



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**A COMPOSITE FRAMEWORK FOR ESL TEXTBOOK EVALUATION**

**JAYAKARAN MUKUNDAN**

**FBMK 2004 6**

**Disertai CD-ROM / disket yang boleh diperolehi  
di Bahagian Media dan Arkib  
(*Accompanying CD-ROM / disk available  
at the Media and Archives Division*)**

**A COMPOSITE FRAMEWORK FOR ESL TEXTBOOK EVALUATION**

**JAYAKARAN MUKUNDAN**

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in  
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

April 2004



*Dedicated to my family who were with me all through this long and eventful journey*



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of  
the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**A COMPOSITE FRAMEWORK FOR ESL TEXTBOOK EVALUATION**

**By**

**JAYAKARAN MUKUNDAN**

**April 2004**

**Chairperson: Associate Professor Shameem Rafik-Galea**

**Faculty: Modern Languages and Communication**

Textbook evaluation practices have not been critically examined to determine effectiveness and value in learning-teaching environments and this is probably the main reason why the literature suggests that textbooks selected have been more of a hindrance than a benefit to teaching. The assumption made by the researcher is that since much of the criticism in selection processes of textbooks is directed towards the checklist, which at this moment seems to be the only instrument used in textbook evaluation practices, then there would be a need to re-evaluate the usefulness of the checklist, identify weak areas and then develop a composite framework where the checklist will be supported by complementary instruments, namely the concordance software and the reflective journal.

The researcher suggests a 4-phase procedure in the development of the composite framework. Phase 1 tests the Skierso Evaluation Checklist (SEC) for reliability and item difficulty. Phase 2 tests the capabilities of the concordance software (WordSmith Tools 3.0) to provide analysis of the patterns of presentation of vocabulary and structures in textbooks, to determine the extent to which the software will help discriminate between books in a selection process and to determine to what extent the analysis would provide greater illustration to responses required of by items in Section D of the SEC. Phase 3 tests the capabilities of the reflective journal in providing greater illustration to responses to items in Section E (Exercises and Activities) of the SEC. Finally, in Phase 4 the researcher will assemble aspects of the two complementary components into a framework which has the checklist as its main instrument. This framework will then be tested for reliability and item difficulty.

In Phase 1, the findings revealed that while the overall reliability of the SEC was high, the difficulty analysis of items showed Section D and E of the checklist as having the largest number of difficult items. Phase 2 of the study found that the concordance software is capable of many useful functions in textbook evaluation and is able to provide greater illustration, through computation, to 6 items in Section D of the SEC. Phase 3 of the investigation revealed that teachers' reflections contributed to input that was beneficial to evaluation, especially the items in Section E of the SEC.

The composite framework was assembled and tested in Phase 4. It was then compared to the mono-instrument procedure (Phase 1) which consisted of the checklist (SEC).

The comparison of the two procedures showed the composite framework to be more reliable at 0.9324 reliability as compared to 0.7675 reliability for the SEC as a standalone instrument. The difficulty analysis of items also showed marked improvement when comparisons were made. Only 4 items were considered difficult within the composite framework as opposed to 14 when the SEC was tested as a standalone.

This study has provided an alternative to the checklist dominated procedure by proposing a framework which works on the combined effort of 3 distinct instruments, thus providing for much needed triangulation which is actually expected in an exercise as complex as textbook evaluation. The spin-offs to this research are the added value it provides by way of increased awareness of action research in textbook evaluation, to greater emphasis and attention to retrospective evaluation and adaptation. It has also led to the creation of the first Malaysian Corpus of the Language of Textbooks which has approximately 150,000 words. This corpus will expand when it accommodates the language of more textbooks within the school system.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

