

영어교육, 61권 2호 2006년 여름

Teachers' Opinions on Criteria for ELT Materials Evaluation and Development *

Hae-Dong Kim

(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Kim, Hae-Dong. (2006). Teachers' opinions on criteria for ELT materials evaluation and development. *English Teaching*, 61(2), 139-164.

The aim of the present study is to illustrate teachers' opinions on criteria for ELT (English language teaching) materials evaluation and development. A total of 508 teachers and pre-service teachers in South Korea were involved in a questionnaire survey. The results of the analysis revealed the following. There was a high level of agreement for the criteria-items that asked for the opinions among the groups of pre-service teachers, primary, secondary, and tertiary school teachers as the average correlation coefficient of .77. For these groups, the criteria related to 'coverage of four skills and communicative strategies,' 'cultural tone' and 'interest' were ranked as highly important. However, relatively low levels of agreements between these groups and the teacher-groups in private institute were found. In relating to the materials development, 246 respondents participated in the survey and stressed that materials should achieve impact, use authentic language, and be relevant and useful. To conclude, it is suggested that, for the purpose of systematic evaluation and the betterment of ELT materials, it should be necessary to identify teachers' opinions within a specific local ELT context.

I. INTRODUCTION

Along with learners, teachers are the main users of ELT (English language teaching) materials. Therefore, a number of theoreticians underscore the importance of applying teachers' own opinions for the purpose of textbook evaluation (Cunningsworth, 1995; Hutchinson, 1987; Lazar, 1993; Mariani, 1980; Rubdy, 2003; Ur, 1996) and development (Crawford, 2002; Tomlinson, 2003). Following the idea suggested in the relevant literature, this study aims to clarify teachers' opinions on criteria for ELT materials evaluation and development. To be specific, the study illustrates the similarities and differences of opinions of teachers in different institutes, such as primary school, private institute for

* This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Grant.

primary school students, secondary school, and university, and those of pre-service teachers in South Korea.

As to value of the present study, Wright (1990) indicates that opinions of the particular material-users in a certain context should be valuable information for teachers in a similar context, because they would find much of relevance. Roberts (1996) also states that “it would be *interesting* to know whether an “evaluative consensus” exists” in a certain ELT context - and “it would be *informative* to compare notes” (p. 386, emphasis by himself) with other contexts. Tomlinson (2003) asserts that for the development of ELT materials, it is necessary to obtain and to utilize relevant information about the target teachers’ opinions on their preferred types of materials.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Teachers’ Opinions

The term ‘opinions’ as a plural form means “beliefs or views which are held by a large group of people” (*Collins Cobuild dictionary*, 1987, p. 1010). When applied to teachers, the term ‘opinions’ covers the notion of ‘beliefs,’ which is usually used in literature on teacher training or education. Clark and Yinger (1979) define ‘beliefs’ as teachers’ implicit theories. Clark and Peterson (1986) argue that teachers’ ‘beliefs’ belong to a realm of cognition that formulates their thought processes. In similar vein, Richards and Lockhart (1994) defines teachers’ belief systems as “the information, attitudes, values, theories, and assumptions ... that teachers build up over time and bring with them to classroom” (p. 385). To some extent, the notion of opinions also covers the notions of ‘assumptions’ of teachers, when ‘opinions’ are related with evaluation and development of materials. Woods (1996) mentions that “the assumptions about learning affect the way we assume we should teach the material; and the assumptions about language determine what the material is” (p. 189). In connection with materials evaluation and development, another notion of ‘awareness’ may also belong to the notion of teachers’ opinions. Many of English language teacher-training courses and books as well (for example, Nunan & Lamb, 1996; Rea-Dickins & Germaine, 1992; Spratt, 1994) aim to develop teachers’ awareness on materials evaluation criteria and selection procedures (Hutchinson, 1987). A decision making about the selection of the most suitable textbook is associated with teachers’ awareness and it seems to be equivalent with the notion of ‘opinions.’ Accordingly, teachers’ ‘opinions’ can be used as an umbrella term and defined as a group of teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, values, theories, assumptions and awareness as a variable related with materials evaluation and development.

With regard to evaluation and development of materials, the importance of teachers' opinion has been stressed by many ELT theoreticians. Mariani (1980) argues that "many different standards of criteria may be taken into consideration when choosing or evaluating a coursebook, depending once again on your [i.e. teachers'] professional beliefs" (p. 28). Cunningsworth (1984) also stresses the importance of teacher-selector's "professional judgement" (p. 74) in applying the criteria for materials evaluation. Hutchinson (1987) mentions that "teachers need to decide which criteria are the more important" (p. 43) for textbook evaluation and development. Lazar (1993) states that teachers may "add any other criteria which you [teachers] consider to be important" (p. 56) in using the proposed checklist. Cunningsworth (1995) also suggests that "it is best to identify your [i.e. teachers'] own priorities" (p. 2) in applying his checklist. Ur (1996) says that "it is worth thinking about ... what the main criteria are for coursebook assessment" (p. 184). Tomlinson (2003) mentions that it should be necessary for materials developers to identify the target teachers' opinions on their preferred types for the betterment of ELT materials. These theoreticians admit that teachers' preferences on the criteria in the proposed checklist can be dependent upon their own opinions and teachers may have definite opinions on their ideal materials.

2. Studies on Teachers' Opinions about Materials

Study on teachers' opinions about materials might be categorized into two types according to its investigation purpose.

One type is a descriptive study and usually carried out within a specific local context. Williams (1981) describes procedures for qualitative materials evaluation used for an ESP (English for Specific Purposes) teacher education course in Manila, the Philippines. In practice, during the session he collects 36 teachers' opinions and extracts a consensus on materials evaluation criteria. Dudley-Evans and Bates (1987) report that they obtained teachers' opinions on an ESP coursebook used for upper secondary school in Egypt by means of questionnaires, discussions, observation and seminars. They discuss collecting teachers' opinion is a practical approach for materials evaluation and development. Chambers (1997) presents an example of selection-process to demonstrate how a group of teachers can establish materials evaluation criteria. This type of study attempts to describe a method of collecting a group of teachers' opinions and of using them for the purpose of materials evaluation. The idea of using consensus of teachers' opinions within a certain ELT context for materials evaluation is a central focus of this type of study.

Unlike a descriptive nature of the former type of study, the other is an exploratory and has generally been dealt within the field of teacher education. The foci of studies are usually to define individual teachers' variables in formulating their opinions and to

measure degree of these variables' influence on the use of textbooks. For example, based on questionnaire-data from twenty-six teachers, Nunan (1988) reports that there are differences between inexperienced and experienced teachers in realizing use of materials in classroom. In re-interpreting his data, Nunan and Lamb (1996) admit partial influence of teacher training experience for inexperienced teachers in formulating their opinions. Hutchinson (1996) argues that, based on her classroom research by interviews and observations on three different teachers' uses of the same textbook in the Philippines, an initial ELT teacher training experience increases one teacher's confidence in using the textbook. In the analysis of the questionnaire study on 249 ESL (English as a Second Language) teachers in Hong Kong, Richards and Lockhart (1994) point out that teachers' beliefs on the role of textbooks are related with the amount of teaching experience and teachers' mother tongue. This type of study tries to identify sources of differences in teachers' opinions, usually by means of checking the relationship between opinions and use of materials. Thus, this type of study supports Woods' (1996) statement that teachers' different interpretation of the textbook leads different decision-making in classroom. As long as the present study shall not deal with teachers' behaviours with certain materials in a classroom but their opinions per se, this type of study will not be further covered.

