

Coursebook Appraisal: Case of Hung Vuong University

Luu Trong Tuan

Ho Chi Minh City University for Natural Resources and Environment

&

Hung Vuong University, Vietnam

E-mail: luutrongtuan@vnn.vn

Received: August 13, 2011

Accepted: September 20, 2011

Published: March 1, 2012

doi:10.5539/ass.v8n3p192

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n3p192>

Abstract

Most EFL learners wish to have been taught speaking skill through appropriate coursebook at university. Nonetheless, choosing and evaluating an appropriate coursebook for each group of learners is a challenge. The findings divulge that both teachers and students had positive attitudes on task content and task presentation in each chapter and teachers' exploitation of content and task in the coursebook. Nonetheless, issues on themes and difficult sections were found. This research provides a foundation for decision-making in terms of withdrawing or maintaining the use of a coursebook. In the case of continued use of the coursebook at Hung Vuong University, Vietnam, the research provides EFL teachers with some guidelines on the process of adaptation or supplementation of the coursebook.

Keywords: Coursebook appraisal, Coursebook design, Listening, Speaking, EFL

1. Introduction

Besides the recognition of the magnitude of the oral skill development, teachers and learners have to appreciate the value of developing of the learners' listening and speaking skills "not merely so that they can pass examinations but also for more general use when they wish to use their English in the outside world." (Underwood, 1989, p. ix).

However, at Faculty of Tourism at Hung Vuong University, the students studying listening and speaking skills through the coursebook *High Season* have not achieved what had been expected. Through students' reflections, the students said that the *High Season* was difficult for them to study due to the influence of learning styles acquired from high school. They found that it is hard to adjust to skill-based lessons. They had many problems with each skill, especially, oral skills. For example, in a listening lesson they could not follow a long conversation in some strange topics with many new words, and different and strange voices produced at fast speed. They had to listen to the recording many times, but they did not understand what the speakers said. It took them a lot of time to listen to one task, but at last they usually had to look at the audioscript to find the correct answers. Besides, in some speaking classes the students felt hard or did not have many ideas to discuss or talk about some certain topics.

As a result, it requires a survey to find out the attitudes of the teachers and students on the coursebook *High Season* by Harding and Henderson (2008). This research was guided by the ensuing questions:

What are students' and teachers' attitudes on

the layout of the coursebook?

the content of the parts in each chapter of the coursebook?

the ways in which the content and tasks in the coursebook are exploited in terms of teaching and learning?

Are there any relationships between students' and teachers' attitudes on

the layout of the coursebook?

the content of the parts in each chapter of the coursebook?

the ways in which the content and tasks in the coursebook are exploited in terms of teaching and learning?

2. Literature review

2.1 Principles of coursebook design or material development

Tomlinson (1998, pp. 7-21) suggested a set of 16 principles and each of which was discussed in detail. These principles are very valuable when they are explained and demonstrated with the examples to indicate how they could be applied. Among above principles, some principles relate to language learning and the others are about the general beliefs in learning and satisfy the need of learner differences and facilitation.

According to McGrath (2002, p.154), “Nunan (1988b, p. 1) showed how the principles were realised in a particular set of material”, but his remarkable principles attaches special importance to the curriculum and the latter pays attention to developing learners’ ability in their learning strategies and learning autonomy.

Next, Nunan (1988a, p. 99) reported that in a learner-centred approach, experienced teacher found the more useful materials with the following characteristics:

The materials can be exploited in a variety of ways;

The materials should reflect the outside world (authenticity of text and task);

The materials should foster independent learning by making the learners “more aware of the learning process” (e.g. building self-evaluation and assessment into the tasks);

The materials should be suitable for mixed groups of learners with different proficiency levels and preferred learning styles;

The materials should act as a model for teachers to develop their own variations.

The materials should also reflect the sociocultural context within which they be used.

Rossner (1988, p. 143), discussing teacher’s expectations of materials, sees the impact of communicative principles as being most clearly visible in the following. Material will:

provide ‘comprehensive input’ for generalised rehearsal of skills and ‘activation’ of learners’ interlanguage repertoire;

raise learners’ awareness about language, communication, learning, etc.;

provide experiences of communication in the new language similar or parallel to those likely to be encountered beyond the learning situation.

(cited in McGrath, 2002, p. 155)

Hutchinson and Walters’ (1987) approach to the formulation of principles, like that of Rossner, is to start from intended effect of the materials, or as they put it, ‘what materials are supposed to do (p. 107). Their principles are paraphrased below. Material should:

act as a stimulus to learning (e.g. texts are interesting; there are opportunities for learners to use their existing knowledge and skills; both teacher and learners can cope with the context);

help to organise the teaching-learning process (e.g. there should be a clear and coherence structure which help the teacher to plan lessons and learners to feel a sense of progress and achievement, but the structure should not be so rigid that monotony results);

embody a view of the nature of teaching and learning (i.e. reflect the beliefs of the writer);

reflect the nature of the learning task – in this case, *language* learning (i.e. represent the complexity of language learning but also its manageability);

provide models of correct and appropriate language use.

(cited in McGrath, 2002, p. 155)

Bell and Gower (1998, pp. 122-125) “decided on a set of key principles in details when they wrote a coursebook”. Here are the headings of the principles: Flexibility, From text to language, Engaging content, Natural language, Analytic approaches, Emphasis on review, Personalised practice, Integrated skills, Balance of approaches, Learner development, and Professional respect.

In addition, according to Crawford (2002), effective teaching materials included the following characteristics:

Language is functional and must be contextualised

Language development requires learner engagement in purposeful use of language

The language used should be realistic and authentic

Classroom materials will usually seek to include an audio visual component

In our modern, technologically complex world, second language learners need to develop the ability to deal with written as well as spoken genres

Effective teaching materials foster learner autonomy

Materials need to be flexible enough to cater to individual and contextual differences

Learning needs to engage learners both affectively and cognitively

(pp. 84-87)

Additionally, it is necessary for a textbook to develop the learning autonomy. Fenner and Newby (2000) also raised the relationship between autonomy and textbooks. For instance, “by adhering to certain principles in the texts and tasks provided, the book can assist and promote an approach to self-directed learning” (p. 78). Tomlinson (2010, p. 90) incorporate the above views into three principles of materials development:

Make sure the texts and tasks are as interesting, relevant, and enjoyable as possible so as to exert a positive influence on the learners’ attitudes to the language and to the process of learning it.