## **RANGKAKERJA KOMPOSIT BAGI PENILAIAN BUKU TEKS ESL**

**Oleh**

**JAYAKARAN MUKUNDAN**

**April 2004**

**Pengerusi:   Profesor Madya Shameem Rafik-Galea**

**Fakulti:     Bahasa Moden dan Komunikasi**

Amalan penilaian buku teks tidak dinilai secara kritis untuk menentukan keberkesanan dan nilai dalam situasi pembelajaran-pengajaran dan ini mungkin sebab utama mengapa bahan rujukan mengenai buku teks banyak menyebut bahawa buku teks lebih menjadi penghalang dan pembawa krisis daripada membawa faedah dalam pengajaran. Oleh kerana kebanyakan kritikan terhadap proses pemilihan buku ditujukan kepada senarairujuk (checklist) akibat daripada menjadi instrument menilai buku teks yang tunggal, maka perlulah ada usaha kearah menilai semula keberkesanan senarairujuk, mengesan bahagian lemah dan seterusnya membentuk kerangka komposit (*composite framework*) dimana senarairujuk dibantu oleh instrument sampingan ia itu perisian konkordans (*concordance software*) dan jurnal refleksi (*reflective journal*).

Penyelidik mencadangkan prosedur 4 fasa dalam pembentukan kerangka komposit. Fasa 1 akan menguji senarairujuk Penilaian Skierso (*Skierso Evaluation Checklist – SEC*) dari segi kebolehpercayaan dan kesukaran item (*item difficulty*). Fasa 2 akan menguji kebolehan perisian konkordans (*WordSmith Tools 3.0*) untuk menganalisa corak persembahan vokabulari dan struktur dalam buku teks untuk menentukan sejauh mana perisian ini boleh mendiskriminasi antara buku dalam proses penilaian dan juga untuk menentukan sejauh mana analisis dengan menggunakan perisian boleh memberi gambaran yang lebih mendalam pada respons yang diperlukan oleh item dalam Bahagian D di *SEC*.

Fasa 3 menguji kebolehan jurnal refleksi dalam keupayaan memberi gambaran lebih jelas kepada respon yang perlu dibuat oleh penilai bagi item dibahagian E ia itu Latihan dan aktiviti (*Exercises and Activities*). Akhir sekali, di Fasa 4 penyelidik akan mengumpul aspek dari dua komponen (Perisian dan Jurnal) dan membina kerangka komposit bersama-sama instrument utama, ia itu senarairujuk *SEC*. Kerangka yang dibentuk itu akan diuji dari segi kebolehpercayaan dan kesukaran item.

Di Fasa 1, dapatan menunjukkan bahawa kebolehpercayaan keseluruhan *SEC* adalah tinggi tetapi analisis kesukaran item pula menunjukkan bahawa Bahagian D dan E senarairujuk mempunyai item sukar yang terbanyak. Fasa 2 kajian mendapati bahawa perisian konkordans boleh melakukan banyak fungsi dan berupaya memberi gambaran yang lebih jelas melalui komputasi pada 6 item di Bahagian D *SEC*. Fasa 3



menunjukkan bahawa refleksi menyumbangkan input yang berguna kepada penilaian terutamanya bagi Bahagian E *SEC*.

Kerangka komposit dibina dan diuji di Fasa 4 dan perbandingan dibuat antara kerangka komposit dan prosedur instrument mono (Fasa 1) yang hanya melibatkan penggunaan *SEC*. Hasil perbandingan menunjukkan bahawa kerangka komposit lebih tinggi kebolehpercayaannya dengan 0.9324 kebolehpercayaan berbanding dengan 0.7675 kebolehpercayaan bagi *SEC* semasa bersendirian. Perbandingan analisis kesukaran item juga menunjukkan peningkatan. Hanya 4 item masih sukar dalam kerangka komposit berbanding dengan 14 item di ujian Fasa 1 di mana *SEC* bersendirian.

Hasil kajian ini menawarkan alternative bagi prosedur penilaian yang sehingga ini dikuasai oleh senarairujuk. Kerangka komposit menggabungkan 3 instrumen dan menyumbangkan kepada triangulasi.