To sum up, the effects of different individual variables such as length of teaching experience, teacher training and first language on their opinions on materials are not the main concerns of the present study. The main focus is opinions of teachers in a certain ELT context or situation in relating to criteria for materials evaluation and development.

3. Relevant Studies on Teachers' Opinions in a Certain Context

There have not been many studies investigating teachers' opinions about materials in a certain EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context. Seven studies have specifically collected materials users' opinions on materials evaluation and/or development criteria. Two studies cover opinions of teachers in South Korea.

Tomlinson (1997) collects opinions of teachers, researchers and writers from various countries and reports their 'wishes' for ELT materials development. At the conference of Materials Development Association in Dublin, he asked the participants to jot down three wishes that "they would like to see happen in the next ten years in EFL published materials" (p. 3). After collecting 117 written mentions from thirty-nine respondents, who were from fifteen different countries, he prioritised their wishes on the basis of frequency of mentions. Twenty-four wishes, which were mentioned more than twice from the respondents, were analysed by the order of frequency, like a list of prioritised criteria. The most frequently mentioned criterion of wish was 'localisation of materials' (nine mentions), and followed 'application of current research into spoken discourse' (seven mentions).

Tomlinson (1997) summarizes that the respondents hoped more choices, more flexibility, and more variety and wanted the learners to be given more opportunities to engage their minds and their imaginations. He further mentions that nobody wanted the centrality of grammar, the short texts, the closed activities, the safe topics, the lack of choice, variety and flexibility and the invariable unit format. His survey study demonstrates that a group of teachers' opinions for the development of ELT materials can be obtained by means of an open-ended response and the criteria for materials development can be prioritised by analysing the frequency of respondents' mentions.

Nunan (1988) describes the priority of senior teachers' response to a set of materials evaluation criteria. He administered a survey to twenty-seven senior ELT teachers in a professional development workshop in order to gain "insights into their attitudes toward language teaching" (p. 105). He presented seven criteria for evaluating teaching materials for classroom use and asked them to rank the criteria from most to least important. The most important item to the teachers was that 'the materials make clear that the link between the classroom and the wider world' and followed 'the materials foster independent learning.' According to Nunan's interpretation of the results, the teachers gave much importance to the criteria which were related to the task-based approach and the characteristics of learner-centeredness. The major problem of his survey, however, seems that the content of the criteria used was biased to the idea of learner-centeredness. Among the seven presented criteria, three criteria are closely related to the idea of learner-centeredness.

Dougill's study (1987) presents teachers' reasons for liking and disliking ELT textbooks. He conducted a small-scale survey to ELT teachers in six Oxford Arels-Felco schools. He asked the reasons for liking and disliking ELT textbooks to the teachers and presented the results of mentions in the table by the order of frequency. The most preferred, i.e. the most frequently mentioned, reason for liking was 'interesting (referring to texts, activities or tapes)' and followed 'generating discussion and argument.' The reason for disliking was 'boring' and followed 'bland,' and 'badly developed.' One problem that occurred by asking and displaying reasons of both liking and disliking seems that it is rather difficult for us to identify the clear order of priority, because semantically related values are displayed by the different order of priority in opposed sections of liking and disliking. For example 'varied' is the third best reason for liking while 'repetitive' is the seventh least reason for disliking, and 'clear' as the sixth best reason and 'messy' as the fourth least reason. Despite of the problem of clarification, by checking the prioritised reasons of liking and disliking, it is possible for us to identify that the most preferred criterion in materials evaluation to the respondents is 'interest not boredom.'

Hutchinson's doctoral project (1996) deals with teachers' preferences for features in ELT textbooks. The teacher-subjects of Hutchinson's investigation were twenty-one

teachers, who used the same ELT textbook in the same course at eight different fisheries colleges in the Philippines. A questionnaire survey was used for the data-collection. The questionnaire asked “How important is it that the following features be included in the textbook for your fisheries English?” (p. 129) and presented the criteria as question-items. A total of 50 items of 7-point Likert-scale rating system were used. According to Hutchinson’s analysis, the teacher-respondents preferred ‘grammar drills,’ ‘clear grammar explanations’ and ‘rules.’ Based on the findings, Hutchinson claims that “grammar is central in ELT textbooks” (p. 154). One of the major problems in Hutchinson’s study is that the criteria-items of the questionnaire were rather restricted by focusing on descriptive aspects, such as grammar, vocabulary, exercises, activities and format. Another problem is that the ten-page questionnaire with all the 50 items looks overlong. Although there are problems, the study illustrates that teachers in a certain context may be able to prioritise textbook evaluation and development criteria, when they are presented in the form of a checklist-questionnaire.

Alderson and Scott’s investigation (1992) covers teachers’ preferred criteria for ESP materials. They carried out interviews to 50 Brazilian ESP teachers. By the analysis of the interview data, they report that a total of eleven criteria are identified. Among these eleven mentioned criteria, the most preferred criterion (44 mentions) is ‘student interest / motivation / needs.’ The significance of their study is that a group of teachers’ opinions about their preferred criteria can be obtained by the data collection method of interview as well.

The following two studies present the data collected from the teachers in South Korea. Kyunghwan Kim, Kyong-Sun Hong, Mia Kim and Garnet Nimmo (1998) carried out a questionnaire survey to 97 teachers of universities in South Korea. The main aim of their study is to provide information for the development of materials by identifying usefulness and interest in types of materials, usefulness and interest in topic areas, and importance of types of exercises for reading, writing, listening and speaking. The results show that the respondents preferred four skills integrated and content-based materials. They also conclude that supplementary materials such as a teacher’s manual and audio-visual materials are essential for a conversation course. The study provides a basis for evaluating and developing coursebooks for English languages courses in universities in Korea.

The study of Haedong Kim (2002) presents opinions of 28 teachers in a university in South Korea in relating to their preferred criteria for materials evaluation. The teacher-participants were asked to write down three preferred criteria for materials evaluation. A total of seventeen criteria were identified. The results of the analysis show that, for this group of teachers, the criterion of ‘topic-content’ was the most frequently mentioned and the second most frequently mentioned one was ‘motivation.’ The criterion of ‘textbook-level’ was ranked third according to the frequency of mentions. This study

indicates a possibility of a consensus of preferred criteria among teachers in the same course (Chambers, 1997). The most frequently mentioned criterion in the group represents the most important one, and ideally it can be weighted in the process of quantifying the results for the textbook evaluation in a similar ELT context.

The review on the previous studies about the teachers' opinions to criteria for materials evaluation or development has led us to make the following justification for the present study.

