 3/(11.1%) | 2.9 | 1.14 | Very Low |
| 16   | 1/(3.7%) | 1/(3.7%) | 6/(22.2%) | 18/(66.6%) | 1/(3.7%) | 3.6 | .79 | Moderate |
| 17   | 0/(0%) | 2/(7.4%) | 2/(7.4%) | 14/(51.8%) | 9/(33.3%) | 4.1 | .84 | Moderate |
| 18   | 1/(3.7%) | 3/(11.1%) | 0/(0%) | 17/(62.9%) | 6/(22.2%) | 3.8 | 1.0 | Moderate |
| 19   | 0/(0%) | 4/(14.8%) | 4/(14.8%) | 14/(51.8%) | 5/(18.5%) | 3.7 | .94 | Moderate |
| 20   | 0/(0%) | 6/(22.2%) | 4/(14.8%) | 9/(33.3%) | 8/(29.6%) | 3.7 | 1.13 | Low |
| 21   | 0/(0%) | 5/(18.5%) | 4/(14.8%) | 8/(29.6%) | 10/(37.0%) | 3.8 | 1.13 | Low |
| 22   | 1/(3.7%) | 2/(7.4%) | 3/(11.1%) | 18/(66.6%) | 3/(11.1%) | 3.7 | .90 | Moderate |

*SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; N: Neutral; A: agree; SA: Strongly agree
**N: Number of respondents

Table 5 indicates the means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages and degrees of evaluation of the writing skill checklist items. Item 14: “Writing material in 'English for Undergraduates' handles controlled writing”; Item 16: “Writing tasks in 'English for Undergraduates' progress appropriately”; Item 17: “'English for Undergraduates' includes a great variety of writing tasks”; Item 18: “'English for Undergraduates' teaches paragraph writing adequately”; Item 19: “'English for Undergraduates' emphasises on punctuation”, and Item 22: “Writing activities in 'English for Undergraduates' encourage learners to review and edit their written work” have received ‘moderate’ degree of evaluation. Item 20: “'English for Undergraduates' emphasises on spelling”, and Item 21: “English for Undergraduates' emphasises on accuracy” have received ‘low’ degree of evaluation. Item 15: “Writing material in 'English for Undergraduates' handles free writing” has received ‘very low’ degree of evaluation. Overall, the criteria of writing skill has received ‘moderate’ degree of evaluation and 70.09% of the respondents have either responded as agree or strongly agree that 'English for Undergraduates' represent writing skill adequately.

5.3 Criteria of Culture

Table 6: Means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages and degrees of evaluation of the criteria of culture

| Items | *SD | *D | *N | *A | *SA | Means | Standard deviation | Degree of evaluation |
|-------|-----|----|----|----|-----|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 23    | 1/(3.7%) | 4/(14.8%) | 2/(7.4%) | 15/(55.5%) | 5/(18.5%) | 3.7 | 1.06 | Moderate |
| 24    | 0/(0%) | 3/(11.1%) | 4/(14.8%) | 15/(55.5%) | 5/(18.5%) | 3.8 | .87 | Moderate |
| 25    | 0/(0%) | 7/(25.9%) | 9/(33.3%) | 9/(33.3%) | 2/(7.4%) | 3.2 | .93 | Very Low |
| 26    | 0/(0%) | 7/(25.9%) | 6/(22.2%) | 10/(37.0%) | 4/(14.8%) | 3.4 | 1.04 | Very Low |
| 27    | 1/(3.7%) | 9/(33.3%) | 3/(11.1%) | 12/(44.4%) | 2/(7.4%) | 3.1 | 1.11 | Very Low |
| 28    | 0/(0%) | 2/(7.4%) | 3/(11.1%) | 18/(66.6%) | 4/(14.8%) | 3.8 | .75 | Good |

*SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; N: Neutral; A: agree; SA: Strongly agree
**N: Number of respondents