Set achievable challenges, which help to raise the learners’ self-esteem when success is accomplished.

Stimulate emotive responses through the use of music, song, literature, art, and so on, through making use of controversial and provocative texts, through personalization, and through inviting learners to articulate their feelings about a text before asking them to analyze it.

In a nutshell, although different theorists state many principles of coursebooks design and materials development, most of them have the some common principles. Firstly, the materials should meet the learners’ differences and facilitate the learners’ learning. Moreover, materials ought to be authentic and make learner feel at ease or feel interested. In addition, the materials have to develop language skills to the outside world beyond classroom. Besides, the materials should encourage learner autonomy. However, not many theorists discussed about coursebooks design and materials development related to curriculum and syllabus.

2.2 Instruments for choosing and appraising coursebooks or materials

In Tomlinson’s (1998, p.xi) standpoint, materials evaluation is “the systematic appraisal of the value of materials in relation to their objectives and to the objectives of the learners using them”. He also determined that evaluation can be pre-use to predict potential value, whilst-use to understand and to describe “what the learners are actually doing whilst the materials are being used”, and post-use to analyse the result of using the materials.

Rea-Dickins and Germaine (2009) stated that general evaluation purposes are for three principal reasons: (1) accountability, (2) curriculum development and betterment, and (3) self-development: teachers and other language teaching professionals (p. 23). On evaluating classroom learning materials, they propose that evaluation criteria should concern the purposes and content of language learning as well as the procedures of text and task performance in the classroom (p. 34).

According to Dublin and Olshtain (1986, pp. 29-30), “in surveying the existing materials, it is necessary to develop questions as an aid for evaluating them”. They suggest considering the following questions:

By whom and where the materials developed? Were they produced for the international market which at best is concerned with the broadest possible definition of the target population?

Are the materials compatible with the syllabus?

Do most of the materials provide alternatives for teachers and learners?

Which language skills do the materials cover?

How authentic are the text types included in the materials?

How do learners and teachers who have used the materials feel about them?

When the only documents to be examined are commercial textbooks in use, it is necessary to mind the following questions:

Do the commercial textbooks in use contain statements about educational and linguistic point of view? Do these policy statements coincide with the views held by the teachers using the materials? Or, are the teachers, themselves, aware of such educational and linguistic orientations?

How have the teachers using the textbooks adapted them to the timeframe and other constraints of the course?

Do the teachers make any cultural adaptations with the textbooks?

Do they see the textbook as serving the goals of their students in terms of examinations to higher levels of education or higher levels in the language program?

What adaptations do teachers make to fit local attitudes toward language learning?

Many scholars suggested several criteria, guidelines, or checklists for evaluation or selection of textbooks. Cooker (2008) criticises Reinders and Lewis (2006) for listing surface level criteria for materials which “do not address real learning issues.” She quite rightly insists that criteria for evaluating materials should be based on such core principles as “the ability to interest and engage learners, to be meaningful and challenging and to have a sustained positive impact” (Cooke, 2008, pp. 128-129).

By and large, there is very great literature on textbook selection and textbook evaluation procedure. Several scholars have offered various guidelines, checklists or questions based on general and different criteria to help teachers choose and evaluate a textbook systematically. Nevertheless, a clear formula or system may not ever supply a definite way to evaluate a textbook. The salient features in criteria for choosing and evaluating the textbook of most of the authors are considering the content, the layout and design, topics, and skills (but four skills in general coursebooks). A checklist to judge a specific skill textbook such as listening, speaking, reading, or writing cannot be found.

2.3 Exploiting, adapting and supplementing coursebooks or materials

Discussing what a good coursebook is, Harmer (2007) wrote,

With a good coursebook, there is a strong possibility that the language, content and sequencing in the book will be appropriate, and that the topics and treatment of the different language skills will be attractive. As a result, the teacher will want to go ahead and use what is in the book. (Harmer, 2007, p. 146)

Therefore, good exploitation of the textbooks or materials is very necessary because “exploitation is the creative use of what is already there (e.g. text, visual, activity) to serve a purpose which is *additional* to that foreseen by the textbook writer” (McGrath, 2002, p. 65). “Teachers need strategies for working with the book open and closed.” “Teachers also need specific strategies for handling coursebook presentation material, practice material, and skills development material” (Davies and Pearse, 2000, p. 150).

In contrast, if the coursebook is not appropriate for a particular group of students, the teachers have four alternatives to consider. They are omitting lessons from coursebook, replacing the coursebook lesson, adding activities and exercises to the coursebook, or adapting what is in the book (Harmer, 2007, pp. 146-147).

Also, Ur (1996, p. 189) suggested that “most commercially produced materials can be adapted to fit a range of needs and goals not originally envisaged by the materials writers”. According to Tomlinson (1998), material adaptation is “making changes to materials in order to improve them or to make them more suitable for a particular type of learners.” In addition, “adaptation can include reducing, adding, omitting, modifying, and supplementing. Most teachers adapt materials every time they use a textbook in or to maximize the value of the book for their particular learners” (p. xi). Supplementary materials are “materials designed to be in addition to the core materials of a course. They are usually related to the development of skills of reading, writing, listening or speaking rather than to the learning of language items” (p. xiii).

Maley (1998, pp. 281-283) advised that teachers can “use some or all of the following strategies to make the published course bearable, or more effective:”

“Give it a rest”: Teachers introduce additional material to restore interest or supply light relief such as songs, rhymes, games, cartoons, off-air recordings, video clips, etc.

“Change it”: Teachers can adapt materials by using several options such as omission, addition, reduction, extension, rewriting/ modification, replacement, re-ordering, branching.

“Do it yourself”: Teachers can use “Scissors and Paste” and “the process option”.

