

The Textbook Selection and Evaluation Process for an Intermediate Level English Oral Communication Course

Cameron ROMNEY

Michael HOLSWORTH

Abstract

This article reviews the systematic processes and selection criteria employed in order to evaluate and choose new textbook material for part of an EFL oral communication curriculum at a Japanese University. It reviews the context of where this selection took place, the issues that brought the need for a change forth, and the steps taken to make the necessary changes. A brief review of textbook selection issues is discussed followed by an explanation of the rubric created and how it was applied. Finally, the results of the selection, a discussion about the processes, and pedagogical and institutional implications are discussed.

Keywords: Textbook, Criteria, Selection, Evaluation, Communication

Introduction

As part of the two-year compulsory general English program for first and second year students, this Japanese University focuses on two main elements; TOEIC proficiency development and communicative competency development. This paper focuses exclusively on the communication development part of the program, but may provide a framework that can be applied to other contexts. The communication part of the program focuses primarily on developing students' speaking and listening proficiency in classrooms with approximately 20 students, in order to maximize their opportunity to engage with native English speaking teachers. As part of this program, evaluation and assessment primarily focuses on an Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) test. This interview measures various aspects of second language production such as reading aloud, expressing opinions on a topic, and connecting ideas with personal experiences.

As part of this program, students are placed in one of four levels (Basic, Elementary, Intermediate and Advanced) based on TOEIC Bridge scores. The test is taken in their first year. The TOEIC test is taken again at the start of the second year, giving students the opportunity to move up to higher levels. Students are required to take four English communication courses as part of the general English program, two during their first year in term one and two, and two in their second year, in term three and four. The focus of this report is on the textbook selected for the Intermediate level in

the second year of the program used in term three and four. During the first year, students in the Intermediate level use English Firsthand 2 (Helgesen, Brown & Wiltshire, 2010) for term one and term two. For the second year, students currently use the textbook *World Link Developing English Fluency 2* (Stempleski, Douglas, & Morgan, 2011) in terms three and term four. After reviewing various comments that were received from both teachers and students, the decision was made to undertake a search to find a replacement textbook that would logically follow the English Firsthand 2 textbook used in the first year, and be more suitable to the program, the teachers, and the needs of the students.

Literature review

Opinions on commercially available ELT coursebooks vary widely. There are those that see them as valuable tools that provide a high quality and consistent source of teaching and learning activities (Richards, 1993) and those that feel they stifle the teacher and learner (Meddings, 2004). Some even go so far as to suggest that textbooks are “an educational failure” (Swales, 1980, p. 11). However, most teachers fall somewhere between these two extremes and see the value of coursebooks, albeit with reservations (Sheldon, 1988).

These reservations are most likely because as Byrd & Schuermann (2014) discuss, textbooks rarely fit the teaching and learning situation completely and that teachers have to adapt and supplement the textbook to their particular situation. They further note that much of the literature discussing ELT materials is focused on how teachers can adapt and supplement textbooks.

Because no textbook can “fit perfectly” (Byrd & Schuermann, 2014, p. 387) the teaching and learning setting, choosing a textbook to be used in class is a complex process with number of factors to be considered. Byrd (2001) identifies what she feels are three main issues, which are how well the textbook fits the curriculum, the students, and the teachers. In addition to these factors Garinger (2002) notes that there are also practical considerations of things like availability and cost.

Because of the complexity in choosing a textbook, it is necessary to first evaluate commercially available ELT coursebooks as to their suitability (Sousa & Hurst, 2011). In trying to address the perceived needs of the learners and teachers, and to meet the goals of the curriculum, a pre-use or pre-dictive evaluation is often employed (Tomlinson, 2003). However, this kind of evaluation is a difficult and time-consuming process. Tomlinson (2003) lists 14 effects materials can have on a learner and proposes a series of 19 principles, to be used when evaluating materials, but he readily admits that these principles are “cumbersome” (p. 22) and are likely to be difficult to implement. He further states that evaluations can and should vary from situation to situation, but are often conducted in an

impressionistic, ad-hoc and subjective way.

In fact, many researchers report that coursebooks are often selected by the so-called “flick-test” (Bell & Gower, 1998, p. 125) or the “30-second evaluation” (Byrd, 2001, p. 422). Garinger (2002) also notes that often things unrelated to teaching and learning such as “personal preference” (p. 1) are used.

