ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Students' Evaluations on Textbooks at a Vietnamese University

Nguyen Thi Dan Tam
Faculty of English
HCMC University of Economics and Finance
141-145 Dien Bien Phu Street, Ward 15, Binh Thanh District, Vietnam

Abstract

Textbooks are important educational resources, but their appropriateness can vary. This research paper presents data from an assessment of the suitability of the *American English File* series for non-English major students at a private international university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The evaluation used qualitative and quantitative methods, including surveys, interviews, and data analysis using SPSS and theme analysis. The findings highlight lecturers' and students' feedback on the textbook's content, layout, language registers, skills, activities, and practical application of English.

Keywords: textbook, evaluation, suitability

(Received: 26 June 2023; Revised: 14 July 2023; Accepted: 22 August 2023; Published: 29 September 2023)

I. Introduction

Textbooks are widely utilized as primary educational materials for teaching and learning purposes. They serve multiple functions, providing a framework for teachers to attain the desired goals and objectives of the course, as well as guiding them during lesson delivery. Textbooks have a profound influence on learners, shaping their attitudes and performance over the duration of the course. When learners have a positive affinity for their textbooks, they are more likely to derive enjoyment from the course and actively engage in the lessons. Additionally, textbooks play a pivotal role in providing essential input and creating valuable opportunities for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners to practice and communicate in the target language.

Researchers have recently shown increased interest in the role of English teachers and learners, as well as active teaching materials. The quality and relevance of textbooks are also a key concern for improving foreign language education. While Western English textbooks are widely used, they may not be suitable for all contexts and cultures (Richard, 2001). In the

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Vietnamese market, the "American English File- AEF" series has been selected as the main textbook for non-specialized English learners at UEF University. Authored by Christina Latham-Koenig and Clive Oxenden, and published by Oxford University Press in 2010, this series has been used since its second edition and requires evaluation. It is important to determine its effectiveness, strengths, weaknesses, and alignment with program standards and the needs of students. This evaluation is crucial to justify its continued use among newer options in the market to enhance student learning.

II. Literature review

1. The importance of textbook evaluation

Textbooks assume a significant role in the process of teaching and learning, serving as the principal means of imparting knowledge to learners. Moreover, one of their fundamental purposes is to present existing knowledge in a carefully selected, accessible, and organized manner. According to Hutchinson and Torres (1994), textbooks hold a crucial and beneficial position in the instruction and acquisition of English. The authors assert that textbooks supply essential input through a variety of activities, readings, and explanations within classroom lessons. Consequently, textbooks will continue to endure as they fulfill specific educational requirements.

According to Sheldon (1988), textbooks hold a crucial role within any ELT program, serving as a central component that offers significant benefits for both students and teachers in ESL/EFL classrooms. Additionally, Cunnigsworth (1995) highlights the potential of textbooks to fulfill various additional roles in ELT curriculum, which is advantageous. He argues that textbooks effectively support self-directed learning, serve as a valuable source of instructional material, provide ideas and activities, act as a reference for students, reflect predetermined learning objectives within a syllabus, and offer support for less experienced teachers who are still building their confidence. Furthermore, Hycroft (1998) asserts that textbooks have a primary advantage in that they provide a tangible measure of progress and achievement, which is psychologically essential for students when used in the classroom.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

In Ellis's (1997) framework, there are two distinct types of materials evaluation: predictive evaluation and retrospective evaluation. Predictive evaluation involves making decisions about which materials to use prior to their implementation. Teachers conducting predictive evaluation assess various materials to determine which ones align best with their instructional goals. On the other hand, retrospective evaluation takes place after the materials have been used, aiming to assess their effectiveness. This type of evaluation allows teachers to reflect on whether the materials have met their expectations. Both predictive and retrospective evaluations share the common objective of enhancing the effectiveness of the teaching and learning environment. They provide teachers with valuable insights into the overall effectiveness of their teaching methods, including the materials they have employed.