Concisely, there is no book perfect in itself or for a particular learning situation. The teachers have to know how to make a textbook work by exploiting, adapting and supplementing it in some way to meet their own specific learners and teaching situation (Davies and Pearse, 2000, p. 150).

3. Methodology

3.1 Samples

There are two samples – student sample and teacher sample – in this research. Expert sampling which is one type of nonprobability sampling that is not random selection was used to select the samples of students and teachers. “Expert sampling involves the assembling of a sample of persons with known or demonstrable experience and expertise in some area” (Trochim, 2005, p. 42).

3.1.1 Student sample

82 second-year students from Faculty of Tourism at Hung Vuong University, who just finished studying the coursebook *High Season*, were selected as the sample for this research. The female students outnumbered those of the opposite gender: 65 girls (79.3%) vs. 17 boys (20.7%).

3.1.2 Teacher sample

Eight teachers who had experiences on teaching the coursebook *High Season* were invited to participate in this study. Among these teachers, six are female (75%) and two are male (25%).

3.2 Instruments

This survey used two sets of questionnaires: questionnaire for students and questionnaire for teachers. The questionnaires were employed to collect the data since “language surveys are any survey research studies that gather data on the characteristics and views of informants about the nature of language or language learning through the use of oral interviews or written questionnaires” (Brown, 2001, p. 2). Moreover, “the questionnaire is a relatively popular means of collecting data” as “it enables the researcher to collect data in field settings, and the data themselves are more amenable to quantification than discursive data such as free-form fieldnotes, participant observers’ journals, and the transcripts of oral language” (Nunan, 1992, p. 143). Besides, the advantages of questionnaires are that “they can be administered simultaneously to many respondents and require only one person for administration” and “they provide permanent and exact records of respondents’ answers” (Genesee and Upshur, 1996, p. 132).

3.2.1 Questionnaire for students

The Questionnaire for students was written in Vietnamese to help students understand it easily, so getting the data from the students was faster and more exact. It consists of 38 questions in two parts:

Part A – Background information is demographic/ background questions, including six questions (with six items) and students gave the answers by filling the blanks.

Part B – Students’ attitudes on the coursebook *High Season* comprises 32 questions.

Most of the questions (21) with many items (54) expect the responses on a five-point Likert-type scale (1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Partially Disagree, 3: Uncertain, 4: Partially Agree, and (5): Strongly Agree). “One familiar type, the Likert scale, presents not questions but statements and ask for degrees of agreement” (McDonough and McDonough, 1997, p. 176). These items are main content of the questionnaire since “Likert-scale questions are effective for gathering respondent’s views, opinions, and attitudes about various language-related issue” (Brown, 2001, p. 41).

Some of the questions (7) with many items (70) are multiple choice (63) and open-ended questions (7). Besides, two questions are yes/ no questions with two open answers if the answers are yes. These questions aim to get more information for the responses on Likert-scale questions since “many questionnaires include open-ended questions to allow the respondents to feel that they can contribute more individual points of view and more detailed information than is elicited in closed questions” (McDonough and McDonough, 1997, p. 176).

3.2.2 Questionnaire for teachers

The other questionnaire was used for collecting the information from the teachers in written form in English. The questionnaire for teachers comprises 34 questions in two parts:

Part A – Background information is demographic/ background questions, including three questions three items) and teachers answer by filling the blanks.

Part B – Teachers’ attitudes on the coursebook *High Season* is opinion/ value questions. This questionnaire is relatively similar to the questionnaire for students but it has 33 questions. There are few questions for teachers different from students’ ones (asking teachers more about exploitation of speaking activities).

Specifically, 21 questions with 51 items expect the responses on a five-point Likert-type scale (1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Partially Disagree, 3: Uncertain, 4: Partially Agree, and (5): Strongly Agree). Moreover, 8 questions consist of 59 items of multiple choice and 6 items open-ended questions. Besides, four questions are yes/ no questions with four opened answers if the answers are yes.

3.2.3 Piloting the questionnaires

Before officially used this study, the questionnaire for students was piloted with fifteen students. The reliability of the piloted questionnaire was Cronbach alpha (α) = .728. Since “the most commonly reported internal consistency reliability in survey research is Cronbach alpha” (Brown, 2001, p. 173), the result showed that the questionnaire for students was reliable and could be used for collecting the data of the research.

4. Findings and discussions

4.1 Students' and teachers' attitudes on the coursebook layout

4.1.1 Students' and teacher's general preferences of the coursebook layout

The survey showed the general trend that the students and teachers liked the layout of the book.

<Insert Table 1 here>

Table 1 reveals that the total mean score of students' general preference of the layout ($M = 3.68$) and that of teachers' ($M = 3.66$) are over the scale 3 in the five-point scale. In other words, the two means are higher than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire. This indicates the level of students' and teacher's preferences of the coursebook layout are high. Therefore, students and teachers had positive attitudes toward the layout of the coursebook.

4.1.2 The reasons that teachers and students liked the layout of the book

<Insert Table 2 here>

As is shown by the Table 2, there is a difference between the students' and teachers' reasons of liking the layout. The students liked the layout of the coursebook since *it has enough spaces (in boxes and outlines) for necessary information* with the mean score ($M = .54$) which is higher the mid level of the Low = 0 (yes) and the High = 1 (no). On the other hand, the teachers liked the layout of the coursebook because *it has many effective highlightings* ($M = .65$) and *it has suitable spaces between words and lines* ($M = .52$).

4.1.3 The reasons that teachers and students liked the organization of the book

<Insert Table 3 here>

As the Table 3 shows, the students and teachers also liked the organization of the book because of available *Skill index* with the students' mean score ($M = .56$) and the teachers' one ($M = .62$). Besides, the coursebook has *Vocabulary index* with the mean score ($M = .58$) and the *Script* with the mean score ($M = .72$) are also the reasons that the students like the organization of the book while *Table of contents* with the mean score ($M = .61$) is also one of the reasons that the teachers liked the organization of the coursebook.