While noting that an “impressionistic overview” (p. 1) can be useful for a preliminary assessment, Cunningsworth (1995) recommends an in-depth evaluation by means of a checklist. He further notes that there are three basic types of evaluation, pre-use, in-use and post-use. Pre-use focuses on the coursebook before it is implemented, in-use as it is being taught, and post-use after the end of the course.

The pre-use or predictive evaluation is an attempt to address the perceived needs of the learners and teachers, and to match the coursebook to the goals of the curriculum. However, both Ellis (1997) and Tomlinson (2012) note that the more optimal method of textbook selection is based on retrospective, or post-use evaluation. Retrospective evaluations consider issues such as the strengths and weaknesses of coursebooks after having been used in the classroom to investigate which elements of the materials were successful and why. A retrospective evaluation also allows teachers to clearly highlight important points that must be addressed in the selection of new materials.

A retrospective evaluation World Link Developing English Fluency 2

World Link Developing English Fluency 2 (2nd ed.) by Susan Stempleski, Nancy Douglas and James R. Morgan (2011), henceforth referred to as WL2, is a low-intermediate young adult/adult English language textbook for students at the CEFR B1 level (Overview, n.d.) and was used as the core required textbook for the Intermediate English Communication in term three and four in the 2014 academic year. The coursebook is marketed in Japan as part of Cengage Learning’s “Core Program” (National Geographic Cengage Learning, p. 10) and is marketed for use in general English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curricula.

After successfully using *English Firsthand 2* (Helgesen, Brown & Wiltshire, 2010), henceforth referred to as EFH2, as the core required textbook for the first year (term one and term two), Intermediate English Communication courses in academic 2013, teachers and students used WL2 for the second year (term three and four) Intermediate English Communication courses in academic 2014.

While WL2 was being used, two main issues were identified by teachers and brought to the attention of the program coordinators. First, WL2 may in fact have different educational purposes and goals than those of the Intermediate English Communication courses in the first year, specifically

the focus on speaking and listening proficiency, and second, that there was too much material to be covered in the allotted time.

First issue: different educational purposes EFL or EAP?

Over the course of the first semester that WL2 was being used, a number of teachers reported that they felt that WL2 was not an oral communication textbook, but an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) textbook with an oral communication focus.

Despite the publisher's marketing message that WL2 is a speaking oriented book, many of the learning activities that the students engage in are reading and writing activities. The publisher's message is not unfounded however, as on the surface WL2 does contain more speaking activities than reading and writing activities. For example, the middle unit in WL2, Unit Six, Lesson A, contains ten reading and writing activities, three listening activities, and thirteen speaking activities. These speaking activities are identified in the coursebook by a two-person icon. However, many of the activities identified by this icon are meta-discussions of the reading, writing, and grammar activities the students are asked to engage in. For example, on page 56, the students read a short passage, are given two reading comprehension questions, and are instructed to "answer the questions with a partner." In theory this is a speaking activity, but in practice instructors found that the students would read the passage silently to themselves, look for the answers to the questions and make notes or otherwise write the answers, and then simply share their answers with their partner by showing them their textbook. The majority of time spent was engaged in reading and writing, not speaking, even if the students did discuss the questions with a partner. Furthermore, for many of the speaking activities with pair icons the students were specifically directed to engage in this behavior. For example on page 59, the students are asked to "check their answers with a partner" after doing a series of grammar drills. Further complicating the issue was that while in theory these types of meta-discussion activities can be done in the target language with monolingual students in an EFL environment, in practice students usually reverted to their L1 for such activities. When these activities are removed from the count, so that only proper speaking activities are included, for example the activities found on page 58 in which the students are directed to, "practice the conversation with a partner," the number drops from thirteen to six. This issue of a lack of speaking activities with a communicative focus, and therefore a different educational purpose, is further complicated because, as noted by Mendel (2006), in the Lesson B sections of the units in the series, the speaking and listening subsections are replaced by reading and writing activities.

In the case of EAP, reading is generally considered to be most important skill students need to succeed in an English academic environment (Grabe & Stoller, 2104; Sauzier-Uchida, 2009) and an

EAP coursebook should have a large reading focus.

Finally, as noted by Ruegg and Brown (2014), coursebooks are not always used as the publishers intend them to be and the World Link series is often used as an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) text, not as a General English (GE) coursebook. The University of South Florida's English Language Program uses World Link as part of its EAP program, for example. Ruegg and Brown (2014) selected World Link as part of their analysis of vocabulary found in textbooks, which included Academic Word List (AWL) analysis.