Williams (1983), Sheldon (1988), Brown (1995), and Cunningsworth (1995) are in agreement that evaluation checklists should encompass various criteria related to the physical aspects of textbooks, such as layout, organization, and logistical characteristics. Additionally, it is crucial to include criteria that assess the methodology, objectives, and approaches employed in the textbook. Moreover, the checklist should evaluate the extent to which the materials are not only suitable for teaching purposes but also align with the specific preferences of individual teachers and the broader curriculum of the organization.

2. Previous studies about textbook evaluations

A comprehensive examination of textbook content and design has been conducted by researchers from various disciplines and timelines. Alemi & Sadehvandi (2012) conducted a study that evaluated the "Pacesetter Series" textbook from the perspectives of EFL teachers. Their questionnaire-based approach aimed to gather insights on various aspects such as content, organization, language skills development, cultural representation, and overall pedagogical value. In 2014, Mohammadi and Abdi completed a case study on textbook evaluation, where they identified criteria such as accuracy, comprehensibility, organization, suitability, visuals, and language level. In 2019, Setyono and Widodo also implemented a study employing critical discourse analysis to explore the portrayal of multicultural values in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) textbook endorsed by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Later, Lucy, Demszky, Bromley, and Jurafsky (2020) conducted a study employing natural language processing techniques to analyze the content of Texas US history textbooks. They delved into the textual components to gain a deeper understanding of the narratives and themes presented within the educational materials. In the same year, Abdul Rahim and Jalalian Daghigh (2020) completed a content analysis study comparing locally-developed and global (imported) English Language Teaching (ELT) textbooks used in Malaysia. Their study utilized cultural criteria to evaluate the cultural content of both types of textbooks. In 2021, Weninger directs attention to the critical examination of language textbooks. The author emphasizes exploring power dynamics, ideologies, and social ramifications intertwined within the content and design. Weninger also proposes an analytical framework encompassing multiple dimensions, including the textual, visual, and aural aspects of the textbooks. Lebedeva, Veselovskaya, Kupreshchenko, and Laposhina (2021) focused their study on Russian language primary school textbooks specifically designed for migrant students. They used a corpus-based methodology to evaluate these textbooks, considering criteria such as lexical diversity, cultural content appropriateness, multicultural elements, balance between everyday and academic language, and the inclusion of relevant language practice activities.

Recently, Tadesse and Melesse (2022) utilized a qualitative content analysis approach to investigate the arts and crafts content in a grade 3 textbook. They thoroughly examined the textbook's thematic units, instructional objectives, teaching methods, and learning activities related to arts and crafts. Xing, Bender, and Cossi de Souza (2022) analyzed and contrasted the utilization of diagrams for visualizing probability problems in textbooks from the United States and China. They examined the visual structures, design components, and approaches employed in these diagrams, aiming to identify and compare their characteristics and strategies. In 2023, Soliman introduces a model that employs linguistic patterns and characteristics to detect potential glossary terms within individual PDF textbooks. The proposed model aims to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of glossary term identification. Also, Alayont, Karaali, and Pehlivan (2023) conducted an examination of calculus textbook problems using Bloom's Taxonomy. They categorized the cognitive processes involved in the problems into six hierarchical levels: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

III. Research methodology

The objective of this research is to obtain a thorough understanding of lecturers' and students' feedback on the AEF textbooks and examine the factors that affect their appropriateness. To accomplish this, a mixed-method research approach was utilized, which included surveys administered to 925 students and 12 university lecturers at an international private university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. Specifically, participants from the GEP 7 and 6 levels were selected due to their extensive experience with the EAF textbooks. Data were analysed using SPSS and thematic analysis. However, this paper only shares quantitative data taken from students.