First, the preferences to criteria are different according to different contexts. For example, Hutchinson's (1996) study has found out that the teacher-subjects highly prefer the criterion of 'clear grammar explanation' while the teacher-subjects of Tomlinson (1997) and Dougill (1987) don't mention this particular criterion at all. These subjects clearly prefer the criterion of 'interest' in their response. Although the problems of the Hutchinson's instrument are serious threats to the reliability of her findings, it implies at least that the findings of the investigation about the teachers' opinions are better to be interpreted according to the particular ELT context. Therefore, it justifies the necessity of a survey on teachers' opinions on criteria for materials evaluation and development within the South Korean context. Without direct investigation, it would be unrealistic to apply the teachers' opinions for materials evaluation or development.

Second, most of these studies have attempted to describe the teachers' opinions in terms of different levels of 'preferences' to the different criteria. In other words, the studies has focused on 'relative' values of various criteria to the teacher-respondents rather than the 'absolute' value of the certain criterion. Because of this reason, most of the investigators display criteria in the order of importance or frequency of mentions in presenting the findings and interpreting the results. Consequently, it should be necessary to identify the relative importance of the various criteria.

Third, a questionnaire, which takes a shape of a checklist, can be a useful method of data collection. Actually, the data collection methods are different among different investigators. Kyunghwan Kim et al. (1998), Hutchinson (1996), and Nunan (1988) administered a questionnaire survey, Haedong Kim (2002), Tomlinson (1997), and Dougill (1987) carried out a survey of open-ended response, and Alderson and Scott (1992) used an interview technique. It illustrates that there are different methods available to investigate teachers' opinions, and also implies that those methods can be used altogether in order to reveal the opinions in depth that the teacher-respondents hold in minds. What seems apparent is that the questionnaire as a form of a checklist can be used for a large number of teachers, as Kyunghwan Kim et al. (1998), Hutchinson (1996) and Nunan (1988) did. Therefore, for a large scale of survey, it would be beneficial for using a questionnaire survey.

The research questions of this study are as follows:

1) What are teachers' opinions on materials evaluation and development criteria within a

Korean context?

2) Are there any differences in teachers' opinions on materials evaluation and development among different teacher-groups in Korea?

III. RESEARCH METHOD

1. Subjects

For the present investigation, a total of 508 teachers took part in the questionnaire survey asking for opinions about materials evaluation criteria. On the basis of the types of their teaching institutes and their personal variables, they can be divided into six groups. The first group is primary school teachers (n=40), the second secondary school teachers (n=40), the third pre-service teachers at the school of education at a university (n=147), the fourth university teachers (n=127), the fifth Korean teachers of English working for private institutes for primary school students (n=52), and the sixth native teachers of English working for the same private institutes for primary school students (n=122).

The first group of primary school teachers answered the questionnaire during the summer teacher training course in 2005. The survey data from the secondary school teachers were collected from three different courses at two different post-graduate schools of education in 2004 and 2005. Those who were taking the courses but not practising teachers were excluded in the data analysis. The data from the third group of pre-service teachers were obtained from three different pre-service teacher training courses at a university in 2005. The data of the fourth group are utilized from the previous data collected from the mail survey as a part of this investigator's doctoral project in 1997. Owing to the rather out-datedness of the data, a care is given in interpreting the results from this group. The data of the fifth and sixth groups of teachers at private institutes were obtained via a mail survey in November 2003.

TABLE 1
Backgrounds of the Teacher-Subjects

Teacher Group	Survey on evaluation	Survey on development	Gender		Year(s) of Survey
			Male	Female	
Primary school	40	40	11 (28%)	29 (72%)	2005
Secondary school	40	59	7 (12%)	52 (88%)	2004, 2005
Pre-service teachers	147	147	39 (27%)	108 (73%)	2005
University	127	-	65 (52%)	60 (48%)	1997
Korean at private institute	52	-	2 (4%)	50 (96%)	2003
Native at private institute	122	-	57 (47%)	64 (53%)	2003
Total	508	246	181 (33%)	363 (67%)	

The following Table 1 summarizes the backgrounds of the teachers at each group. Missing responses on gender are excluded in the presentation. The gender distribution of secondary school teachers is calculated on the basis of those who participated in the survey on the criteria for materials development.

Among the subjects, 363 (67 %) were female. In case of the native English teachers at private institute, there were 46 (37%) Canadians, 37 (30%) Americans, 9 (7%) Irish, 9 (7%) New Zealanders, 7 (6%) British, 3 (3%) Australians, and others.

In case of the questionnaire survey asking for opinions about criteria for materials development, a total of 246 subjects participated in. All of the first group of primary school teachers, the second group of secondary school teachers, and the third group of pre- service teachers answered the questionnaire. Additionally, nineteen secondary school teachers of two different courses at two different post-graduate schools of education took part in the survey in 2004. For the final analysis of teachers' opinions on criteria for materials development, their responses were also utilized as a part of the second groups' opinions.

It can be assumed that by choosing the teacher-subjects from different institutional types, it is possible to categorize the teachers' opinions by different ELT contexts. In other words, the groups of teachers are categorized by their teaching institutes, so the groups' opinions may eventually reflect the teachers' opinions in different ELT contexts.

As long as the aim of this study is to clarify teachers' opinions on criteria for materials evaluation and development in a certain ELT context, the selection of various teacher-groups may make it possible to illustrate a certain group's opinions more clearly by comparison with other groups' opinions. Therefore, the selection of various teacher-groups fits for the aim of the present study. Furthermore, the present study invites the opinions of pre-service teacher group and of native-teacher group. It means that the variables of teaching experience and first language can be partially controlled by the group membership. Even though the analysis of the effects of teaching experience and first language on opinions is not the main concern of the present investigation, the results of the comparisons among the teacher-groups may partly reveal the influences of those teacher variables.

2. Instrument: Questionnaire

In the present study, a questionnaire was used as a data collection instrument. By using a questionnaire, it was possible to get countable responses on a range of criteria-items. Consequently, the collected data was amenable to quantification and the teachers' opinions on various criteria could be easily compared. Additionally, it was possible to carry out a large-scale survey from different teacher-groups in different contexts. The idea of using a checklist as a basis for a questionnaire has been proposed

by theoreticians (for example, Roberts, 1996; Tomlinson, 2003). The actual use of a checklist as a questionnaire- instrument for quantifying materials users' relative preferences on criteria has been demonstrated by previous researchers, such as Hutchinson (1996) and Nunan (1988).