These observations, the reading and writing focus, and the recognition by researchers and other programs that WL2 is an EAP textbook, support the conclusion that WL2 may in fact be an EAP textbook, not a speaking textbook and therefore not appropriate for the Intermediate English Communication course in the second year of the program in terms three and four.

Second issue: Coursebook organization and volume of material

EFH2 consists of twelve eight-page units, each with seven lessons organized around different skills or functions for a total of 115 pages, including review units. WL2 on the other hand consists of twelve 10-to-14 page units, each with two lessons, broken down into six or seven sub-lessons, again organized around different skills or functions for a total of 137 pages, including review units. EFH2 has 24-25 learning activities per unit; whereas, WL2 has anywhere from 38–44 learning activities per unit. According to the teacher's manual (Helgesen, Brown & Wiltshire, 2010), each unit in EFH2 can be completed in approximately three hours: two 90-minute classes or three 60-minute classes. WL2, while not providing a general timeframe for the course as a whole, did list approximate times for each learning activity in the lesson planner (Stempleski, Douglas, Morgan & Curtis, 2011). By adding the suggested times for each activity in unit one together, the recommended timeframe for completing the unit was approximately seven to eleven hours, more than double the time needed for EFH2. Depending on the measure, there is anywhere from 15% (total pages) to 72% (time to complete tasks) more material in WL2 than EFH2.

The reason for the significantly different amount of material may be related to the difference in educational purpose as stated above. Generally speaking, an EAP program offered by an English Language Institute (ELI) at an American university consists of four to six hours of study, four or five days per week. If WL2 were used as one of the core textbooks for such a program, seven to eleven hours of materials would be needed. In contrast, a typical EFL university course in Japan consists of one or two 90-minute classes per week.

Because of the large volume of material in WL2, it was necessary for teachers to skip activities in the text to maintain the schedule laid out in the syllabus of beginning a new unit every other week.

This created three main issues. First, one of the main reasons for using a common textbook is to insure that all of the students are studying the same thing. If there is too much material and the teachers are skipping, and not all skipping the same things, then the students may or may not be studying the same material across the various sections of the course. Second, it was possible for teachers to skip all of the speaking activities and focus only on the grammar, reading and writing activities, thereby changing the fundamental nature of the course from an oral communication course to a more traditional text-based skills course. Third, students may have felt that they were not getting the full value of the textbook they purchased.

Searching for a replacement for WL2

After identifying the issues with WL2 listed above, a working group was formed to conduct a series of new pre-use, predictive textbook evaluations to explore alternatives to WL2.

Existing checklists

The primary method used for evaluating textbooks for selection is by means of a checklist or rubric (Byrd, 2001; Byrd & Schuermann, 2014; Cunningham, 1995; Littlejohn, 1998; Mann & Copland, 2015; McGrath, 2002; Mukundan & Ahour, 2010), and yet, despite this common method, there is not widespread agreement on the criteria to be used for evaluating materials (McDonough, Shaw, & Masuhara, 2013). Mukundan & Ahour (2010) argue that published checklists provide the most accurate results because they have been tested for their reliability, but note that there are shortcomings of existing rubrics and that a clearer, more concise and flexible checklist would be more advantageous than the current existing ones. An opposite argument is that checklists should be created to match the specific learning and teaching situation for which they are to be used (Byrd & Schuermann, 2014; Mann & Copland, 2015; Rubdy, 2003).

After searching for up-to-date evaluation checklists, and finding few, and after a review of several published checklists (Brown, 1997; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Littlejohn, 1998), the working group felt that a new predictive evaluation checklist should be created, especially for the task of finding a replacement for WL2. In addition, it was necessary to base it on the retrospective evaluation feedback of WL2.

Developing a checklist: approach

As noted above, because students in the Intermediate English level courses all take the same end-of-semester Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) exam, one of the main concerns in finding a text-

book to replace WL2 was that it didn't disadvantage students in taking the OPI, as was the case with WL2, but also that it did not unfairly advantage the students on the OPI, for example by having learning activities specifically used for OPI exam preparation. Therefore, a significant concern for finding a new textbook was not only finding one that matched the curriculum but also was similar to the English Firsthand series both in terms of methodological approach and learning activities. Of further concern was that some teachers noted that the transition from EFH2 to WL2 was difficult for some students as the books had different organizational styles, pacing and volume of material. In the case of Elementary level students, the transition from English Firsthand Success textbooks used in the first year to the English Firsthand 1 textbook used in the second year was exceedingly simple because both books, being from the same series, were organized in the same way with same amount of lesson material and pacing.