This project ultilized Cunningsworth's framework, which was also known as the Cunningsworth's Evaluation Checklist. It was proposed by Brian Cunningsworth in his book "Choosing Your Coursebook" published in 1995. The framework provides a set of criteria that can be used to evaluate and select coursebooks for language teaching purposes. It is primarily focused on English language teaching but can be adapted for other languages as well. Cunningsworth's framework consists of the following criteria: aims and objectives, syllabus, content, methodology, language skills, vocabulary, grammar, exercises and activities, support for teachers, design and layout. By using Cunningsworth's framework, teachers and learners can assess coursebooks based on these criteria to determine their suitability for their specific teaching context and learners' needs. It provides a systematic approach to evaluate and select coursebooks that can enhance the effectiveness of language teaching and learning. From the Cunningsworth's framework, a new framework has been proposed to fix the context of the research setting.

IV. Findings

1. Students' evaluations on the suitability of the current textbook

The findings of the survey regarding students' responses are outlined in this section.

1.1 Students' needs

In order to investigate the English learning needs of students, this scale consisted of 8 items, each offering 5 different options.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Reasons of learning English- NE1	925	1	5	4.06	1.336
Future use of English-NE2	925	1	5	3.16	1.734
Strong English skill-NE3	925	1	5	2.16	1.326
Skills to be improved-NE4	925	1	5	3.16	1.808
Learning style-NE5	925	1	5	3.49	1.575
English varieties-NE6	925	1	5	2.94	1.799
Learning sources-NE7	925	1	5	3.88	1.372
Classroom activities-NE8	925	1	5	2.66	1.792
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of NE

Table 1 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 2.66 to 4.06.

			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NE1	Graduation	73	7.9	7.9	7.9
		Oversea study	63	6.8	6.8	14.7
		Future work	171	18.5	18.5	33.2
		Personal use	45	4.9	4.9	38.1

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

		More than 2 options	573	61.9	61.9	100.0
	NE2	Chat	298	32.2	32.2	32.2
		Travel	66	7.1	7.1	39.4
		Work	115	12.4	12.4	51.8
		Entertaining	80	8.6	8.6	60.4
		More than 2 options	366	39.6	39.6	100.0
	NE3	listening	435	47.0	47.0	47.0
		speaking	167	18.1	18.1	65.1
		reading	127	13.7	13.7	78.8
		writing	136	14.7	14.7	93.5
		More than 2 options	60	6.5	6.5	100.0
	NE4	listening	304	32.9	32.9	32.9
		speaking	107	11.6	11.6	44.4
		reading	83	9.0	9.0	53.4
		writing	1	.1	.1	53.5
		more than 2 options	430	46.5	46.5	100.0
	NE5	self-learning	212	22.9	22.9	22.9
		pairs	38	4.1	4.1	27.0
		groups	117	12.6	12.6	39.7
		with lecturers	201	21.7	21.7	61.4
		more than 2 options	357	38.6	38.6	100.0
		Total	925	100.0	100.0	

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Table 2. NE

According to the information provided in table 2, it was discovered that 62% of students indicated having various reasons for learning English, such as for graduation and employment purposes. Similarly, 50% of students believed that English would be beneficial for both their work and travel endeavors, while 33% estimated that they might use English primarily for casual conversations. Regarding their English proficiency, 47% of students recognized their weakness in listening skills, and 47% expressed a desire to improve more than two aspects of English, including listening and speaking. Surprisingly, 23% of students mentioned a preference for self-learning, whereas 22% stated a preference for studying with teachers. However, the majority of students, accounting for 39%, opted for a combination of self-learning and studying with teachers as their preferred approach.