Table 6 indicates the means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages and degrees of evaluation of the representation of culture checklist items. Item 28: “Social relationships in 'English for Undergraduates' are portrayed realistically” receives ‘good’ degree of evaluation. Item 23: “Social and cultural contexts in 'English for Undergraduates' are comprehensible to the learners” and Item 24: “Learners can interpret the relationships, behaviour, intentions, etc of the characters portrayed in 'English for Undergraduates'” have received ‘moderate’ degree of evaluation. Item 25: “Women are given equal prominence to men in all aspects of the 'English for Undergraduates'”, Item 26: “Appropriate physical and character attributes of women are given in 'English for Undergraduates'”, and Item 27: “Women are shown as occupying appropriate professional and social positions in 'English for Undergraduates'” receive ‘very low’ degree of evaluation. Overall, the criteria of culture has received ‘low’ degree of evaluation and 62.3 % of the respondents have either responded as agree or strongly agree that ‘English for Undergraduates’ represent culture adequately.
5.4 Criteria of Organization

Table 7: Means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages and degrees of evaluation of Organization

| Le | *SD | *D | *N | *A | *SA | Means | Standard deviation | Degree of evaluation |
|----|-----|----|----|----|-----|-------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 29 | 0/(0%) | 5/(18.5%) | 19/(70.3%) | 0/(0%) | 3.5 | .80 | Moderate |
| 30 | 0/(0%) | 4/(14.8%) | 17/(62.9%) | 1/(3.7%) | 3.5 | .80 | Low |
| 31 | 0/(0%) | 6/(22.2%) | 15/(55.5%) | 3/(11.1%) | 3.4 | .88 | Very Low |
| 32 | 0/(0%) | 6/(22.2%) | 15/(55.5%) | 3/(11.1%) | 3.5 | .97 | Low |
| 33 | 0/(0%) | 7/(25.9%) | 11/(40.7%) | 3/(11.1%) | 3.3 | 1.00 | Very Low |
| 34 | 1/(3.7%) | 8/(29.6%) | 13/(48.1%) | 2/(7.4%) | 3.2 | 1.09 | Very Low |
| 35 | 0/(0%) | 6/(22.2%) | 13/(48.1%) | 5/(18.5%) | 3.6 | 1.04 | Low |
| 36 | 1/(3.7%) | 6/(22.2%) | 13/(48.1%) | 6/(22.2%) | 3.6 | 1.18 | Moderate |

*SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; N: Neutral; A: agree; SA: Strongly agree

**N: Number of respondents

Table 7 indicates the means, standard deviations, frequencies, percentages and degrees of evaluation of the organization checklist items. Item 29: “English for Undergraduates' maintains continuity in the materials” and Item 36: “English for Undergraduates' includes a key to exercises” receive ‘moderate’ degree of evaluation. Item 30: “English for Undergraduates' uses techniques for recycling and reinforcement of learning”; Item 32: “English for Undergraduates' consists of different predetermined routes or alternatives/optional routes to take through the material”, and Item 35: “English for Undergraduates' includes a list of vocabulary” receive ‘low’ degree of evaluation. Item 31: “Earlier learning is developed or refined in later sections of the material in 'English for Undergraduates'; Item 33: “English for Undergraduates' consists of reference sections”, and Item 34: “English for Undergraduates' includes an index of language items” receive ‘very low degree of evaluation. Overall, the criteria of culture has received ‘low’ degree of evaluation and 63.42% of the respondents have either responded as agree or strongly agree that ‘English for Undergraduates' represent organization adequately.

6. Conclusion

The findings of this research study reveal that criteria of writing skill receive ‘moderate’ degree of evaluation; however, the criteria of reading skill, representation of culture and organization receive ‘low’ degree of evaluation in ‘English for Undergraduates’. 68.08% of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that ‘English for Undergraduates' represent reading skill adequately. Findings reveal that aspects of ‘intellectual growth’ and the authenticity are found to be less satisfactory and receive ‘very low’ degree of evaluation. Cunningsworth (1995) has stated that authentic material brings realism and relevance and can increase learners’ motivation. Tomlinson (2008) has also pointed out that de-contextualized texts hinder language acquisition. Thus, the book needs to be revised in relation to the aspect of intellectual growth and the authenticity in reading texts and activities.

70.09% of the participants have either agreed or strongly agreed that ‘English for Undergraduates' represent writing skill adequately. Findings reveal that aspect of ‘handling of free writing’ is found to be less satisfactory and receive ‘very low’ degree of evaluation. Free writing activities encourage learners to generate ideas and make connections. Warren (2009), stated that, textbooks can help a lot in creative writing, essay writing, constructive analysis writing etc. because learners can get idea about their writing topic from textbook, moreover they can bring literature in writing with the help of textbook.