Therefore, before a rubric could be created for use in analyzing possible replacements for WL2, an analysis was needed of the English Firsthand series. Fortunately, such an analysis had been undertaken by the working group writing the end-of-semester OPI and was made available to the intermediate level textbook replacement selection group. Whereas the OPI group was concerned with creating a test that covered all material in the English Firsthand series, the WL2 replacement group was only tasked with finding a textbook to continue on from EFH2, so the team decided to focus only on the analysis of EFH2.

This analysis identified EFH2 as an oral communication focused, four-skills general English EFL textbook using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Task Based Learning (TBL) methods and activities.

The analysis of the English Firsthand series by the OPI working group also identified all of the explicitly taught grammar and vocabulary, as well as the communicative goals and functions, and the themes and topics of the coursebooks. While it was important that the textbook to be used after EFH2 have the same methodology, types of learning activities, and be similarly organized, it was felt by the group members that the text should be sufficiently different in terms of grammar, vocabulary, communicative goals/functions, and themes/topics to insure that students were not simply repeating similar material from the previous year.

Based on this analysis, the checklist needed to have two main goals: 1) to identify a potential WL2 replacement that had the same theoretical underpinnings and types of learning activities; and 2) to identify a replacement text that had sufficiently different content.

Composing the checklist

With the two main goals listed above in mind, a fifteen question, six section checklist was created.

The questions used on the checklist were a mix of yes/no questions, used to determine if the candidate coursebook matched EFH2 in terms of absolute criteria, such as using CLT; and Likert scale questions used to determine how well the candidate textbook matched EFH2 in non-absolute areas where there might be overlap, such as how similar or different the theme and topics were to EFH2. Ideally, the replacement textbook would match perfectly in terms of methodologies and activities, and have no overlap in terms of themes, topics, grammar, communicative functions, etc. However, given the time limits, the available instructors to join the selection committee, and the fact that an exhaustive search reviewing all published textbooks would be impossible, as long as the candidate coursebook was sufficiently different from EFH2, some overlap would be tolerated.

Section one: General considerations

The first section of the checklist consisted of five yes/no questions. The purpose of these questions was to determine whether or not the candidate textbook met the general criteria to be a replacement for WL2. These questions quickly eliminate any candidate coursebooks that didn't meet the broad needs of the curriculum and department. Please see Table 1 for a list of the questions used in the general section of the checklist.

Table 1 *Questions 1–5: General Information*

Item Number	Question
1.	Is the text a communication focused book?
2.	Is the intended context EFL?
3.	Does the text include 'four skills' practice?
4.	Is there a workbook?
5.	Are there other supplementary materials (photocopy worksheets, student website, videos, etc.)?

Note: Items 1 through 5 reflect general information about the candidate coursebooks under review.

Question one was aimed at eliminating any coursebooks that had a reading and writing or other academic skills focus, similar to WL2, but different from the curriculum focus on oral communication skills. Question two was aimed at eliminating any coursebooks that, like WL2, seemed to be intended for an ESL audience in the United States or other English speaking countries. Although the primary focus of the curriculum was on oral communication, EFH2 was a four-skills textbook so it was important that any candidate books also include some reading and writing. Question three was designed to address this issue. Questions four and five were primarily written to address the teaching context of the department which has a large number of diverse instructors who require quick and easy ways to supplement and expand the material in the coursebook.

Section two: Coursebook organization and volume of material

One of the issues with WL2 was that the coursebook was organized in a manner very different from EFH2 and had significantly more material. Questions six, seven and eight address these issues. Please see Table 2 for a list of questions.

Table 2 *Questions 6–8: Organization and volume of material*

Item Number	Question
6.	How well does the text match the organization of English Firsthand? (12 units divided into 7 lessons)
7.	How well does the text match the amount content of English Firsthand? (40–60 minutes of material per unit)
8.	How similar is the ‘lesson flow’ of the text to English Firsthand? (Vocab → Listening → Conversation → Information Gap → Grammar → Free practice → Reading → Writing)

Note: Items 6 through 8 reflect general organization and volume of candidate coursebooks in comparison to the English First 2 used by students in the first year in term one and two.