			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		American English	357	38.6	38.6	38.6
	NE6	British English	105	11.4	11.4	49.9
		Australian English	55	5.9	5.9	55.9
		Other	57	6.2	6.2	62.1
		AE and BE	351	37.9	37.9	100.0
	NE7	coursebooks	97	10.5	10.5	10.5
		language apps	77	8.3	8.3	18.8
		news, songs	116	12.5	12.5	31.4
		internet	181	19.6	19.6	50.9
		more than 2 options	454	49.1	49.1	100.0
	NE8	language games	457	49.4	49.4	49.4
		communicative activities	30	3.2	3.2	52.6

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

	presentation	94	10.2	10.2	62.8
	fun project	54	5.8	5.8	68.6
	more than 2 options	290	31.4	31.4	100.0
	Total	925	100.0	100.0	

Table 3. Students' needs of learning English

Table 3 indicated that the two main student groups expressed a desire to learn American English (39%) and a combination of American English and British English (38%). Additionally, 50% of students disclosed that they utilized more than two resources to enhance their English skills, such as the Internet, news, or songs. Lastly, the majority of students (50%) expressed their fondness for language games in the classroom, while 32% indicated a preference for a blend of language games and engaging projects.

1.2 Layouts

In this section, you will find the outcomes derived from the assessment conducted by students regarding the layouts of the current textbook, AEF. The evaluation consisted of a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Clear layout-LAY1	925	1	5	3.88	.836
Effective organization-LAY2	925	1	5	3.99	.888
Appealing layout-LAY3	925	1	5	2.77	1.167

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Appropriate illustration-LAY4	925	1	5	3.81	.811
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 4. Layouts

Table 4 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 2.77 to 3.99.

		strongly disagree	disagree	no idea	agree	strongly agree
Valid	LAY1	.9	8.8	10.2	61.9	18.3
	LAY2	.6	8.5	10.4	52.1	28.3
	LAY3	9.4	42.9	19.2	17.7	10.7
	LAY4	.4	8.9	14.7	60.9	15.1

Table 5. Evaluation for textbook layouts

According to Table 5, out of the 4 items examined, 81% of the students expressed agreement regarding the textbook's clear layout. Similarly, 76% of the students agreed that the textbook had suitable illustrations, and 81% agreed that it possessed effective organization. However, 53% of the students disagreed with the notion that the textbook had an appealing layout.

1.3 Content

This section shows students' evaluation on the content of the textbook.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Interesting topics-CON1	925	1	5	3.30	1.037

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Suitable topics-CON2	925	1	5	2.72	1.285
Practical topics-CON3	925	1	5	1.90	1.333
Various topics-CON4	925	1	5	2.37	1.324
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 6. Content

Table 6 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 1.90 to 3.30.

		strongly disagree	disagree	no idea	agree	strongly agree
Valid	CON1	3.2	26.8	13.5	49.7	6.7
	CON2	11.5	51.7	4.6	17.8	14.4
	CON3	59	18.2	6.9	6.1	9.8
	CON4	29.5	40.3	3.5	16.9	9.8

Table 7. Evaluation for textbook content

In table 7, it was demonstrated that approximately half of the students, specifically 57%, expressed agreement regarding the textbook's interesting topics. Conversely, a slightly higher percentage, 63%, disagreed that these topics were relevant to their specific needs or areas of study. As a result, the majority, around 77% of the students, concluded that the textbook lacked practical topics. Additionally, a significant portion, 70% of the students, strongly disagreed with the notion that the textbook offered a diverse range of topics, noting that it predominantly focused on a few similar topics throughout the series.

1.4 Activities

This section shows students' evaluation on the activites included in the textbook.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Balance of activities-ACT1	925	1	5	3.03	1.080
Meaningful activities-ACT2	925	1	5	2.24	1.004
Various activities-ACT3	925	1	5	2.77	1.163
Communicative vocabulary and grammar-ACT4	925	1	5	2.00	1.162
Independent learning-ACT5	925	1	5	2.48	1.148
Entertaining activities-ACT6	925	1	5	2.51	1.102
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 8. Activities

Table 8 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 2.00 to 3.03.

		strongly disagree	disagree	no idea	agree	strongly agree
Valid	ACT1	6.8	31.5	18.2	38.8	4.8
	ACT2	23.8	45	15.1	15.5	.6
	ACT3	11.7	40.9	12.4	29.2	5.9
	ACT4	43.1	34.6	5.9	12.2	4.1
	ACT5	18.7	45.6	9.0	22.7	4.0
	ACT6	13.0	53.6	7.8	20.9	4.8