In the present study, two particular checklists were chosen for the design of a questionnaire. The criteria for materials evaluation were based on those of Haedong Kim (2004) and the criteria for materials development were set up on the basis of those of Tomlinson (1998). In case of evaluation items, they were adapted by the criteria of Peacock (1997), which had been constructed by referring to the criteria of Grant (1987), Sheldon (1988), Skierso (1991), McDonough and Shaw (1993), and Cunningsworth (1995). Actually, the early version of the questionnaire had sixty criteria-items, so a preliminary survey was carried out to reduce the number of the criteria-items. A total of thirty-eight ELT teachers at a university in South Korea took part in the preliminary survey. Based on the factor analyses on the responses from those teachers, the items were reduced into sixteen criteria. One item asking about teachers' guide was excluded, and a total of fifteen criteria-items for materials evaluation were set up. The details of the logic behind using factor analyses, the results of factor analyses and item-reduction procedures are specifically presented in the study of Haedong Kim (2004). Since the criteria-items for materials evaluation were used in a Korean ELT context, the content validity of the items used in the present study can be acceptably high. In case of the criteria-items for materials development, they were adopted from those of Tomlinson (1998). By analysing the previous results of SLA (Second Language Acquisition) studies, he proposes a total of sixteen criteria for ELT materials development. Under each criterion, the results of previous findings and the justifications for his proposals are presented. Although the criteria have never been used for any empirical studies in any ELT contexts, the content validity of his proposal seems to be moderately high. In fact, his criteria for materials development were translated by Youngtae Kim (2003) and introduced to many ELT practitioners in Korea. In this sense, the use of his criteria for checking the opinions on materials development in the present study seems to be justified.

The questionnaire was two-page long and written in Korean (see Appendix). The questionnaire used for native teachers were written in English. It consisted of the two parts asking opinions on the 15 textbook evaluation criteria and on the seventeen textbook development criteria. Ratings were on a seven-point Likert-scale on which 1 = *not at all important*, 2 = *quite unimportant*, 3 = *not so important*, 4 = *important*, 5 = *quite important*, 6 = *very important*, and 7 = *extremely important*. Since many criteria could be important, it was believed that if the scale would be presented in a descending order, instead of an ascending order, it should be convenient for the teacher-subject to mark the rating.

To check whether the criteria-items were consistently asking opinions about criteria, internal consistency reliability of the criteria-items was measured. Cronbach's alpha was chosen as a measure. The following Table 2 shows the item reliabilities of each teacher-group for the criteria-items for materials evaluation and for materials development.

TABLE 2
Item Reliability: Cronbach's Alpha

Criteria-item for materials	Average	Primary school	Secondary school	Pre-service teachers	University	Korean at private institute	Native at private institute
Evaluation	.85	.73	.68	.87	.86	.97	.98
Development	.88	.84	.85	.93	-	-	-

In case of the fifteen criteria asking opinions about materials evaluation, the average of Cronbach's alphas from six different teacher-groups was computed as .85. In case of the seventeen criteria asking opinions about materials development, the average of Cronbach's alphas was computed as .88. These results indicate that the item reliabilities of the questionnaire were generally high for these groups of teachers.

3. Method of Analysis

For the data analyses, descriptive statistics of mean scores and standard deviations of the fifteen individual criteria-items for materials evaluation and sixteen individual criteria-items for materials development are calculated. The mean score of each teacher-group on a particular criterion is considered as the level of the group's opinions of importance on that criterion. The obtained mean scores of six different teacher-groups are checked for the purpose of the comparison.

For inferential statistics, correlation tests are conducted to check levels of agreement to opinions among the different teacher-groups. Additionally, fifteen ANOVAs for the individual items of materials evaluation are carried out. The teacher-group is considered as an independent variable, and the rating as a dependent variable. If significant difference is found out, post-hoc test is carried out. In the same way, sixteen ANOVAs for the individual items of materials development are conducted. In the present study, it was impossible to conduct 3 (primary, secondary, and university school-group) X 2 (native and Korean English teacher-group) X 2 (in-service and pre-service teacher-group) ANOVA tests, because the membership of an individual teachers was identified by the institutional type: native English teachers worked for only private institute and no pre-service teachers worked for any school.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Opinions on Materials Evaluation Criteria

The mean results of the ratings on the fifteen materials evaluation criteria are shown in the following Table 3. The overall results indicate that all teacher-groups expressed a relatively higher importance on the criterion of 'interest' (item 4) among the materials evaluation criteria. The criterion related to the learners' needs of studying English language skills, the criterion-item 8 (inclusion of four skills and communicative strategies) was highly ranked. The secondary school, university, and pre-service teacher-groups ranked this criterion as the first important one.

The criterion of 'price' (item 16) was also ranked as an important criterion. The high level of importance to the criterion seems reflect the position of teachers as a major selector of coursebook who might need to consider the target learner's economic condition. Interestingly, university teacher-group ranked the criterion of price as the highest, whereas primary school teacher-group did it as the eighth. Perhaps, this pattern of response was caused by the actual difference of prices between ELT coursebooks for university-level learners and for primary school learners.

Another high rank criterion among the groups was a 'cassette tapes quality' (item 15). It seems probably due to two reasons. First, a cassette-tape recorder or a CD player is frequently used at classroom in Korea for listening. The practical reason of frequent use of cassette tapes or CDs might have probably caused the high importance of the criterion. Second, a poor quality of some cassette tapes or CDs might have led the teachers to give a higher priority on the criterion. Some teacher-respondents wrote dissatisfaction of their current cassette tapes on the questionnaire. To this group of teacher, the criteria of 'variety in a unit and systematic grading' (item 9), 'appropriacy for classroom activities' (item 3) and '(in line with current) theories of learning methodology' (item 6) were considered as slightly less important than the other criteria above. It seems probably that the teachers might have had a certain level of confidence in their classroom language teaching and/or adaptation of the coursebook, so they might have responded those criteria as less important for them. As the coursebook selection criteria were asked in the questionnaire, the criteria relevant with aspects of 'self-study' materials were ranked as relatively low important ones; such as item 5 (encouraging responsibility for own learning - the eighth rank), item 11 (mechanism for feedback / self-study - the twelfth rank), and item 10 (guidance for use of the book - the thirteen rank). The 'guidance for pronunciation' (criterion-item 7) in the printed coursebook seems to be inefficient for listening practice, so it was regarded as low important one.

TABLE 3
Importance of Coursebook Evaluation Criteria: ANOVAs and Descriptive Statistics