Hasil sampingan kajian ini ialah keupayaannya memberi penekanan kepada penilaian retrospektif dan adaptasi. Kajian ini juga membentuk Korpus (Corpus) bagi Bahasa Buku Teks ESL di Malaysia yang mengandungi lebih kurang 150,000 perkataan. Korpus ini merupakan yang pertama dihasilkan diMalaysia.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The head of my supervisory committee Assoc. Prof. Dr. Shameem Rafik Galea has been of immense inspiration to this research. I was fortunate to have found someone who shares the same interest in materials. Her guidance throughout this study was extremely helpful. The other members of the committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Chan Swee Heng and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rosli Talif provided a lot of support. I am extremely grateful to all three supervisors.

I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. Abdul Rahman Aroff and Prof. Dr. Othman Dato Hj. Mohamed for initially providing me the guidance in the research. Their enormous contributions in guiding me in the design of this research is much appreciated. I am also thankful to Hj. Azali Mahbar for providing me support and inspiration in this research. My Dean, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zakaria Kasa, and my Head of Department, Dr. Arshad Abdul Samad constantly encouraged me. I am grateful to both of them.

I benefited a lot from the experiences of organizing the Malaysia International Conference on English Language Teaching (MICELT). It was at these conferences (from 1996 – 2004) where I had the chance to network and get assistance from people like Prof. Alan Maley and Prof. Brian Tomlinson, who shared the same interests in Materials and Textbook Evaluation and constantly updated me on the latest literature on materials. I am extremely grateful for their support. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rob Waring was immensely helpful. I had entire theses written on materials sent to me via email! The

publishers were also helpful. John Lowe, Ian Martin and Wong Mei Mei provided so many of the books that I needed for reference in this research.

My good friend Michael Chee has been of great help. He provided me access to facilities in his office. I am also grateful to Cynthia, Yin Looi, KK Tang, Jon Loong, Michael Yeow, Zhong Sheng and Mohd. Awis for being so helpful. I am also thankful for the help provided by Dulip Singh, Dzeelfa and Anealka Aziz.

My special thanks go to the schools, especially the teachers involved in the study. They were ever so helpful despite the constraints that they had. I am also grateful to the experts who did the validations for me.

My family and friends were such great support throughout this episode and this soaked up all the pressure that was mounting especially mid-way and right through the end of the write-up. I am so blessed! Thanks!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
APPROVAL	xi
DECLARATION	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xix
LIST OF FIGURES	xxi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxiii
 <b>CHAPTER</b>	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Background of the Study	
1.1.1 The Background to State-Sponsored Material in Malaysian Schools	3
1.1.2 The Malaysian Textbook for English Language	3
1.2 The Role of the Textbook in Relation to the Richards and Rodgers (1987) Model for Methodology	6
1.2.1 Predictive and Retrospective Evaluation of Textbooks	8
1.3 The Statement of the Problem	12
1.4 The Objectives of the Study	14
1.5 The Research Questions	15
1.6 Limitations to the Research	16
1.7 Significance of the Research	18
1.8 Scope of the Study	20
1.9 Theoretical Framework	21
1.10 The Structure of the thesis	27
1.11 Definitions of Terms	29
 2 THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE	 35
2.0 Introduction	35
2.1 An Overview of Materials Development in ELT	36
2.2 The Role of the Textbook, the Controversies Surrounding it and the Implications of Evaluation	40
2.3 Perspectives in Materials Evaluation	49
2.4 An Overview of Common Materials Evaluation Practices	51
2.5 The Emerging and Rather Unfortunate Importance Placed on the Checklist as the Main Offering in Explicit Evaluation of Textbooks	53
2.6 The Issues Related to Aspects of Reliability and Validity in Use of Evaluation Checklists	64
2.7 The Use of Concordance Software in ELT	67
2.8 Teacher Reflection as an Essential Component of	