Table 9. Evaluation for textbook activities

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Table 9 presented findings indicating the existence of two conflicting perspectives regarding the equilibrium of activities within the textbook. Among the surveyed students, 44% expressed agreement, while 38% expressed disagreement on this matter. Furthermore, a significant majority of 69% of students disagreed with the notion that the textbook offered meaningful activities for communication. Similarly, 78% of students disagreed with the idea that the textbook effectively incorporated vocabulary and grammar within communicative activities. Moreover, 64% of students also expressed disagreement with the inclusion of activities supporting independent learning in the textbook. Finally, it was reported by 67% of students that the textbook lacked entertaining activities.

1.5 Language skills

This section shows students' evaluation on the language skills included in the textbook.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Clear focus-LS1	925	1	5	3.82	.923
Balance of 4 language skills-LS2	925	2	5	3.84	.879
Sub-skills practice-LS3	925	1	5	2.52	1.436
Various sources-LS4	925	1	5	2.53	1.360
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 10. Language skills

Table 10 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 2.52 to 3.84.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

		strongly disagree	disagree	no idea	agree	strongly agree
Valid	LS1	.5	14.6	6.2	59.8	18.9
	LS2		11.2	14.1	54.1	20.6
	LS3	31.0	30.9	8.2	15.0	14.8
	LS4	28.5	30.7	9.8	20.6	10.3

Table 11. Evaluation for textbook language skills

In table 11, it was observed that 79% of the students were in agreement regarding the textbook's clear emphasis on language skills. Additionally, 75% of the students expressed agreement with the textbook's ability to offer a balanced approach to all four language skills. However, a notable 62% of students disagreed with the presence of sub-skills practice, such as listening for main ideas, within the textbook. Similarly, 60% of students reported their disagreement with the inclusion of materials from diverse sources in the textbooks.

1.6 Language registers

This section shows students' evaluation on language registers in the textbook.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Authentic language-LR1	925	1	5	3.75	.728
Appropriate level-LR2	925	2	5	3.72	.778
Suitable amount of grammar-LR3	925	2	5	3.78	.848
Friendly illustration of grammar-LR4	925	1	5	2.81	1.214
Realistic language-LR5	925	1	5	3.56	1.158

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Diverse range of registers and accents-LR6	925	1	5	2.81	1.026
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 12. Language registers

Table 12 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 2.81 to 3.75.

		strongly disagree	disagree	no idea	agree	strongly agree
Valid	LR1	1.6	7.4	10.5	75.7	4.9
	LR2		12.5	10.3	69.5	7.7
	LR3		11.9	13.8	58.9	15.4
	LR4	17.2	27.5	18.5	30.9	5.9
	LR5	1.3	22.9	22.5	25.5	27.8
	LR6	5.5	42.3	23.6	23.4	5.3

Table 13. Evaluation for textbook language registers

According to table 13, it was found that 80.6% of the students agreed that the language used in the textbook was authentic. Furthermore, 76% of the students expressed agreement that the language used was appropriate for their proficiency level. A significant majority, 74% of the students, agreed that the textbook provided an adequate amount of grammar lessons. On the other hand, 55% of the students disagreed with the presence of user-friendly grammar illustrations. In terms of language realism, 53% of the students agreed that the language presented in the textbook reflected real-world usage. However, 66% of the students disagreed with the textbook's provision of a wide range of language registers and accents from various English varieties.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

1.7 Students' current use of English in reality

This section presented information about how students are presently utilizing English in real-life situations in relation to the English they have learned from the textbook.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fluent daily communication-RE1	925	1	5	2.60	1.103
International certificates-RE2	925	1	5	2.65	1.042
Entertainment-RE3	925	1	5	2.20	1.004
Work-RE4	925	1	5	3.05	.946
Information search-RE5	925	1	5	3.38	1.088
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 14. Students' current use of English