For these questions, selection members were asked to rate the candidate coursebooks on how well they matched EFH2. They chose a score from one (does not match) to five (matches very well).

Section three: Approach, methods, and activities

In order to try to find materials that matched EFH2 as closely as possible, a coursebook that used a similar approach, methods and learning activities was critical. Using the definitions of approach, method and activities proposed by Richards and Rodgers (2001), the approach of EFH2 was identified as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The methods used are primarily Task Based Learning (TBL), along with a mix of direct method, the natural approach, and even some Total Physical Response (TPR). The learning activities include activities such as listening and identifying pictures, practicing scripted dialogues, and information gap tasks, to name just a few. Two questions were used to ascertain how similar the candidate coursebook was to EFH2. Reviewers were asked to rate the books as a five for very similar and one for not similar. Please see Table 3 for these questions.

Table 3 *Questions 9–10: Methods and Activities*

Item Number	Question
9.	How similar are methodologies used in the text to English Firsthand 2?
10.	How similar are activities used in the text to English Firsthand 2?

Note: Items 9 and 10 reflect methods and activities of candidate coursebooks in comparison to the English First 2 used by students in the first year in term one and two.

Section four: Themes and topics

The working group decided that the new book should be sufficiently different in terms of themes and topics to give the students as much variety as possible. Realistically, some overlap was inevitable as most EFL coursebooks constrained by PARSNIPS, a ban on topics related to politics, alcohol, religion, sex, narcotics, isms, and pork, have similar themes and topics (Thornbury, 2006). Only one question, Number 11, was needed to address this issue: How much do the themes/topics differ from English Firsthand 2? Reviewers marked their answers as a five for highly different and one for similar.

Section five: Language and functions

Again, the working group decided that the ideal textbook should not simply repeat the same grammar, vocabulary, and communicative purposes and functions as EFH2. Three questions were devised to identify how similar the candidate coursebook was to EFH2 in these areas. Again, reviewers were asked to rate their responses as a five for highly different and a one for similar. Please see Table 4 for these questions.

Table 4 *Questions 12–14: Language and Functions*

Item Number	Question
12.	How much does the explicitly taught grammar differ from English Firsthand 2?
13.	How much does the explicitly taught vocabulary differ from English Firsthand 2?
14.	How much do the communicative purposes/functions differ from English Firsthand 2?

Note: Items 12 through 14 reflect specific language and language functions of candidate coursebooks in comparison to the English First 2 used by students in the first year in term one and two.

Section six: Overall impressions

The final question of the checklist asked working group members to give their overall impression, based on their experience and intuition, about the suitability of the candidate coursebook. The question was: How suitable is this text in your opinion for the 3rd & 4th semester of the communication curriculum? They were asked to express their opinion in response to the question as five for highly suitable and one for not suitable.

These fifteen questions spilt over six sections totalling 60 points. The five yes/no questions of section one were worth two points each for a total of ten points and the remaining ten Likert-type scale questions were worth five points each for a total of 50 points. The candidate coursebook that scored the highest overall would be given priority for implementation in the 2015 academic year beginning in April, 2015.

Implementation of the checklist

Initially, a two-stage evaluation process as suggested by McGrath (2002) was considered. The first stage would be the preliminary “first-glance” (p. 29) evaluation to determine basic compatibility and the second a more in-depth analysis to determine the appropriateness of the candidate coursebook. However, the initial deadline to finish conducting the candidate coursebook evaluations was moved up from January to November, therefore the first-stage evaluation had to be dropped.

Instead, the working group chair approached the main international publishers: Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press, Macmillan English, National Geographic Learning, and Pearson, and asked them to nominate one or more of their textbooks that they felt best-matched the English Firsthand series for consideration by the working group. Cambridge University Press and Macmillan English both failed to nominate any titles, and Pearson, the publisher of EFH2, indicated that no other coursebooks in their catalog would be appropriate. Please see Table 5 for a list of the textbooks nominated to the working group by publisher representatives.