4.1.4 Feelings about the chapter structure

<Insert Table 4 here>

Each chapter monotonously follows the same predictable parts and sequences of exercises made the students feel that this book is easy to study (students' mean score $M = .65$ and teachers' $M = .62$) although it is *bored* because of this mean score of the students $M = .34$ and that of the teachers $M = .52$) (See Table 4).

As Harmer (1991) said, “teachers who over-use a textbook and thus repeated follow the sequence in each unit may become boring over a period of time for they find themselves teaching the same type of activities in the same order again and again. Meanwhile, “students may find the study of English becoming routine and thus less and less motivating” (p. 257).

In a nutshell, the layout of the book made the students and teachers satisfied. Nevertheless, some teachers thought that the coursebook has “small/ short exercises so students do not lose focus” and “the book is laid out the same for each chapter” made them feel like the organization of the coursebook. Another reason that the students liked the layout of the coursebook is logically sequencing and interesting exercises. The students also liked the coursebook because it was presented in chapters and parts. Besides, there is a script to check again after listening, so they felt it interested.

4.2 Students' and teachers' attitudes on the coursebook content

4.2.1 Students' and teacher's general preferences of the coursebook content

The general tendency from the survey revealed that students and teachers liked the content of the book.

<Insert Table 5 here>

As seen in Table 5, the total mean score of students' general preference of the coursebook content ($M = 3.87$) and that of teachers' ($M = 3.85$) are over the scale 3 in the five-point scale. In other words, the two means are higher than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire. This indicates the level of students' and teacher's preferences of the coursebook content are high. Therefore, students and teachers had positive attitudes towards the content of the coursebook.

4.2.2 The themes that students and teachers preferred

Specifically, the themes that they preferred are *Reservations and check-in* and *Dealing with complaints* because the total mean scores of the students ($M = 4.48$ and 4.47) and that of the teachers ($M = 4.76$ and 4.52) of the themes that they liked are the highest mean scores in the ten themes. However, the degree of the teachers' like in the theme - *Reservations and check-in* ($M = 4.76$) was higher than that of the students ($M = 4.48$). In addition, to the theme *Reservations and check-in*, the level of the teachers' like is more stable than the students' one because the standard deviation of the mean score of the teacher ($SD = .32$) is lower than that of the students ($SD = .81$) (see Table 6)

<Insert Table 6 here>

In contrast, Table 7 displays that students and teachers disliked three themes: *Staffing and internal organization*, *Conferences*, and *Money matters* with the lowest means scores. The mean scores of students about these themes liked in order are $M = 3.54$, 3.65 , and 3.87 and those of the teachers are $M = 2.27$, 3.48 , and 3.12 .

Nonetheless, *Money matters* and *Staffing and internal organization* are the two themes that students and teachers disliked but the levels of students' and teachers' dislikes were different. The total mean score of the students in *Money matters* is 3.87 and that of the teachers is 3.12 . These things indicate that there was a rather large difference between students' and teacher's dislike of this theme. The level of teachers' dislike was higher than that of the students. Similarly, in the theme *Staffing and internal organization* the total mean score of the students ($M = 3.54$) is very higher than that of the teachers ($M = 2.27$) which means that the differences between two groups were very large. Consequently, teachers disliked this theme very much higher than the students did.

<Insert Table 7 here>

4.2.3 The easy and challenging themes

The themes that can easily be discussed or considered as "easy" themes are *Reservations and check-in* and *Types of accommodation* with the total mean scores of the students ($M = 4.65$ and 4.57) and teacher's ($M = 4.61$ and 4.76) in terms of the themes that they can easily discuss (see Table 8). Nevertheless, the feeling of all teachers about these easy themes is fixed since the low standard of deviation of the teachers' mean score about *Reservations and check-in* is $.51$ and that about *Types of accommodation* is $.48$. Meanwhile, the higher standard deviation of the students' mean score about *Reservations and check-in* is $.71$ and that about *Types of accommodation* is $.88$. This proclaims that there was a wide disparity between the students' and teacher's views around the mean scores of easy themes.

<Insert Table 8 here>

On the other hand, Table 9 shows that students thought that five themes: *The business traveller*, *Hotel facilities*, *Conferences*, *Staffing and internal organization*, *Money matters* were challenging themes. The mean scores of students about these themes in order are $M = 1.47$, 2.75 , 2.87 , 2.90 , and 2.98 . All of these mean scores are under the scale 3 in the five-point scale. Also, the teachers considered only two themes - *The business traveller* and *Conferences* are challenging themes since the mean scores of the teachers about the themes that can easily be discussed in order are $M = 2.24$ and 2.72 and both of them are under 3 in the five-point scale. To the teachers, they thought that there were fewer challenging themes for students. Clearly, there was a difference between the students' and teachers' views on the "challenging" themes although they had the general views on only two "challenging" themes - *The business traveller* and *Conferences*.

<Insert Table 9 here>

4.2.4 The reasons why the students can not easily discuss on the themes

As illustrated in Table 10, the reasons that they can not easily discuss about these themes are *strange topic* and *lack of knowledge about the topic* with the total mean scores of students ($M = .55$ and $.64$) while those of teachers ($M = .83$ and $.98$) in the multiple-choice answers (coded that choosing: *yes* = 1, not choosing: *no* = 0) in the questionnaire. They are over the mid-point $.5$. In particular, to the reasons - *lack of knowledge about the topic*, the level of dispersion of the students' response around the mean score ($SD = .53$) is too high comparing with the one of the teachers' ($SD = .01$). In other words, there was a big difference between the students in this response while almost 100% teachers agreed that this reason made students difficult to talk about the themes easily.

<Insert Table 10 here>

Obviously, the students and teachers liked most of the popular themes that would occur daily in their future career life. Like Stern's (1992) suggestion, themes or topics should "reflect the needs of learners, their real or presumed interests, or some other (for example, education) rationale" (p. 169).

4.2.5 Authenticity of the language used in the coursebook

It can be seen from the Table 11, the total mean score of students about the real life English language ($M = 4.09$) and that of teachers ($M = 4.01$) are over the scale 3 in the five-point scale. In other words, the two means are higher than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire, indicating that the level of students' and teacher's views on the authentic language used in the coursebook are high. Therefore, students and teachers assumed that the language used in the coursebook is real life English.