Table 14 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 2.20 to 3.38.

		strongly disagree	disagree	no idea	agree	strongly agree
Valid	RE1	10.3	49.7	18.8	12.5	8.6
	RE2	9.2	45.2	22.2	18.4	5.1
	RE3	26.1	42.9	16.5	13.6	.9
	RE4	3.7	29.4	26.6	38.6	1.7

	RE5	3.6	25.0	13.4	46.4	11.7

Table 15. Evaluation for students' current use of English

A majority of students, according to table 15, specifically 60%, expressed their disagreement with the idea that the textbook adequately helped them communicate fluently in their daily lives. Similarly, 55% of students disagreed with the notion that they could acquire an international certificate after studying the textbook. Additionally, 51% of students disagreed with the idea that they could utilize the textbook for entertainment purposes such as listening to music or watching films. On the other hand, 40% of students agreed that they could apply the English knowledge gained from the textbook in their work, while 58% of students agreed that they could utilize the English they learned from the book to search for information.

1.8 Students' ranking for the current textbook

This section shows students' evaluation on general assessment the textbook, from 1 star to 5 stars.

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Layout-RA1	925	1	5	3.62	1.130
Activities-RA2	925	1	5	2.89	.725
Content-RA3	925	1	5	2.94	.814
Language skills-RA4	925	1	5	3.53	.925
Language types-RA5	925	1	5	3.15	1.184

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Practical applications-RA6	925	1	5	3.10	.910
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 16. Rankings

Table 16 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 2.89 to 3.62.

		1 star	2 stars	3 stars	4 stars	5 stars
Valid	RA1	2.3	18.2	21.7	30.8	27.0
	RA2	1.7	26.7	53.6	17.2	.8
	RA3	2.8	26.9	44.5	24.9	.9
	RA4	5.8	6.1	23.9	57.5	6.7
	RA5	13.6	12.8	29.2	34.3	10.2
	RA6	2.7	22.3	44.2	24.2	6.6

Table 17. Student's rankings for the current textbooks

In table 17, it was observed that approximately 58% of students gave the textbook's layout a rating of 4 to 5 stars. Around 54% of students rated the textbook activities with 3 stars. As for the content of the textbook, 44.5% of students gave it a rating of 3 stars, while 27% rated it with 2 stars. When it came to language skills, about 64% of students rated them as 4 to 5 stars. Similarly, 45% of students gave language registers a rating of 4 to 5 stars. Additionally, 44% of students rated the practical applications with 3 stars.

1.9 Textbook suitability

This section shows students' evaluation on the suitability of the textbook.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
appropriate for learners' needs-SU1	925	1	5	2.80	1.172
suitable for university non-major of English students-SU2	925	1	5	3.39	1.149
raising my interest in long-term learning-SU3	925	1	5	3.18	1.283
can be continued to use for next year-SU4	925	1	5	3.13	1.272
Valid N (listwise)	925				

Table 18. Suitability

Table 18 shows that Mean values of this scale vary from 2.8 to 3.39.

		strongly disagree	disagree	no idea	agree	strongly agree
Valid	SU1	5.5	49.8	18.6	11.6	14.5
	SU2	1.7	28.4	19.4	30.1	20.4
	SU3	4.6	34.8	23.9	10.7	25.9
	SU4	6.3	34.2	21.6	15.9	22.1

Table 19. Evaluation for textbook stutability

According to table 19, the majority of students, approximately 55%, expressed their disagreement with the suitability of the textbook for their needs. On the other hand, around 51%

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

of students agreed that the textbook was suitable for non-English majors. When it came to raising their interest in long-term learning, about 41% of students disagreed, while 24% did not provide their perspective. Furthermore, 41% of students disagreed with the idea of continuing to use the textbook, and 22% did not express their opinions on the matter.