Table 5 Candidate coursebooks

Coursebook Title	Publisher
<i>Smart Choice 3</i> (Wilson & Boyle, 2012)	Oxford University Press
<i>Stretch 3</i> (Stempleski, 2014)	Oxford University Press
<i>Inspire 3</i> (Hartmann, Douglas & Boon, 2014)	National Geographic Learning

Note: List of candidate coursebooks nominated by publisher representatives.

Although not an ideal solution, using information from publishers to determine an initial list of coursebooks for evaluation has been suggested by others (Cunningsworth, 1995). This change eliminated one of the steps for choosing a new textbook and sped-up the process significantly by quickly reducing the number of candidate coursebooks. It was felt that this was a reasonable compromise because the publisher representatives know their own catalogs best, but also regularly frame suggestions to teachers in terms of coursebooks being similar to other books on offer by their competitors. Each publishers who responded expressed a familiarity with the English Firsthand series, and was able to nominate a coursebook they felt would follow the communicative English curriculum and be a reasonable match the English Firsthand.

The working group then evaluated inspection copies of the candidate textbooks along with the checklist. The working group members then individually scored the candidate textbooks using the checklist and discussed the total results.

Results

In order to avoid peer influence, the working group members reviewed each candidate coursebook independently. After finishing, the working group met for a final time and reviewed the consolidated scores. Please see Table 6 for a summary of these scores and Appendix B for the complete analysis. Based on the summary of scores, and discussion of the candidate coursebooks, *Smart Choice 3* (Wilson & Boyle, 2012) was chosen by the working group to be recommended as a replacement textbook for WL2.

Table 6 Summary of reviewer scores

Coursebook	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Total Score
Inspire 3	29	38	42	40	139
Smart Choice 3	57	56	50	44	207
Stretch 3	51	50	48	43	192

Note: Summary of reviewer scores of candidate coursebooks.

Discussion

While there was considerable variation in scores generated by each individual reviewer—and no reviewer gave the same score to the same candidate coursebook as another reviewer—it is interesting to note that the overall rankings were consistent across all four reviewers. Namely that all four reviewers ranked *Smart Choice 3* (Wilson & Boyle, 2012) as the best replacement for WL2 and all four reviewers ranked *Inspire 3* (Stempleski, 2014) as the least appropriate replacement. A norming session was not conducted prior to implementation of the checklist and may account for the lack of interrater reliability. While the variation in individual scores may call into question the reliability of the checklist, the consistency of the overall ranking would seem to confirm the validity of the checklist.

Finally, despite the issue of interrater reliability, the working group was able to easily come to a unanimous decision, and all members felt comfortable with the nomination of *Smart Choice 3* (Wilson & Boyle, 2012). One non working-group member who attended the final meeting where the candidate coursebooks were discussed and the scores were consolidated as an observer noted that the process of coming to a decision on a textbook was easy and equitable.

In conclusion, although revision may be needed, the process of creating a context specific checklist used for evaluating candidate coursebooks to be used by a number of teachers in a large program is recommended. Provided that the criteria used to create the checklist are well thought out, creat-

ing a new checklist can systematize an often impressionistic and subjective task.

Conclusion

Over the years, many different attempts have been made to create a checklist for materials evaluation that would be universally applicable to many different contexts. However, as this report demonstrates, the best course of action for any given context is to review several different evaluations and determine to what criteria will provide the most objective and applicable results. When given a choice of predictive or retrospective evaluation, it is clear that the predictive evaluation is the easiest, however, the retrospective framework for evaluation provides teachers with the most pedagogically sound results to base their decisions.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to the non-author members of the textbook selection group, Matthew Coomber and Justine Ross, for their contributions to the checklist creation and scoring processes.

References

- Brown, J. B. (1997). Textbook evaluation form. *The Language Teacher*, 21(10).
- Byrd, P. (2001). Textbooks: Evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation. In M. Celce-Mucia (ed.) *Teaching English a Second of Foreign Language*, (3rd ed.) (pp. 415–424). Boston: Heinle & Heinle/Thompson Learning.
- Byrd, P., & Schuemann, C. (2014). English as a second/foreign language textbooks: How to choose them—how to use them. In M. Celce-Murica, D. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 380–393). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Cengage learning. (n.d.) *Overview* [Brochure]. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning Cengage Learning.
- Chambers, F. (1997). Seeking consensus in coursebook evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 29–35.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 36–42.
- Garinger, D. (2002). Textbook selection for the ESL classroom. (ERIC Digest). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EDO-FL-02-10).
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2014). Teaching reading for academic purposes. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 189–274), Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Hartmann, P. Douglas, N. & Boon, A. (2014). Inspire 3. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Helgesen, M., Brown, S., & Wiltshier, J. (2010). *English firsthand 2* (2nd ed.). Hong Kong: Pearson-Longman Asia ELT.
- Helgesen, M., Brown, S., & Wiltshier, J. (2010). *English firsthand 2 teacher's manual*. Hong Kong: Pearson-Longman Asia ELT.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlejohn, A. (1998) The analysis of language teaching materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in*