<Insert Table 11 here>

4.2.6 Level of relevance of language used in the coursebook

As the Table 12 displays, the total mean score of students about the relevance of language used in coursebook ($M = 3.71$) and that of teachers about this ($M = 3.73$) are over the scale 3 in the five-point scale or the two means are higher than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire. This shows that the level of students' and teachers' views on the relevance of language are high. Therefore, students and teachers thought that the language used in the coursebook is relevant to students' level.

<Insert Table 12 here>

The language used in this coursebook is authentic and rather relevant to the students' levels. The use of language is authentic since it has great utility in daily life. According to Crawford (2002), in effective teaching materials "language used should be realistic and authentic" as "the more realistic the language, the more easily it can cater to the range of proficiency levels found in many class" (p. 85). Moreover, "authentic language and real world tasks enable students to see the relevance of classroom activities to their long term communicative goals" (Brown, 1994, p. 245). Littlejohn (1998) also assumes that the principles of sequencing in language are simple to complex in terms of surface structure (p. 215). Clearly, Tanka and Baker used these theories in the designing this coursebook, so the students and teachers felt at ease about the language used in this coursebook.

4.2.7 Quality of CDs and CD players

From the Table 13, it is clear that the total mean score of students' views on the good quality of CD and CD players is $M = 3.81$ and that of teachers' is $M = 4.02$. They are over the scale 3 in the five-point scale or the two means are higher than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire, showing that the level of students' and teachers' views on the good quality of CD and CD players are high. Therefore, students and teachers found that the bad quality of CD and CD players are clear, good, and loud enough.

<Insert Table 13 here>

Since when recorded material is being used, an inferior or poor recording or bad quality equipment can create difficulties for the students in listening, these questions about the quality of CD, the CD player, and the sound of the content on the CD were posed here. However, the result shows that they are good enough for students to listen to the conversations and lectures. Therefore, the reasons that students could not listen to the conversations or lectures well were not the bad quality of CDs and CD players.

4.3 Students' and teachers' attitudes toward the parts in each chapter of the coursebook

4.3.1 Students' and teachers' attitudes toward the liked parts

4.3.1.1 Students' and teachers' general preferences of the parts

The general tendency from the survey indicated that the students and teachers liked the parts in each chapter of the coursebook.

<Insert Table 14 here>

Table 14 displays that the total mean score of the students' general preference of the parts ($M = 3.79$) and that of the teachers' ($M = 3.46$) are over the scale 3 in the five-point scale. In other words, the two means are higher than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire. This reveals the level of the students' and teacher's preferences of the parts are high. Thus, the students and teachers had positive attitudes towards the parts in each chapter of the coursebook.

4.3.1.2 The parts that students and teachers liked

Each chapter of the coursebook has four parts. The students and teachers liked the *Part 4-Speaking* presented in each chapter because, as can be seen from the Table 15, the mean score of the students of liked parts is 4.52 and that of the teachers is 4.14. These means scores are very higher than the mid-point of the five-point scale in the questionnaire. Nevertheless, the standard deviation of the students ($SD = .75$) is smaller than that of the teachers ($M = .97$). It proves that the students' responses are less fluctuated than the teachers' ones.

<Insert Table 15 here>

Moreover, they found that *Part 4-Speaking* has interesting activities as students' mean score of interesting activities in this part is 0.52 and the teachers' one is 0.64. These means scores are equal or higher than the mid-point from 0 to 1 (see Table 16).

<Insert Table 16 here>

Similarly, as seen in Table 17 and the students and teachers found that *Part 4-Speaking* has *logically sequenced activities* as students' mean score of logically sequenced exercises in this part is .55 and the teachers' one is .77. These means scores are higher than the mid-point from 0 to 1.

<Insert Table 17 here>

4.3.1.3 The parts that students and teachers disliked

<Insert Table 18 here>

On the contrary, Table 18 presents that the students and teachers disliked *Part 2-Language study* and *Part 3-Reading* as the students' mean scores of disliked parts- *Part 2* and *Part 3* are 3.72 and 3.86 as well as the teachers' ones are 3.28 and 3.32. In addition, in *Part 4*, the level of the students' dislike is more stable than the teachers' one because the standard deviation of the mean score of the students ($SD = 1.07$) is lower than that of the teachers ($SD = 1.38$).

4.3.1.4 The parts from which the students could learn much

Table 19 reveals that the students and teachers thought *Part 1-Listening* and *Part 4-Speaking* are the parts from which the students could learn much. The student's mean score in *Part 1* is $M = 4.25$ and that in *Part 4* is $M = 4.24$ while the teachers' mean score in *Part 1* is $M = 4.12$ and that in *Part 4* is $M = 4.05$.

<Insert Table 19 here>

4.3.1.5 Parts which students internalized listening and speaking skills easily

Table 20 reveals that the total students' mean score of the parts which students internalized listening and speaking skills easily in *Part 1* is $M = 4.32$ and that in *Part 4* is $M = 4.01$ while the teachers' ones in *Part 1* is $M = 4.04$ and in *Part 4* is $M = 3.7$. Therefore, the students and teachers believed that *Part 1-Listening* and *Part 4-Speaking* are the parts which students internalized listening and speaking skills easily. Besides, the level of the students' thought about internalizing listening and speaking skills easily in *Part 4* is more fixed than the teachers' one because the standard deviation of the mean score of the students ($SD = 1.19$) is much lower than that of the teachers ($SD = 1.87$).

<Insert Table 20 here>

4.3.2 Students' and teachers' attitudes toward the difficult parts

Table 21 shows that students and teachers agreed that two parts are difficult. They are *Part 1-Listening* and *Part 3-Reading* since the mean scores of students about the difficult parts in order are $M = 3.66$ and 3.58 as well as those of the teachers in order are $M = 3.37$ and 3.41. All of these mean scores of two groups of students and teachers are higher than the scale 3 in the five-point scale in the questionnaire. Hence, both students and teachers reckoned that the students felt difficult in studying these parts.