	Textbook Evaluation	70
2.9	The Case for the Development of the Composite Model for Textbook Evaluation	73
2.10	Summary	75
3	METHODOLOGY	77
3.1	Research Design	77
3.2	The Procedures in the Assembly of the Composite Model	81
3.3	The Main Instruments in the Study	82
3.3.1	The Selection of the Evaluation Checklist	84
3.3.2	The Selection of Concordance Software	85
3.3.3	Reflective Journals	92
3.4	The Pre-and Post Teaching Support Instruments for Preparation of Reflection	93
3.5	The Statistical Instruments	94
3.6	The Content for Evaluation: The Textbook	95
3.7	The Evaluators in the Checklist Selection Process	96
3.8	The Experts for Validation	97
3.9	Selection of Schools	97
3.10	Pilot Studies	98
3.11	The Procedures in Implementation of the Research	99
3.11.1	Phase 1: The Evaluation of the Checklist as the First Instrument in the Composite Framework	100
3.11.2	Phase 2 : The Evaluation of the Concordance Software as the Second Instrument in the Composite Framework	101
3.11.3	Phase 3: The Evaluation of the Reflective Journal as the Third Instrument in the Composite Framework	101
3.11.4	Phase 4 :Test of Newly Formed Framework	102
3.12	Data Collection and Analysis	102
3.12.1	Detailed Illustration of Procedures Used for Analysis of Data	103
4	PHASE 1: THE TEST AND ANALYSIS OF THE SEC	106
4.0	Introduction	106
4.0.1	The Evaluation Instrument	107
4.1	Test 1 on the SEC: The Reliability Test	107
4.1.1	The Reliability Test	107
4.1.2	The Results of the Reliability Test	108
4.1.3	Results on Reliability, Section by Section in the SEC	108
4.1.4	Implications of Results of Reliability Test	
4.2	Test 2 on the SEC: A Difficulty Analysis of Items	111
4.2.1	Procedures for Difficulty Analysis of Items	111

4.2.2	The Results of the Difficulty Analysis of Items in SEC	112
4.2.3	The Analysis of the Difficulty Test	113
4.2.3.1	Difficult Items in Section D	114
4.2.3.2	Difficult Items in Section E	116
4.2.3.3	Difficult Items in Section F	117
4.3	The Summary of Findings	118
5	PHASE 2: THE TEST AND ANALYSIS OF THE CONCORDANCE SOFTWARE	121
5.0	Introduction	121
5.1	The Instrument (WordSmith Tools 3.0)	122
5.2	The Content (Textbook) for Analysis	123
5.2.1	The Procedure for the Development of the Textbook Corpus	124
5.3	Part 1 of Test: The Appraisal of the General Capabilities Of WordSmith Tools 3.0	124
5.3.1	The Unfocused Exploration of the Capabilities of WordSmith Tools 3.0	125
5.3.1.1	General Information about Words, Sentences and Paragraphs in the book	125
5.3.1.2	The Analysis of the Function of Keyness	128
5.3.1.3	The Analysis of the Capabilities of the Software to Illustrate Reintroduction/Recycling	129
5.3.1.4	Other Aspects of the Exploration	134
5.3.1.5	Features which do not Contribute Directly to this Research	135
5.3.2	Directed Exploration of the Capabilities of WordSmith Tools 3.0	138
5.3.2.1	Detailed Analysis of the Capabilities of the Concordance Software to Help Provide Greater Input to Responses Provided to the 6 Identified Items in the SEC	140
5.4	Part 2 of Test: Determining the Ability of the Software to Discriminate Between 2 Textbooks	146
5.4.1	Comparison of the Two Books in Terms of General Features	146
5.4.2	Distribution of Vocabulary	150
5.4.3	The Analysis of the Function of Keyness	151
5.4.4	The Analysis of the Capabilities of the Software to Illustrate Distribution/Recycling	154
5.4.5	Recycling of Structures: Sequence Connectors	155
5.5	Part 2 of Test: Discrimination Between Books in Selection Using the SEC	157
5.5.1	Vocabulary	158
5.5.2	Vocabulary and Structures	160