Coursebook evaluation criteria	Mean square	F	p	Teacher Group										
				Primary school			Secondary school			Pre-service teachers				
				I	M	SD	R	M	SD	R	M	SD	R	
1. General impression and quality	7.16	3.55	0.00	1	5.83	1.1	7	6.05	0.9	7	5.81	1.1	9	
2. Cultural tone	34.29	20.70	0.00	2	6.15	0.9	4	6.28	0.8	3	6.10	1.0	4	
				3	6.15	0.9	5	5.73	1.0	10	5.39	1.2	14	
3. Appropriacy for classroom activities	11.80	5.24	0.00	4	6.70	0.6	1	6.20	1.1	4	6.15	1.1	3	
				5	5.75	1.1	9	5.40	1.1	14	5.67	1.1	11	
4. Interest and relevance	24.09	12.29	0.00	6	4.90	1.2	15	5.03	1.2	15	4.96	1.2	15	
				7	5.43	1.2	12	5.58	1.0	12	5.51	1.2	12	
5. Encouragement of responsibility for own learning	7.07	3.27	0.01	8	6.30	0.8	2	6.45	0.9	1	6.28	1.0	1	
				9	5.35	1.4	13	5.93	1.4	8	5.95	1.2	6	
6. Reflection of theories of learning methodology	2.95	1.39	0.23	10	5.48	1.0	11	5.50	1.3	13	5.49	1.4	13	
				11	5.53	1.1	10	5.93	0.8	9	5.77	1.3	10	
7. Guidance in pronunciation	14.42	6.46	0.00	12	5.98	1.2	6	6.15	1.0	5	5.99	1.1	5	
				13	4.98	1.2	14	5.58	1.2	11	5.88	1.0	8	
8. Coverage of four skills and communicative strategies	22.81	10.68	0.00	14	6.15	1.0	3	6.28	0.9	2	6.24	1.2	2	
				15	5.80	1.4	8	6.08	1.2	6	5.91	1.3	7	
9. Variety in a unit and systematic grading	24.55	11.32	0.00	Teacher group										
				University			Korean at private institute			Native at private institute				
10. Guidance in use of the book	11.71	5.24	0.00	I	1	5.33	1.9	3	5.06	1.8	2	5.44	2.0	5
				2	4.94	1.8	9	4.35	1.6	15	5.20	1.8	9	
11. Mechanism for feedback / self-study	20.83	10.28	0.00	3	5.20	2.0	7	4.62	2.0	9	5.45	1.9	4	
				4	5.33	2.0	2	4.90	2.0	4	5.52	2.0	3	
12. Facilitation of use of English outside the classroom	43.54	21.18	0.00	5	5.16	2.0	8	4.81	1.9	6	5.31	2.0	8	
				6	4.69	1.8	14	4.42	1.8	12	4.8	1.9	14	
13. Inclusion of summary lists	26.26	11.35	0.00	7	4.86	1.9	11	4.4	1.7	13	5.05	1.9	11	
				8	5.26	2.1	5	5.08	2.0	1	5.34	2.1	7	
14. Quality of cassette tapes	27.27	12.77	0.00	9	4.88	1.9	10	4.35	1.7	14	5.10	1.9	10	
				10	4.78	1.8	12	4.52	1.6	11	4.89	1.9	12	
15. Price and availability	7.85	3.25	0.01	11	4.78	1.8	13	4.64	1.7	8	4.84	1.9	13	
				12	4.62	1.9	15	4.56	1.7	10	4.65	1.9	15	
				13	5.32	2.1	4	4.69	1.8	7	5.60	2.1	1	
				14	5.21	2.0	6	4.88	2.0	5	5.36	2.0	6	
				15	5.38	2.1	1	5.04	1.9	3	5.53	2.1	2	

Note: 'I' = item number, 'M' = mean, 'SD' = standard deviation, 'R' = rank order

Inspection of the results from ANOVAs reveals that there were significant differences in the levels of opinions on evaluation criteria between the teacher-groups. Among the results of fifteen ANOVAs, fourteen results show statistically significant differences. The item of 'theories of learning methodology' (item 6) indicates no significant differences. All in all, this pattern of the results implies that there can be differences in the levels of opinions on the importance of materials evaluation criterion according to the membership of the

teacher.

For the further investigation, post-hoc tests were carried out. The results reveal that, among the groups, the group of Korean teachers at private institute showed the most noticeable different opinions from other groups (38 cases), and followed by the group of native teachers at private institute (25 cases), and pre-service teachers (22 cases). Less than 20 cases of occurrences of significant differences were found in the case of primary school teacher-group (10 cases), secondary school teacher-group (14 cases), and university teacher-group (15 cases). It may be suggested that there may be a noticeable difference in opinions between teachers in private institutes and teachers in public institutes. The following Table 4 presents the occurrences of each group's significant differences in opinions from other groups.

In case of Korean teachers in private institutes, they ranked the criterion of 'cultural tone' (item 2) as the least important, whereas other groups regarded it as moderately important. They ranked the criterion of 'general impression' (item 1) as a very important one (the second rank), whereas other groups considered it as moderately important.

TABLE 4
The Occurrences of Significant Differences: Post-hoc Tests

Coursebook evaluation criteria	Primary school	Secondary school	Pre-service teachers	University	Korean at private institute	Native at private institute
1. General impression and quality	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Cultural tone	2	2	2	2	5	5
3. Appropriacy for classroom activities	1	1	0	0	3	1
4. Interest and relevance	2	1	2	2	4	3
5. Encouragement of responsibility for own learning	0	0	1	0	1	0
6. Reflection of theories of learning methodology	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Guidance in pronunciation	0	1	2	1	2	0
8. Coverage of four skills and communicative strategies	2	2	2	2	4	4
9. Variety in a unit and systematic grading	0	1	2	1	3	1
10. Guidance in use of the book	0	0	1	0	3	0
11. Mechanism for feedback / self-study	0	2	3	1	2	2
12. Facilitation of use of English outside the classroom	2	2	2	2	4	4
13. Inclusion of summary lists	0	0	2	2	2	2
14. Quality of cassette tapes	1	2	2	2	4	3
15. Price and availability	0	0	1	0	1	0
<i>total</i>	10	14	22	15	38	25

The differences of opinions between teachers in private and public institutes can be easily identified by the check of correlation coefficients on the criteria-items. The following Table 5 presents correlation coefficients of teachers' opinions on the fifteen evaluation criteria between the teacher-groups.

TABLE 5
Correlation Coefficients of Teachers' Opinions on Evaluation Criteria

	Primary school	Secondary school	Pre-service teachers	University	Korean at private institute	Native at private institute
Primary school						
Secondary school	.76					
Pre-service teachers	.63	.90				
University	.87	.77	.70			
Korean at private institute	.47	.45	.45	.51		
Native at private institute	.35	.28	.38	.27	.63	

The average correlation coefficient was computed as .56 ($n = 15$), indicating a moderate level of agreement in criteria priorities among the teachers from various institutes in Korea. However, the correlation coefficient for native English teachers at private institute with the teachers in other groups was relatively low. The average correlation coefficients was computed as .38 ($n = 5$), indicating a low level of correlation. Interestingly, the correlation coefficient with Korean teachers in the same type of institute was relatively high, as $r = .63$.

The correlation coefficients of teacher-groups of primary school, secondary school, university and pre-service were relatively high, as the average of .77 ($n = 6$). Among the groups, the correlation coefficient between secondary school and pre-service teachers was the highest, as $r = .90$. It seemed to be caused by the possibility that pre-service teachers were being trained to be teachers at secondary schools, so their opinions might have been similar to those of secondary school teachers. On the basis of the correlation checks, it can be inferred that the membership of certain type of teaching institute might be relatively stronger variable rather than the variables of first language or teaching length in responding the importance of coursebook evaluation criteria.

2. Opinions on Materials Development Criteria

The teachers were asked to rate the importance of each of the sixteen materials development criteria on a seven-point Likert-scale. The following Table 6 shows the mean results of the ratings and the results of ANOVAs.