<Insert Table 21 here>

4.3.2.1 The difficulties that the students encountered

As shown in Table 22, the mean scores of the difficulties between the students and teachers are approximately in the mid-point of the interval from 0 (*no*) to (*yes*). Consequently, the students and teachers found that the students had to face some difficulties in studying this coursebook. Specifically, they *could not identify sounds, could not guess the meaning from the sound, and could not understand the cues*. Besides, they *lack vocabulary, and lack knowledge about the topic*. However, there are differences between the students' and teachers' views in the students' difficulties of *could not guess the meaning from the sound* and *lack vocabulary* because total mean score of the students' former is .64 while that of the teachers' is .39 and the total mean score of the students' latter is .82 and that of teachers' is .37. This shows that the teachers did not recognize these difficulties of the students.

<Insert Table 22 here>

4.3.2.2 The parts which students could not listen well

From the Table 23, it is clear that *Part I-Listening* is the part that students could not listen well as the mean score of the students ($M = 4.56$) and that of the teachers ($M = 4.22$) in this part are the highest in all of parts. Also, they are very much higher than the mid level in the five-point scale in the questionnaire.

<Insert Table 23 here>

4.3.2.3 Reasons why students and teachers thought that students could not listen to Part 1-Listening well

The Table 24 represents that the means scores of the reasons in the students and teachers are rather high comparing with the mid-point from 0 to 1. These prove that *long conversation, fast speed of delivery, hardly intelligible accent, and lack of adaption* are the obstacles when they listened to *Part I*. Nevertheless, there are differences between the students' and teachers' views in the reason of *hardly intelligible accent* because total mean score of the students is .72 while that of the teachers' is .34. This indicates that the teachers did not recognize this *reason of not listening well* of the students.

<Insert Table 24 here>

As a whole, the students and teachers had positive attitudes on the parts of the coursebook. Furthermore, the levels of students and students' likes and dislikes in terms of parts of the coursebook are the same. In fact, the coursebook has ten chapters and each chapter has four parts. The structure of the parts and series of tasks in the same part of all the chapters are rather similar. Because the students and teachers were very familiar with the repetitious tasks in each part, they had a clear perception of the parts. As a result, students and teacher had the same attitudes towards the parts of each chapter in the book.

4.4 The ways of the teachers' exploitation of the content and tasks in the coursebook in terms of instruction

4.4.1 Exploiting the content and tasks in the coursebook

The survey represented the good tendency of teachers' coursebook exploitation of the content and tasks in the coursebook in terms of instruction. Table 25 illustrates that the total mean score of students' views on teachers' coursebook exploitation ($M = 3.54$) and that of teachers' ($M = 3.49$) are over the scale 3 in the five-point scale. In other words, the two means are higher than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire, revealing the level of students' and teacher's views on good coursebook exploitation are high. Accordingly, students and teachers realized that the teachers exploited the coursebook well, including instruction of the content in the order assigned in each chapter, revision of the lessons, and enhancement of students' autonomous learning. However, not all of the teachers exploited a certain part overwhelmingly because the total mean scores about this are not very high.

<Insert Table 25 here>

4.4.2 Adapting the coursebook

Especially, the salient feature is coursebook adaptation. It can be seen from Table 26 that both of the total mean scores of the students and teachers about teachers' coursebook adaptation are the same ($M = 3.84$). They are higher than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire, indicating the students and teachers agreed that teachers had adaptation of the coursebook. However, the standard deviation of the students ($SD = 1.00$) is much bigger than that of the teachers ($M = .52$). It proves that the teachers' responses are less fluctuated than the students' ones.

<Insert Table 26 here>

4.4.3 Skipping some parts in the book

As Table 27 shows, the total mean score of the students about teachers' skipping some parts in the coursebook ($M = 2.58$) and that of the teachers' ($M = 2.54$) are under the scale 3 in the five-point scale. In other words, the two means are lower than the mid level in the designed five-point scale in the questionnaire, indicating not many teachers skipped some parts of the book.

<Insert Table 27 here>

4.4.4 Using additional materials

<Insert Table 28 here>

It is clear from Table 28 that the total mean score of students about teachers' using additional materials ($M = 0.49$) and that of teachers' ($M = 0.52$) are the approximate mid-point of the interval from 0 to 1 of the yes/no-question. In other words, the two mean scores show that teachers used additional materials to supplement the coursebook but not all of them.

All in all, the students and teachers believed that most of teachers knew how to exploit the coursebook and use additional materials but a few did not. The teachers enhanced students' learning autonomy by asking the students to review the lessons at home, do self-assessment logs and gave them homework. However, some students did not often do them because they did not have device to listen, they did not have time to listen again. Also, the lessons which are difficult or not interesting made them hesitate in reviewing the lessons. Moreover, some students thought that it is not necessary to do those.

From the survey, it is clear that each teacher has his or her own way to exploit the coursebook. Some instructors instructed all the contents and in the order of parts in each chapter. All of the instructors had adaptation for relevant exercises. Only few teachers exploited the content of audioscript after asking the students to listen to the recording (without looking at audioscript) or after finishing all chapters to find more information that they could not hear before. These teachers also had the students follow along with the script as they listened or asked the students to make a summary.

Especially, some teachers skipped a certain part in the book and added more materials. According to some students' and teachers' ideas in opened answer following this question, only a few teachers skipped some parts in the coursebook. The students responded that the teachers sometimes skipped *Part 1-Listening*. They also omitted some easy or unnecessary or unsuitable parts, pronunciation, self-assessment logs, focus on testing, some less important activities, along with the parts that students can do by themselves at home, and speaking activities. They skipped these things because of not having enough time in class.

Furthermore, some students said that their teachers added more activities such as films, games, songs, articles, video clips and some speaking activities. The teachers also supplemented listening to real conversations or situations, homework, extra activities or situations, information about the different cultures and situations. They gave some simple activities in class, exercises from magazines and TV or internet, vocabulary related to the lessons, argument in two teams. In addition, they chose the outside topics which related to lessons and asked the students to search the information and write about them and then make a speech.