5.6	Summary of Findings	165
6	PHASE 3: THE TEST AND ANALYSIS OF THE REFLECTIVE JOURNAL	168
6.0	Introduction	168
6.1	The Pilot Study	169
6.2	Procedures for Implementation of Reflective Journals during the Test Period	170
6.3	Analysis of Reflections According to Response Requirements of Sections/Items in the SEC	171
6.4	Detailed Analysis of Responses in Teacher Reflective Journals	174
6.4.1	Detailed Analysis of Responses to Section A: Bibliographic Data	175
6.4.1.1	Key Language Cues in Responses Relevant to SEC items	176
6.4.2	Detailed Analysis of Responses to Section B: Aims and Goals	176
6.4.2.1	Key Language Cues to Responses Relevant to SEC Items	178
6.4.3	Detailed Analysis of Responses to Section C: Subject Matter	179
6.4.3.1	Key Language Cues in Responses Relevant to SEC Items	183
6.4.4	Detailed Analysis of Responses to Section D: Vocabulary and Structures: Grammar (DG)	184
6.4.4.1	Key Language Cues in Responses Relevant to SEC Items	186
6.4.5	Detailed Analysis of Responses to Section E: Exercises and Activities	187
6.4.5.1	Key Language Cues in Responses Relevant to SEC Items	191
6.4.6	Detailed Analysis of Responses to Section F: Layout and Physical Makeup	192
6.4.6.1	Key Language Cues in Responses Relevant to SEC Items	194
6.5	Summary of Findings	194
7	PHASE 4: ASSEMBLY AND TEST OF THE COMPOSITE FRAMEWORK	198
7.0	Introduction	198
7.1	The Rationale for the Approach in the Assembly of the Composite Framework	198
7.2	A Summary of the Processes leading to the Assembly of the Composite Framework	200
7.3	The Assembly of the Composite Framework	201

	7.3.1 Assembly of Data from Phase 2 which will support Section D (Vocabulary and Structures) of the SEC	202
	7.3.2 Assembly of Data from Phase 3 which will support Section E (Exercises and Activities) of the SEC	204
7.4	Test of the Framework	205
7.5	Results of Difficulty Analysis of Items in Section D and E of the SEC	207
7.6	Summary of Findings	209
 8	 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	 212
8.0	Introduction	212
8.1	Discussion of Findings in Phase 1 of the Investigation: The Over-view	213
	8.1.1 Making Limited Generalizations	220
8.2	Discussion of Findings in Phase 2 of the Investigation: The Over-view	225
	8.2.1 Making Limited Generalizations	234
8.3	Discussion of Findings in Phase 3 of the Investigation: The Over-view	235
	8.3.1 Making Limited Generalizations	240
8.4	Discussion of Findings in Phase 4 of the Investigation: The Over-view	240
	8.4.1 Making Limited Generalizations	241
8.5	Summary of Findings	242
 9	 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 245
9.0	Introduction	245
9.1	The Fate of the Evaluation Checklist	245
9.2	The Thinking Outside the Box – Developing the Idea of Conceptual Change	248
9.3	Implications of this Research	249
9.4	Recommendations	254
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	257
	APPENDICES	280
	BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	396



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Evaluation Summary Of Candidate Software	91
2 Difficulty Analysis Of Items In The SEC	112
3 Illustration Of Responses: Grammar	114
4 Illustration Of Responses: Vocabulary	115
5 Illustration Of Responses: Vocabulary And Structures	115
6 Illustration Of Responses: Exercises And Activities	117
7 Illustration Of Responses: Layout And Physical Makeup	117
8 Reliability Scores Of Skierso Evaluation Checklist (SEC)	118
9 Difficulty Analysis Of Sections Within SEC	119
10 Some Basic Information Provided By WordSmith	126
11 Example of Keyness For Unit 13, Form 4 Textbook	129
12 Distribution Of Words Based On The Number Of Units In The Form 4 Textbook	130
13 Distribution Of Words Based On The Number Of Occurrences In Form 4 Textbook	131
14 Distribution Of Sequence Connectors In The Form 4 Textbook	132
15 An Example Of Concordance Line That Shows Context Of Occurrence In The Target Structure (Form 4 Textbook)	133
16 Gender Bias In The Form 4 Textbook	135
17 Number Of New Words In The Syllabus Introduced In Each Unit In The Textbook	141
18 Words That Are Not Found In The Form 4 Textbook	142
19 Recycling Of Items In The Form 4 Textbook	145