62.3 % of the participants have either agreed or strongly agreed that ‘English for Undergraduates' represent culture adequately. The findings reveal that the book does not give equal prominence to women. Women are portrayed as occupying inappropriate professional and social positions, and they are not given appropriate physical and character attributes. Thus, the book posses gender biases against women that need to be amended.

63.42% of the participants have either agreed or strongly agreed that ‘English for Undergraduates’ organize its contents adequately. The findings reveal that the book does not include the index of language items adequately. The book does not refine or develop the early learning in later sections. The missing aspects of organization need to be amended.

‘English for Undergraduates’ a course-book introduced in 2006 for English language classes at University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan (UOSJP) need to be revised as per the policy of Higher Education Commission (HEC) that recommends the revision of English language courses after every three years. The checklist items that are found to be inadequate need to be amended for making the course-book more effective.
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Appendix 1: Questionnaire
Evaluation of 'English for Undergraduates'

Demographics

- Gender:
  - Male
  - Female

- Teaching experience:
  - 1-5 years
  - 6-10 years
  - 11-15 years
  - more than 15 years

- Qualification:
  - BS/M.A/equivalent to 16 years
  - MS/MPhil/equivalent to 18 years
  - PhD

A. Reading Skill

1. Reading text in ‘English for Undergraduates’ is used for introducing new language items (grammar and vocabulary).
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

2. Reading material in 'English for Undergraduates' is linked to other skills work.
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

3. 'English for Undergraduates’ emphasises on reading for pleasure.
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

4. 'English for Undergraduates’ emphasises on reading for intellectual satisfaction.
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

5. 'English for Undergraduates’ includes a great variety of reading texts from different genres.
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

6. 'English for Undergraduates’ includes long reading texts.
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

7. Reading texts in ‘English for Undergraduates’ encourage intensiveness reading.
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

8. Reading texts in ‘English for Undergraduates’ are authentic.
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

9. The subject matter of reading texts in ‘English for Undergraduates’ is appropriate to the linguistic level of the learners.
   | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

10. The subject matter of reading texts in ‘English for Undergraduates’ is interesting.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

11. Reading material in ‘English for Undergraduates’ helps comprehension by giving pre-reading questions.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

12. Literal (surface) reading comprehension questions are asked in ‘English for Undergraduates’.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

13. Discourse-processing reading comprehension questions are asked in ‘English for Undergraduates’.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

B. Writing Skill

14. Writing material in ‘English for Undergraduates’ handles controlled writing.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

15. Writing material in ‘English for Undergraduates’ handles free writing.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

16. Writing tasks in ‘English for Undergraduates’ progress appropriately.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

17. ‘English for Undergraduates’ includes a great variety of writing tasks.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

18. ‘English for Undergraduates’ teaches paragraph writing adequately.
    | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

19. ‘English for Undergraduates’ emphasises on punctuation.
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ emphasises on spelling. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 21. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ emphasises on accuracy. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 22. | Writing activities in ‘English for Undergraduates’ encourage learners to review and edit their written work. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

**C. Cultural representation**

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23. | Social and cultural contexts in ‘English for Undergraduates’ are comprehensible to the learners. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 24. | Learners can interpret the relationships, behaviour, intentions, etc of the characters portrayed in ‘English for Undergraduates’. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 25. | Women are given equal prominence to men in all aspects of the ‘English for Undergraduates’. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 26. | Appropriate physical and character attributes of women are given in ‘English for Undergraduates’. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 27. | Women are shown as occupying appropriate professional and social positions in ‘English for Undergraduates’. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 28. | Social relationships in ‘English for Undergraduates’ are portrayed realistically. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

**D. Organization**

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ maintains continuity in the materials. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 30. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ uses techniques for recycling and reinforcement of learning. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 31. | Earlier learning is developed or refined in later sections of the material in ‘English for Undergraduates’. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 32. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ consists of different predetermined route or alternatives/optimal routes to take through the material. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 33. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ consists of reference sections. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 34. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ includes an index of language items. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 35. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ includes a list of vocabulary. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |
| 36. | ‘English for Undergraduates’ includes a key to exercises. | 1 SD | 2 D | 3 N | 4 A | 5 SA |

*SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; N: Neutral; A: agree; SA: Strongly agree*