4.5 *The relationships between students' and teachers' attitudes toward the coursebook*

4.5.1 Attitudes toward the layout of the coursebook

The hypothesis is that there is no relationship between the students' and teachers' attitudes toward the layout of the coursebook. As shown Table 29, the Pearson Chi-Square value is 1.568. The Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) is .952 ($p > .05$)

<Insert Table 29 here>

The Pearson p -value is very much above .05, the test showed the students' and teachers' attitudes toward the layout of the coursebook are independent of one another. Consequently, the hypothesis is accepted that there is no relationship between the students' and teachers' attitudes toward on the layout of the coursebook. In other words, it is concluded that the students' attitudes toward the layout of the coursebook is independent from the teachers' one.

4.5.2 Attitudes toward the content of the coursebook

The hypothesis is that there is no relationship between the students' and teachers' attitudes toward the content of the coursebook. Table 30 indicates that the Pearson Chi-Square value is 28.279. The Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) is .612 ($p > .05$).

<Insert Table 30 here>

The Pearson p -value is very much above .05, the test showed the students' and teachers' attitudes toward the content of the coursebook are independent of one another. Thus, the hypothesis is accepted that there is no relationship between the students' and teachers' attitudes toward the content of the coursebook. In other words, it is concluded that the students' attitudes toward the content of the coursebook is independent from the teachers' one.

4.5.3 Attitudes toward the parts of the chapter

The hypothesis is that there is no relationship between the students' and teachers' attitudes toward the parts found in each chapter of the coursebook. It is clear from the Table 31 that the Pearson Chi-Square value is 22.108. The Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) is .247 ($p > .05$).

<Insert Table 31 here>

The Pearson p -value is very much above .05, the test showed the students' and teachers' attitudes toward the parts found in each chapter of the coursebook are independent of one another. As a result, the hypothesis is accepted that there is no relationship between the students' and teachers' attitudes and views on the parts found in each chapter of the coursebook. In other words, it is concluded that the students' attitudes on the parts found in each chapter of the coursebook is independent from the teachers' one.

4.5.4 Views on teachers' coursebook exploitation

The hypothesis is that there is no relationship between the students' and teachers' views on the teachers' coursebook exploitation. From Table 32, it is clear that the Pearson Chi-Square value is 14.729. The Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) is .719 ($p > .05$). Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted that there is a relationship between students' and teachers' views on the teachers' coursebook exploitation.

<Insert Table 32 here>

The Pearson p -value is very much above .05, the test showed the students' and teachers' views on the teachers' coursebook exploitation are independent of one another. As a result, the hypothesis is accepted that there is no relationship between the students' and teachers' views the teachers' coursebook exploitation. In other words, it is concluded that the students' views on teachers' coursebook exploitation are independent from the teachers' one.

5. Concluding remarks

The coursebook *High Season* can be continued using for students but it needs adaptation and addition from teachers to make them more suitable for the students. There are some unmatched preferences between teachers and students in terms of the themes of the coursebook; therefore, teachers should avoid imposing their views on students' views. On the other hand, teacher must find out the students' attitudes to have good methods in exploitation of each theme.

In the case of finding out the students' disliking themes, challenging themes, or strange themes, teachers need to know the reasons why they feel that in order to use specific and effective strategies in drawing students' favor or interest.

Supplying the background knowledge related to the lessons before letting the students listen and speak is extremely important. In other words, teachers should effectively exploit pre-listening activities and add more related content if it is necessary.

Along with supplying background knowledge, teachers should help students to have procedural knowledge, knowledge of situation, knowledge of co-text, and knowledge of the language system because they are information sources in comprehension (Anderson and Lynch, 1998, p.13).

References

- Anderson, A. & Lynch, T. (1988). *Listening*. Oxford: OUP.
- Bell, J. & Gower, R. (1998). Writing Course Materials for the World: A great Compromise. In B. Tomlinson, (Ed.), *Materials Development in Language Teaching* (pp. 116-129). Cambridge: CUP.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, J.D. (2001). *Using Surveys in Language Programs*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cooker, L. (2008). Self-access materials, In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials: A critical review* (pp. 110-132). London: Continuum.

- Crawford, J. (2002). The Role of Materials in the Language Classroom: Finding the Balance, In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Ed.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 80-91). Cambridge: CUP. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190.013>
- Davies, P. & Pearse, E. (2000). *Success in English Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Dubin, F. & Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course Design: Developing Programs and Materials for Language Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Fenner, A.B. & Newby, D. (2000). *Approaches to Materials Design in European textbooks*. European Centre for Modern Languages. [Online] Available: <http://archive.ecml.at/documents/materials.pdf> (November 16, 2010)
- Geneses, F. & Upshur, J. (1996). *Classroom-Based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Harding, K. & Henderson, P. (2008). *High Season: English for the Hotel and Tourist Industry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English* (New ed.). Oxford: Pearson/Longman.
- Littlejohn, A. (1998). The analysis of language teaching materials: inside the Trojan Horse, In B. Tomlinson, (Ed.), *Materials Development in Language Teaching* (pp. 190-216). Cambridge: CUP.
- Maley, A. (1998). Squaring the Circle – Reconciling Materials as Constraint with Materials as Empowerment, In B. Tomlinson, (Ed.), *Materials Development in Language Teaching* (pp. 279-294). Cambridge: CUP.
- McDonough, J. & McDonough, S. (1997). *Research Methods for English Language Teachers*. London: Arnold.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials Evaluation and design for Language Teaching*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988a). *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nunan, D. (1988b). *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: OUP.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rea-Dickins, P. & Germaine, K. (2009). *Evaluation*. Oxford: OUP.
- Reinders, H. & Lewis, M. (2006). An evaluative checklist for self-access materials. *ELT Journal*, 60, 272-278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl007>
- Stern, H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) (1998). *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Tomlinson, B. (2010). Principles of effective materials development, In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice* (pp. 81-108). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trochim, M.K.W. (2005). *Research Methods: The Concise Knowledge Base*. Ohio: Atomic Dog Publishing.
- Underwood, M. (1989). *Teaching Listening*. New York: Longman.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: CUP.