TABLE 6
Importance of Materials Development Criteria: ANOVAs and Descriptive Statistics

Materials development criteria	Mean square	F	P	Teacher Group								
				Primary school			Secondary school			Pre-service teachers		
				M	SD	R	M	SD	R	M	SD	R
Impact	2.06	2.68	0.07	6.73	0.5	1	6.49	0.8	1	6.37	1.0	1
To feel at ease	3.41	3.15	0.04	6.40	0.7	5	6.25	0.9	6	5.99	1.2	8
To develop confidence	2.84	2.44	0.09	6.40	0.7	4	6.32	0.9	3	6.05	1.2	7
Relevant and useful	0.42	0.44	0.64	6.45	0.7	3	6.47	0.8	2	6.35	1.1	2
Learner self-investment	0.64	0.56	0.57	6.25	0.7	7	6.14	1.0	8	6.05	1.2	6
To acquire the points being taught	0.37	0.30	0.74	5.88	1.0	12	5.75	1.0	12	5.72	1.2	11
Language in authentic use	1.83	1.83	0.16	6.48	0.8	2	6.31	0.9	4	6.15	1.1	3
Linguistic feature of the input	1.15	1.07	0.34	6.13	0.8	9	5.85	1.1	10	5.87	1.1	9
To achieve communicative purposes	1.12	1.00	0.37	6.13	0.8	8	6.31	0.9	5	6.07	1.2	5
The positive delayed effects of instruction	0.75	0.59	0.56	5.55	1.1	14	5.41	1.1	14	5.33	1.2	15
Different learning styles	1.37	1.27	0.28	5.88	0.9	11	5.80	1.1	11	5.62	1.0	12
Different affective attitudes	1.15	0.93	0.40	5.70	1.0	13	5.71	1.2	13	5.51	1.1	14
A silent period	0.08	0.05	0.95	5.18	1.2	16	5.20	1.1	16	5.14	1.3	16
Both right and left brain activities	0.64	0.60	0.55	5.95	0.9	10	5.90	1.0	9	5.78	1.1	10
Not too much controlled practice	1.46	1.12	0.33	5.53	0.9	15	5.32	1.2	15	5.59	1.2	13
Opportunities for outcome feedback	0.32	0.34	0.71	6.25	0.8	6	6.22	0.8	7	6.13	1.1	4

For these groups of teachers, the criteria of ‘impact’ (materials should achieve impact), ‘to develop confidence’ (materials should help learners to develop confidence), ‘relevant and useful’ (what is being taught should be perceived by learners as relevant and useful), and ‘language in authentic use’ (materials should expose the learners to language in authentic use) were considered as very important for the development of ELT coursebooks. It can be interpreted that the responses of these teacher-groups generally reflect the ideas of recent English language teaching.

The criteria regarded to be of low importance for these teacher-groups were closely related to the recent findings of SLA (Second language acquisition) research. The criteria of ‘the positive delayed effects of instruction’ (materials should take into account that the positive effects of instruction are usually delayed), ‘a silent period’ (materials should permit a silent period at the beginning of instruction), and ‘not too much controlled practice’ (materials should not rely too much on controlled practice) represent the proposals based on current SLA research results. It seems probable that these groups of

teachers might have had a low level of confidence utilizing the findings of recent study results in using coursebooks, and so might have considered these criteria as relatively less important. The levels of preferences to the criteria of 'different learning styles' (materials should take into account that learners differ in learning styles) 'different affective attitudes' (materials should take into account that learners differ in affective attitudes), and 'both right and left brain activity' (materials should maximise learning potential by encouraging intellectual, aesthetic and emotional involvement which stimulates both right and left brain activities) seem to reflect the teachers' rather conservative opinions on individualization of materials use.

Among the results of sixteen ANOVAs on the levels of opinions on materials development criteria, only one item of 'to feel at ease' revealed a statistically significant difference among the groups. This pattern of the results suggests that there can be a possibility of consensus in opinions on materials development among primary school, secondary school, and pre-service teachers.

In case of the correlation coefficients of the teachers' opinions on materials development criteria, very high levels of correlations were obtained from the groups. The following Table 7 presents the correlation coefficients of the groups.

TABLE 7
Correlation Coefficients of Teachers' Opinions on Development Criteria

	Primary school	Secondary school	Pre-service teachers
Primary school			
Secondary school	.96		
Pre-service teachers	.96	.95	

In seeing the results of high levels of Pearson r correlation coefficients among the groups, it may be tentatively suggested that they might share the same ideas about the directions for coursebook development. However, since the present study did not invite the responses from university teachers and teachers of private institute, the discussion about the consensus with those group members is beyond the scope of the present investigation.

3. Comments on Materials Evaluation and Development Criteria

Many respondents of the questionnaire survey wrote one or more of the followings: i) their own criteria for coursebook evaluation and development, regardless whether the criteria were presented or missed in the questionnaire, ii) criticism or approval of the questionnaire instrument itself, including the content of some criteria-items, iii) description of coursebook selection situation in Korean context, iv) explanation of her/his own

coursebook selection or development procedures, and v) evaluation and recommendation of particular coursebooks for the future materials development of this investigator and other fellow teachers. In this part, for the present investigation purpose, their comments on coursebook evaluation and development criteria are presented only. These criteria may be referred to in setting up a scheme for coursebook evaluation and development for primary, secondary, or university-level coursebook within a Korean context.

1) Secondary and/or University-level Coursebook Evaluation and Development

Interesting types, features, aspects or elements in coursebooks:

- The textbook we use should also draw some interest. For instance, colors, placement, letter size, and pictures or media are factors which motivate students to learn.
- A good book should present a variety of topics with functional notional concept, and those topics should ... be appealing to the needs and interests of the learners.

Coverage of four skills and communicative strategies:

- Integrated, but focused on speaking.
- A good selection of reading should be considered. Use reading parts for homework rather than for class.

Reflection of theories of learning methodology:

- Don't you think a content-based approach is the way to go for EAP course at university in Korea?

Cultural tone:

- Overall, I am disappointed with the publications and materials available thus far for EFL instruction. I feel that much of the content in the current is dry, boring and is lacking of a more 'global' appeal. The material seems to contain a general bias favoring US culture and only US culture, history etc ... and outdated at that!

Facilitation of use of English outside the classroom:

- What is important is getting the students to overcome their fear of making mistakes and use English

Quality of cassette tapes and CDs:

- Cassette should be replaced to CD because it is difficult to find where the content is in case of cassette recorder.

Appropriacy for classroom activities:

- More sophisticate pair work schemes with role cards are always strongly desired.

Price and (supplementary book) availability:

- Any coursebook, I insist, should include sufficient information on supplementary materials, so that any teacher can access to resources other than included in the book (or teachers' guide).

- The better the textbook, the less need for supplementary materials.

Variety in a unit and systematic grading:

- Grammatical points, vocabulary and other new structures should be provided in a meaningful context.

General impression and quality:

- The best textbooks have the following qualities; 1. pictures 2. good use of space; one page = one lesson i.e. easily photocopied.

Teacher's book availability:

- teachers' books with the text on the left hand page and suggested procedure on the right hand page are particularly useful

Mechanism for feedback / self-study:

- ... select the appropriate textbook which should indicate; topics for each unit, functions, grammar and various activities so that students might understand and preview the unit in advance even by themselves.

Flexibility of teacher's approach and management of coursebook:

- I, like many other teachers, see if the book confirms my preference to methods and approach and my teaching style as well.