5. Conclusions

Based on the results, students provided both favorable and unfavorable feedback regarding the textbooks. The textbook's strengths include a clear layout, suitable illustrations, effective organization, interesting topics, emphasis on language skills, authentic language usage, appropriate language for proficiency levels, and reflection of real-world language usage.

Howerver, the textbook exhibits numerous weaknesses that undermine its effectiveness and fail to cater to the diverse needs and areas of study of its readers. Firstly, one of its glaring flaws is the lack of an appealing layout. A visually unattractive design can hinder students' engagement and motivation, making it harder for them to absorb and retain information. Furthermore, the textbook fails to address the specific needs of its readers or cater to their individual areas of study. Each student may have different language learning goals or academic pursuits, but the textbook overlooks this crucial aspect, resulting in a lack of relevance for many learners. Another significant drawback is the absence of practical topics. Language learning is most effective when students can apply their skills to real-life situations. However, the textbook neglects to provide relevant and practical themes that would help students navigate day-to-day communication effectively. Moreover, the textbook lacks a diverse range of topics. Language learners benefit greatly from exposure to a wide array of subjects, as it enhances their vocabulary and knowledge base.

Unfortunately, the limited scope of topics restricts students' exposure and impedes their overall linguistic development. Another critical aspect that the textbook fails to address is the absence of a balance of activities. A well-rounded language curriculum includes various activities such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing. However, this textbook overlooks the importance of a comprehensive approach, leaving students with an inadequate range of language practice opportunities. Additionally, the textbook lacks meaningful activities for communication. Language learning is fundamentally about effective communication, but the absence of engaging

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

and purposeful tasks limits students' opportunities to develop their conversational skills. Moreover, the textbook inadequately incorporates vocabulary and grammar within communicative activities. Language proficiency relies on the seamless integration of these elements, but the textbook falls short in this aspect, hindering students' ability to use vocabulary and grammar accurately and meaningfully. Furthermore, the textbook neglects to include activities that support independent learning. Independent learning is a valuable skill that empowers students to take ownership of their language acquisition journey. The omission of such activities limits students' self-directed learning opportunities.

The textbook also lacks the presence of sub-skills practice, such as listening for main ideas. Developing sub-skills is vital for a well-rounded language education, and the absence of targeted practice in this area hampers students' ability to comprehend and extract essential information from various audio sources. In addition, the textbook fails to incorporate materials from diverse sources. Exposure to a variety of content from different cultural contexts and perspectives enriches students' understanding of language and culture. The absence of diverse materials restricts students' exposure and diminishes their intercultural competence. Moreover, the textbook lacks user-friendly grammar illustrations. Clear and concise grammar explanations, accompanied by visual aids, facilitate students' comprehension and application of grammatical rules. However, the textbook overlooks this aspect, making it harder for students to grasp complex grammar concepts. Lastly, the textbook fails to provide a wide range of language registers and accents from various English varieties. Language learners benefit from exposure to different registers and accents, as it prepares them for real-world interactions with a diverse range of English speakers. Unfortunately, the textbook's limited scope denies students this important exposure.

In conclusion, the textbook exhibits several weaknesses that hinder its effectiveness as a language learning resource. The absence of an appealing layout, relevance to specific needs and areas of study, practical topics, diverse range of topics, balanced activities, meaningful communication tasks, incorporation of vocabulary and grammar within communicative activities, independent learning support, sub-skills practice, materials from diverse sources, user-friendly grammar illustrations, and a wide range of language registers and accents contribute to its overall inadequacy. Addressing these weaknesses would be crucial in providing students with

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

a comprehensive and enriching language learning experience. Consequently, students have come to a firm conclusion that the textbook is unsuitable for their needs and fails to generate long-term interest in their language learning journey. As a result, they have reached a consensus that continuing to use the textbook would be unproductive and detrimental to their progress.

Acknowledgment

This project was funded by Ho Chi Minh City University of Economics and Finance - UEF.