20	Summary Of The Statistics Of Textbook 1(FB) And Textbook 2 (SM)	147
21	Summary Of Tokens, Types, Density Ratio And Consistency Ratio Of Units in Both Textbooks	148
22	Results Of The t-test	150
23	Comparison Of The Distribution Of Vocabulary In The Form 2 Textbooks	151
24	Themes In Form 2 Syllabus And Representation In Textbooks	152
25	Keyness Of Unit 12 Textbook 1 (FB)	152
26	Keyness For Unit 5 Textbook 2 (SM)	153
27	Keyness For Unit 15 Textbook 1 (FB)	154
28	Keyness For Unit 13 Textbook 2 (SM)	154
29	Distribution Of Vocabulary (From The Syllabus Wordlist) In Both Textbooks	155
30	Distribution Of The Sequence Connectors In The Textbooks	156
31	Rate Of Recurrence Of Sequence Connectors In The Textbook	157
32	Number Of New Words In The Syllabus Introduced In Each Unit Of The 2 Textbooks	159
33	Words That Are Not Found In The Textbooks	161
34	Distribution Of The Sequence Connectors In The Textbooks	163
35	Recycling Of Items	164
36	Analysis Of Responses In Teacher Reflection Journals To Identify Linkages To Items In SEC	172
37	Difficulty Analysis Of Items (Post-Test Stage) In Section D And Section E Of The SEC Within The Composite Framework	207
38	Illustration Of Responses: Grammar	208
39	Illustration Of Responses: Vocabulary And Structures	208

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure	Page
1      The Richards And Rodgers Model For Methodology	6
2      The Variables In The Richards And Rodgers Model For Methodology	22
3      A Proposed Composite Framework For ESL Textbook Evaluation	26
4      A Diagrammatic Representation Of The Structures And Processes Of Tests	28
5      The Procedures In The Implementation Of The Research	99
6      Number Of Tokens In The Form 4 Textbook	127
7      Number Of Types In The Form 4 Textbook	127
8      Average Sentence Length In The Form 4 Textbook	128
9      Number Of Sentences In The Form 4 Textbook	129
10     The Dispersion Plot For “Later” In The Form 4 Textbook	134
11     The Text Density Ratio In The Form 4 Textbook	137
12     The Text Consistency Ratio	137
13     The Total Number Of Tokens In Textbook 1 (FB) And Textbook 2 (SM)	147
14     The Total Number Of Types In Textbook 1 (FB) And Textbook 2 (SM)	147
15     The Density Ratio Of All Units In Textbook 1 (FB) and Textbook 2 (SM)	149
16     The Consistency Ratio Of All Units In Textbook 1 (FB) And Textbook 2 (SM)	149
17     Quantity Of Responses To Sections Within The SEC	195
18     Quantity Of Responses Made By Evaluators	196

19	Reliability Scores Of The SEC Operating Within The Composite Framework	210
20	The Difficulty Analysis Of Items In SEC (As It Stood Alone)	210
21	The Difficulty Analysis Of Items In SEC Within The Composite Framework	211

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

ALM	Audio-Lingual Method
EFL	English as Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
EMAS	English of Malaysian Schools
ESL	English as Second Language
FB	Fajar Bakti
IRPA	Intensified Research in Priority Areas
KBSM	Kurikulum Baru Sekolah Menengah
LSAT	Littlejohn's Style Analysis Task Sheet
MATSDA	Materials Development Association
MTLC	Malaysian Textbook Language Corpus
OUP	Oxford University Press
PC	Personal Computer
QC	Quality Control
SEAMEO	South East Asian Ministers of Education Organisation
SEC	Skierso Evaluation Checklist
SITs	Search Patterns In Text
SM	Seri Maju
TBLS	Textbook Loan Scheme
TEFL	Teaching English as Foreign Language
TESL	Teaching of English as Second Language
TESOL	Teachers of English To Speakers of Other Languages

TESP	Teaching of English for Specific Purposes
TIF	Tagged Image File
UK	United Kingdom
UNESCO	United Nations Educational and Scientific Co-operation Organisation
UPM	Universiti Putra Malaysia
VLDE	Vocabulary Load Distribution and Efficiency