- language teaching* (pp. 190–216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mann, S. & Copland, F. (2015). *Materials Development*. Washington D.C.: TESOL Press.
- McDonough, J., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Meddings, L. (2004). Throw away your textbooks. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2004/mar/26/tefl.lukemeddings/>
- Mendel, R. (2006). Review of world link intro – student book and video course. *Language Learning & Technology*, 10(3), 19–26.
- Mukundan, J., & Ahour, T. (2010). A review of textbook evaluation checklists across four decades (1970–2008) (pp. 336–352). In B. Tomlinson & Masuhara, H. (eds.) *Research for Materials Development in Language Learning: Evidence for Best Practice*. London: Continuum.
- National Geographic Learning Cengage Learning. (2015). Japan ELT Catalog [Catalog]. Tokyo, Japan: National Geographic Learning Cengage Learning.
- Richards, J. C. (1993). Beyond the textbook: The role of commercial materials in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, 24(1), 1–14.
- Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rudby, R. B. (2003). Selection of materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 37–57). London, England: Continuum.
- Ruegg, R., & Brown, C. (2014). Analysing the Effectiveness of Textbooks for Vocabulary Retention. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, 3(2), 11–18.
- Sauzier-Uchida, E. (2009). Designing and evaluating an EAP reading textbook: English for Political Science and Economics. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1–21.
- Sheldon, L. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 237–246.
- Sousa, D. & Hurst, N. (2011). Weighing the anchor: A critical approach to course book selection. *APPI Journal*, 11(1), 22–26.
- Stempleski, S., Douglas, N., & Morgan, J. R. (2011) *World link developing English fluency 2* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Stempleski, S., Douglas, N., Morgan, J. R., & Curtis, A. (2011) *World link developing English fluency 2 lesson planner*. Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Stempleski, S. (2014). *Stretch 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swales, J. (1980). ESP: The textbook problem. *The ESP Journal*, 1(1), 11–23.
- Thornbury, S. (2006). *An A to Z of ELT*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). Materials evaluation. In B. Tomlinson (ed.) *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 15–36). London: Continuum.
- Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 45(2), 143–179. doi:10.1017/20261444811000528.
- Wilson, K. & Boyle, M. (2012) *Smart Choice 3* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix A: All reviewer data

Question Scores

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total
Reviewer 1																
Inspire	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	5	0	5	4	2	29
Smart	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4.5	4.5	5	57
Stretch	2	2	2	2	2	4	5	3	4	2	3	5	5	5	4	51
Reviewer 2																
Inspire	2	2	2	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	5	5	5	3	1	38
Smart	2	2	2	2	2	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	56
Stretch	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	5	4	5	50
Reviewer 3																
Inspire	2	2	0	0	2	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	4	4	3	42
Smart	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	4	2	2	2	5	50
Stretch	2	2	2	0	2	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	48
Reviewer 4																
Inspire	0	2	0	2	2	3	3	1	3	3	5	5	5	5	1	40
Smart	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	3	3	2	2	2	2	5	44
Stretch	0	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	5	1	43

大学英語教育における教科書選択と 評価のプロセスに関する一考察：

オーラル・コミュニケーション（中級）における実践

キャメロン ロムニー

ホールズワース マイケル

要 旨

本稿では、大学英語教育におけるコミュニケーション・コースの教材を選択する際に活用した選択過程と評価基準に関して考察する。第一に、カリキュラムの構成を概観し、新たな教材選択に至った問題点を明らかにする。第二に、教科書選択に関する問題点を指摘し、教科書選定の際に作成した具体的な評価項目がどのように活用されたか考察する。最後に、教科書選択の結果とその選択過程に関して論じ、今後の英語教育や英語カリキュラムに関して考察する。

キーワード：共通教科書、教科書の選択、選択の基準、選択の評価、コミュニケーション