Intellectual and/or cognitive level of coursebook, appropriate and stimulating to learners:

- The content of the book should be proper for academic use, that is, to help the students not only to develop their language but also to have sound morality and affirmative attitude, new and helpful knowledge, and so on. Even though the reality is so, the cruel or obscene scenes shouldn't be in the book.

Economy of size and length:

- Personally, I do not like to carry around heavy coursebooks. I think it is important to find a textbook which has enough materials to be covered in one semester only. This would leave a sense of finished feeling for both the teachers and the students.

Clarity and brevity of directions:

- One criterion I find very important, especially in lower level classes, is that the directions in the text should be clear and brief

2) Young Learners Coursebook Evaluation and Development

Coverage of four skills and communicative strategies:

- More creative, open ended activities, no "cookie cutter" responses

Cultural tone:

- More local culture
- Korean culture guide and notes for foreigners
- Use less stereotyped characters and art

Appropriacy for classroom activities:

- Should not be so many craft activities at the higher level
- Older students don't like to sing

Variety in a unit and systematic grading:

- There should be at least 5 characters in the text
- Variety of levels are needed for each unit
- Internet: English activities using the Internet/research

Teacher's book availability:

- Teacher's Book: information on grammar instruction important for native speakers

Mechanism for feedback / self-study:

- Books should allow children to work ahead
- Homework book: clear instructions to help students work independently
- Include self-assessment rubrics

V. CONCLUSION

The present study investigated teachers' opinions on ELT materials evaluation and development criteria. A questionnaire survey was carried out to 508 teachers and pre-service teachers in Korea. In case of the criteria-items that asked for the opinions on materials evaluation, the criteria related to 'coverage of four skills and communicative strategies,' 'cultural tone' and 'interest' were ranked as highly important. The results of the ANOVAs and correlation checks revealed a high level of agreement among the groups of pre-service teachers, primary school, secondary school, and university teachers. The average correlation coefficient was computed as .77 for these groups. However, relatively low levels of agreements between these teachers and the teachers in private institute were reported. In case of the criteria-items that asked for the opinions on the materials development, 246 teachers of pre-service teachers, primary and secondary school teachers answered the questionnaire. They responded that materials should achieve impact, use authentic language, and be relevant and useful for the betterment of ELT. High levels of agreements on the opinions on materials development were found among the groups.

The results of the teachers' opinions on coursebook materials and development criteria identified from the present study can be referred to and directly utilized for the selection of a new coursebook, the adaptation of a chosen coursebook, and the development of a new coursebook, especially within the context of English courses in Korea. The benefits of using teachers' opinions for coursebook evaluation can be as follows: by identifying the teacher-group's preferences and dislikes, it is easily possible to evaluate some competing coursebooks among many candidate-coursebooks, and the selection can be reached on the

basis of the group's approved preferences (Chambers, 1997).

ELT materials designers, who are planning to develop coursebooks for Korean teachers of English, may utilize the results of the teachers' opinions in the present investigation. In other words, for the purpose of "systematizing materials design" (McGrath, 2002, p. 139), it should be beneficial to identify the target teachers' preferences on ELT materials and a local ELT situation.

Surveys or reports on teachers' opinions about materials can attract researchers' attention. To carry out the investigation, the followings can be considered. First, in the present study, a checklist is adapted as a data-collection instrument. It means that a checklist is used not only as a materials evaluation scheme but also as an empirical research tool (Riazi, 2003). It should not necessarily mean that a checklist is always a valid and reliable instrument for the estimation of teachers' opinions to the certain criteria. It should be noticed that there could be serious problems in the construction and the administration of opinion survey, if care would not be given. In this case, it should be better to invite teachers' evaluative comments or responses.

Second, the main purpose of the investigation was to understand and to describe the consensus of particular teachers' opinions to the various criteria. It should be useful to investigate the individual or group differences more systematically with a clear intention of a further comparison of the data within or between the teacher-subjects.

Third, the data collection was carried out at one specific time. It means that the investigator regarded the characteristic of the teachers' opinions as stable rather than changeable. However, it can be noted that the teachers' opinions on the criteria can be altered or developed if a teacher-training would be involved. Therefore, a longitudinal study would be necessary to detect any changes of teachers' opinions on materials evaluation and development criteria.

Fourth, the preferences to the criteria were asked without reference to a particular materials or coursebook. It is certain that the opinions to the criteria and the actual evaluation on certain materials are different dimensions in the minds and inevitably different areas of investigation. Therefore, it should be interesting to investigate both areas and compare the results.

To sum up, we need to be well aware of the fact that the investigation of the opinions on materials evaluation and development criteria is eventually associated with measuring the relative value of various criteria to a specific teacher-group in certain context at certain time.

REFERENCES

Alderson, J. C., & Scott, M. (1992). Insiders, outsiders and participatory evaluation. In J. C.

- Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 25-57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, F. (1997). Seeking consensus in coursebook evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 51, 29-35.
- Collins Cobuild. (1987). *Collins Cobuild English dictionary*. London: Author.
- Crark, C., & Peterson, P. (1986). Teachers' thought process. In M. Wittrok (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd. ed.). (pp. 255-298). New York: MacMillan.
- Crark, C., & Yinger, R. (1979). Teacher's thinking. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Research on thinking* (pp. 231-263). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Crawford, J. (2002). The role of materials in the language classroom: Finding the balance. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 80-91). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1984). *Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching materials*. London: Heinemann.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. London: Heinemann.
- Dougill, J. (1987). Not so obvious. In L. Sheldon (Ed.), *ELT Textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development* (ELT Documents 126) (pp. 29-36). London: Modern English Publications/ The British Council.
- Dudley-Evans, A., & Bates, M. (1987). The evaluation of an ESP textbook. In L. Sheldon (Ed.), *ELT Textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development* (ELT Documents 126) (pp. 100-105). London: Modern English Publications/ The British Council.
- Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook*. Essex: Longman.
- Hutchinson, E. G. (1996). *What do teachers and learners actually do with textbooks?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.
- Hutchinson, T. (1987). What's underneath?: An interactive view of materials evaluation, In L. E. Sheldon (Ed.), *ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development* (ELT Documents 126) (pp. 37-44). London: Modern English Publications/ The British Council.
- Kim, Hae-Dong. (2002). Procedures for the selection of a textbook: A university general English course. *English Teaching*, 57(1), 239-266.
- Kim, Hae-Dong. (2004). Learners' opinions on criteria for ELT materials evaluation. *English Teaching*, 59(3), 3-28.
- Kim, Kyung-hwan; Hong, Kyong-Sun; Kim, Mia; & Nimmo, Garnet (1998). New guidelines for college English materials development. *English Teaching*, 53(3), 217-239.
- Kim, Young-tae. (2003). Chodungyounge kyojaeKabal banghwang (Directions for the development of primary school English textbooks). *KAPEE Newsletter*, 15, 9-13.
- Lazar, G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching: A guide for teachers and trainers*.

- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mariani, L. (1980). Evaluating coursebooks. *Modern English Teacher*, 8, 27-31.
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D., & Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peacock, M. (1997). Choosing the right book for your class. *Essex Graduate Student Papers in Language and Linguistics*, 1, 61-69.
- Rea-Dickins, P., & Germaine, K. (1992). *Evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Riazi, A. M. (2003). What do textbook evaluation schemes tell us?: A study of the textbook evaluation schemes of three decades. In W. A. Renandya (Ed.), *Methodology and materials design in language teaching* (pp. 52-68). Singapore: SEAMEO regional language centre.
- Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, J. (1996). Demystifying materials evaluation. *System*, 24, 375-389.
- Rubdy, R. (2003). Selection of materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 37-57). London: Continuum.
- Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42, 237-246.
- Skierso, A. (1991). Textbook selection and evaluation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.). (pp. 432-453). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Spratt, M. (1994). *English for the teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (1997). The future perfect? *MATSDA Folio*, 4, 3.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). Introduction. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). Materials evaluation. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 15-36). London: Continuum.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, R. (1981). A procedure for ESP textbook analysis and evaluation on teacher education courses. *The ESP Journal*, 1, 155-162.
- Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, T. (1990). Review: ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development. *ELT Journal*, 44, 343-346.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

여러분 안녕하십니까? 본 설문조사는 영어 교과서 평가와 개발의 세부항목에 대하여 조사 하고자 마련한 것입니다. 여러분의 응답은 매우 중요한 연구 자료이오니 성실하게 응답해 주시면 대단히 감사 하겠습니다.

우선 개인 인적 사항을 간단하게 응답해 주세요.

성 별: 남 ___ 여___ 나이: _____ 살

영어 교사로서의 경력: _____ 년 (없는 경우 '0'으로 표시하세요)

교수기관: 초등학교___ 중학교___ 고등학교___ 대학교___

기타(써주세요): _____

I. 다음의 항목을 얼마나 중요하게 생각하는지 응답 표시해 주세요. 이 항목들은 교과서를 평가하는데 자주 참고 되는 항목들입니다. 이 항목은 특정한 교과서를 평가하는 항목이 아닙니다. 다음의 척도를 참조하세요:

아주 중요하다 7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___ 전혀중요하지 않다

1. 교과서는 편집 - 인쇄나 삽화의 수준 및 페이지의 구성 - 이 잘 되어 있어야하며, 최근에 출판된 것이어야 한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

2. 소개되는 문화적 내용은 수업에 적절하며 학습자가 받아들일 수 있을 정도이어야 한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

3. 학습자가 수업시간에 적절하게 수행할 수 있는 역할극이나 활동에 관한 자료를 포함하고 있어야 한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

4. 학습자의 흥미를 불러일으키는 다양하며 적절한 자료를 수록하여 학습자의 개인적 (학습) 참여도를 높여야 한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

5. 학습자 자신이 학습에 스스로 책임감을 갖게끔 안내하는 자료를 포함하고 있어야 한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

6. 교과서는 현재 세계적으로 보편적인 학습 이론과 방법론에 기초한 것이어야 한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

7. 강세의 유형이나 억양, 개별음의 인식과 더불어 발화를 위한 발음연습의 자료가 있어야 한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

8. 듣기, 말하기, 읽기, 쓰기 등의 언어 기술을 균형 있게 제시하며 다양한 수업활동을 소개하여 학습자의 의사소통 전략이 발달할 수 있게 해야한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

9. 개별단원은 다양한 학습 활동 요소들을 포함하고 있어야 하며, 매 단원의 새로운 문법사항은 적절하며 체계적으로 제시되어야 한다.

7___ 6___ 5___ 4___ 3___ 2___ 1___

10. 학습자가 교과서를 올바르게 사용할 수 있게 안내하는 부분이 있어야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
11. 학습자가 배운 바를 점검하고 평가할 수 있는 자료 (e.g. 학습성취도 평가 시험) 들을 포함하고, 학습자 혼자서도 학습할 수 있게 되어 있어야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
12. 교과서는 학습자가 교실 밖에서도 영어를 사용할 수 있게끔 인도 해야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
13. 교과서에는 문법 사항, 언어 기능 항목에 대한 요약이나 색인 및 새로 나온 어휘, 내용 소재(topic) 등에 대한 목록표를 담고 있어야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
14. (테이프가 있는 경우) 테이프는 음질이 좋고, 원어민의 다양한 목소리와 정상적인 대화 속도로 녹음되어 있어야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
15. 교과서는 구입이 용이하고 비싸지 않아야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__

II. 다음은 영어 교과서를 제작하는데 자주 참고 되는 항목들입니다. 여러분이 교과서를 제작할 경우 다음의 요소들은 얼마나 중요한지 응답해 주세요.

우선 제작하고 싶은 대상 영어교과서를 하나 선택하세요:

초등__ 중등__ 대학생__ 기타(일반)__

다음의 척도를 참고하세요:

아주 중요하다 7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__ 전혀중요하지 않다

1. 교과서는 학생의 관심을 끌 수 있어야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
2. 교과서는 학생이 편안하게 학습할 수 있도록 도와야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
3. 교과서는 학생이 자신감을 갖도록 도와야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
4. 학생이 학습내용을 유용하고 유의미하다고 느낄 수 있어야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
5. 교과서는 학생의 적극적인 참여를 요구하고, 조장하여 발견학습을 유도해야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
6. 교과서는 학생이 학습요점을 공부할 준비를 갖추게 하여야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
7. 교과서는 학생을 실생활과 연관된 언어에 노출될 수 있게 해야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
8. 교과서는 입력되는 언어의 특징에 학생의 관심을 끌수 있어야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
9. 교과서는 학생이 의사소통 목적을 달성하기 위해서 목표어를 사용할 수 있는 기회를 제공해 주어야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__
10. 교과서는 교수의 긍정적인 효과가 대개 나중에 나타난다는 점을 고려해야 한다.
7__ 6__ 5__ 4__ 3__ 2__ 1__

11. 교과서는 학생의 학습 유형의 다양성을 고려해야 한다.
7__6__5__4__3__2__1__
12. 교과서는 학생의 정의적 유형의 다양성을 고려해야 한다.
7__6__5__4__3__2__1__
13. 교과서는 교수의 초기 단계의 칠판기를 허용해야 한다.
7__6__5__4__3__2__1__
14. 교과서는 학생의 좌우 대뇌의 활동을 촉진할 수 있는 지적, 심미적 및 정서적 활동을
격려하며 학생의 잠재력을 극대화해야 한다.
7__6__5__4__3__2__1__
15. 교과서는 너무나 통제적인 활동에 의존하여서는 않된다.
7__6__5__4__3__2__1__
16. 교과서는 학습 활동의 결과에 대한 피드백을 줄 수 있는 기회를 제공해야 한다.
7__6__5__4__3__2__1__

이상의 성실한 답변에 대단히 감사 드립니다.

Applicable levels: elementary, secondary, tertiary education

Key words: materials development, materials evaluation, teachers' opinions

Hae-Dong Kim
English Language Education
Graduate School of Education
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
270, Imun-dong, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul
130-791, Korea
Tel: (02) 2174-3017
Email: khhd@hufs.ac.kr

Received in February, 2006

Reviewed in March, 2006

Revised version received in May, 2006