Table 1. General preferences on layout

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	3.68	.70
Teachers	3.66	.51

Table 2. Reasons for liking the layout

Participants	Reasons	M (L-H: 0-1)	SD
Students	It has enough spaces (in boxes and outlines) for necessary information	.54	.51
Teachers	It has suitable spaces between words and lines	.52	.56
	It has a lot of effective highlightings	.65	.53

Table 3. Reasons of liking the organization

Participants	Reasons	M (L-H: 0-1)	SD
Students	Skill index	.56	.51
	Vocabulary index	.58	.51
	Script	.72	.46
Teachers	Table of contents	.61	.53
	Skill index	.62	.53

Table 4. Feelings about the chapter structure

Participants	Feelings	M (L-H: 0-1)	SD
Students	Feel easy to study	.65	.49
	Feel bored	.34	.46
Teachers	Feel easy to study	.62	.54
	Feel bored	.52	.57

Table 5. General preferences of content

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	3.87	.36
Teachers	3.85	.32

Table 6. Liked themes

Themes	Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Reservations and check-in	Students	4.48	.81
	Teachers	4.76	.32
Dealing with complaints	Students	4.47	.70
	Teachers	4.52	.76

Table 7. Disliked themes

Themes	Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Staffing and internal organization	Students	3.54	1.07
	Teachers	2.27	1.2
Conferences	Students	3.65	.92
	Teachers	3.48	1.04
Money matters	Students	3.87	.98
	Teachers	3.12	.97

Table 8. Easy themes

Themes	Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Reservations and check-in	Students	4.65	.71
	Teachers	4.61	.51
Types of accommodation	Students	4.57	.88
	Teachers	4.76	.48

Table 9. Challenging themes

Themes	Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
The business traveller	Students	1.47	1.15
	Teachers	2.24	1.15
Hotel facilities	Students	2.75	1.58
	Teachers	3.6	1.28
Conferences	Students	2.87	1.39
	Teachers	2.72	1.27
Staffing and internal organization	Students	2.90	1.38
	Teachers	3.87	1.35
Money matters	Students	2.98	1.29
	Teachers	3.39	.93

Table 10. Reasons which students cannot easily discuss about the themes

Reasons	Participants	M (L-H: 0-1)	SD
Strange topic	Students	.55	.48
	Teachers	.83	.37
Lack of knowledge about the topic	Students	.64	.53
	Teachers	.98	.01

Table 11. Authenticity of language

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	4.09	.78
Teachers	4.01	.74

Table 12. Level of relevance of language

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	3.71	.79
Teachers	3.73	.72

Table 13. Good quality of CDs and CD players

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	3.81	.90
Teachers	4.02	1.12

Table 14. General preferences on the parts

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	3.79	.34
Teachers	3.46	.31

Table 15. Liked parts

Part	Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Part 4	Students	4.52	.75
	Teachers	4.14	.97

Table 16. Parts having interesting activities

Part	Participants	M (L-H:0-1)	SD
Part 1	Students	.52	.49
	Teachers	.64	.53

Table 17. Parts having logically sequenced activities

Part	Participants	M (L-H: 0-1)	SD
Part 1	Students	.55	.48
	Teachers	.77	.44

Table 18. Disliked parts

Parts	Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Part 2	Students	3.72	.92
	Teachers	3.28	1.05
Part 3	Students	3.86	1.07
	Teachers	3.32	1.38

Table 19. Parts from which students learning much

Parts	Participants	M(H: 5, L: 1)	SD
Part 1	Students	4.25	1.23
	Teachers	4.12	.82
Part 4	Students	4.24	1.15
	Teachers	4.05	1.04

Table 20. Parts that students internalizing listening and speaking skills easily

Parts	Participants	M(H: 5, L: 1)	SD
Part 1	Students	4.32	1.17
	Teachers	4.04	1.42
Part 4	Students	4.01	1.19
	Teachers	3.7	1.87

Table 21. Difficult parts

Parts	Participants	M(H: 5, L: 1)	SD
Part 1	Students	3.66	1.32
	Teachers	3.37	1.48
Part 3	Students	3.58	1.09
	Teachers	3.41	1.20

Table 22. Students' difficulties

Difficulties	Participants	M (L-H: 0-1)	SD
Could not identify sounds	Students	.57	.51
	Teachers	.62	.53
Could not guess the meaning from the sound	Students	.64	.50
	Teachers	.39	.51
Could not understand the cues	Students	.42	.49
	Teachers	.51	.52
Lack vocabulary	Students	.82	.36
	Teachers	.37	.50
Lack knowledge about the topic	Students	.57	.48
	Teachers	.62	.51

Table 23. Parts that students not listening well

Part	Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Part 1	Students	4.56	.87
	Teachers	4.22	.59

Table 24. Reasons for not listening well

Reasons	Participants	M (L-H: 0-1)	SD
Long conversations and lectures	Students	.52	.50
	Teachers	.75	.46
Fast speed of delivery	Students	.79	.41
	Teachers	.50	.54
Hardly intelligible accent	Students	.72	.45
	Teachers	.34	.52
Lack of adaptation	Students	.46	.50
	Teachers	.50	.54

Table 25. Views on good coursebook exploitation

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	3.54	.51
Teachers	3.49	.56

Table 26. Teachers' coursebook adaptation

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	3.84	1.00
Teachers	3.84	.52

Table 27. Teachers' skipping some parts in the book

Participants	M (scale: 1-5)	SD
Students	2.58	1.92
Teachers	2.54	2.04

Table 28. Teachers' additional materials use

Participants	M (L-H: 0-1)	SD
Students	.49	.51
Teachers	.52	.53

Table 29. Chi-Square Test on the layout

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.568	7	.952

Table 30. Chi-Square Test on the content

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	28.279	32	.612

Table 31. Chi-Square Test on the parts of the chapter

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.108	19	.247

Table 32. Chi-Square Test on teachers' coursebook exploitation

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.729	22	.719