References

Abdul Rahim, H., & Jalalian Daghigh, A. (2020). Locally-developed vs. Global textbooks: An evaluation of cultural content in textbooks used in ELT in Malaysia. Asian Englishes, 22(3), 317-331.

Alayont, F., Karaali, G., & Pehlivan, L. (2023). Analysis of Calculus Textbook Problems via Bloom's Taxonomy. PRIMUS, 33(3), 203-218.

Alemi, M., & Sadehvandi, N. (2012). Textbook Evaluation: EFL Teachers' Perspectives on" Pacesetter Series". English language teaching, 5(7), 64-74.

Capek, V. (2022). Methodologies of Textbook Analysis in Czechoslovakia. In History and Social Studies (pp. 120-122). Routledge.

Cunningsworth A (1995). Choosing Your Coursebook. Oxford: Heinemann Publishers Ltd. p.7.

Ebrahimi, F., & Sahragard, R. (2017). Teachers' perceptions of the new English textbooks

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:12 Issue:3, September 2023

in Iranian junior high schools. Journal of Asia TEFL, 14(2), 355.

Eitim, F., Kızılhisar, K. (2010). Educational Research and Review Vol. 5 (9), pp. 508-

517Ellis R (1997). 'The Empirical Evaluation of Language Teaching Materials'. ELT J., 51(1): 36-42.

Huang, P. (2019). Textbook interaction: A study of the language and cultural

contextualisation of English learning textbooks. Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 21, 87-99.

Hutchinson T, Torres E (1994). 'The Textbook as Agent of Change'. ELT J., 48: 4.

Hutchinson T (1987). What is underneath? An interactive view of the material evaluation.

In L. E Sheldon (ed.), ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development, (pp. 37-44), Oxford: Modern English Publications.

Lebedeva, M., Veselovskaya, T., Kupreshchenko, O., & Laposhina, A. (2021). Corpus-

based evaluation of textbook content: a case of Russian language primary school textbooks for migrants. In Facing Diversity in Child Foreign Language Education (pp. 215-233). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Lee, O., & Shin, M. (2023). Universal design for learning in adapted national-level digital

mathematics textbooks for elementary school students with disabilities. Exceptionality, 31(1), 36-51.

Lucy, L., Demszky, D., Bromley, P., & Jurafsky, D. (2020). Content analysis of textbooks

via natural language processing: Findings on gender, race, and ethnicity in Texas US history textbooks. AERA Open, 6(3), 2332858420940312.

Mohammadi, M., & Abdi, H. (2014). Textbook evaluation: A case study. Procedia-Social

and Behavioral Sciences, 98, 1148-1155.

Richards JC (2001). The Role Of text Books In a Language Program. Cambridge University Press.

Setyono, B., & Widodo, H. P. (2019). The representation of multicultural values in the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture-Endorsed EFL textbook: a critical discourse analysis. Intercultural Education, 30(4), 383-397.

Sheldon L (1988). 'Evaluating ELT Textbooks and Materials'. ELT J., 42: 2.

Soliman, A. (2023). An unsupervised linguistic-based model for automatic glossary term extraction from a single PDF textbook. Education and Information Technologies, 1-37.

Tadesse, Z., & Melesse, S. (2022). Analysis of arts and crafts content in the arts and physical education integrated textbook of grade 3: Amhara national regional state in focus. Cogent Education, 9(1), 2041217.

Vojíř, K., & Rusek, M. (2019). Science education textbook research trends: a systematic literature review. International Journal of Science Education, 41(11), 1496-1516.

Weninger, C. (2021). Multimodality in critical language textbook analysis. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 34(2), 133-146.

Xing, C., Bender, M. R., & Cossi de Souza, L. (2022, September). Comparison of Diagram Use for Visualizing Probability Problems in US and Chinese Textbooks. In Diagrammatic Representation and Inference: 13th International Conference, Diagrams 2022, Rome, Italy, September 14–16, 2022, Proceedings (pp. 378-381). Cham: Springer International Publishing.