# Evaluation of a ELT Coursebook Based on Criteria Designed by McDonough and Shaw

**A Module Three Assignment**

**Lexis and Syllabus and Materials**

**ANDREW WHITE**

# 1.0    INTRODUCTION

The selection of a coursebook is one of the most important decisions a teacher will make in shaping the content and nature of teaching and learning. It involves matching the material against the context in which it is going to be used, following the aims of the teaching program, as well as fitting the personal methodology of the teacher.

In this paper, I will first look at the purposes of coursebooks, including their limitations. Following this, I will examine several evaluation methods, as provided by leading experts in the field. I will then apply the model of one of these methods, designed by McDonough and Shaw, to a coursebook used to my own working context. In doing so, I hope to appraise the strengths and weaknesses of my materials.

# 2.0    THE ROLE OF COURSEBOOKS

In the ESL classroom, materials (and for the purposes of this paper, I am referring to coursebooks) are an important aspect of the curriculum. They are the most observable feature of a teacher's methodology, and can contribute greatly to a course's syllabus. O'Neill (1982) provides 4 justifications for the use of coursebooks. Firstly, a large portion of a coursebook's material can be suitable for students needs, even if not specifically designed for them. Secondly, coursebooks allow for students to look ahead, or refresh themselves with past lessons. They remove the element of surprise in student's expectations. Thirdly, coursebooks have the practical aspect of providing material which is well-presented in inexpensive form. Finally, and I believe most importantly, well-designed coursebooks allow for improvisation and adaptation by the teacher, as well as empowering students to create spontaneous interaction in the class.

According to O'Neill, "Since language is an instrument for generating what people need and want to say spontaneously, a great deal must depend on spontaneous, creative interaction in the classroom." (O'Neill 1982: 111). Coursebooks should be accessible to a

variety of students, regardless of their learning goals, as well as being adaptable to the diversity of teachers and teaching styles.

## 2.1 THE LIMITS OF COURSEBOOKS

Most experts agree, however, that heavy dependence on a single coursebook is detrimental to students' needs, and that adaptability and supplemental materials are supportive additions. (Swales 1980, Nunan 1991, Medgyes 1994, Allwright 1981, Stern 1992, Cunningsworth 1995)(See also Section 5.6 and 6.1). The general view among current researchers supports the opportunity for choice, in accordance with student's learning needs and interest. Informal, teacher-made materials with a specific group of students in mind will always assist professional, published materials. (Stern 1992: 353).

Additionally, in discussing what is "available to be learned" in the classroom, as well as to what is "taught", Allwright (1981) emphasizes that "content (potential intake) is not predictable. It is, rather, something that emerges because of the interactive nature of classroom events." (Allwright 1981: 8). Although a coursebook may assist in some way, it cannot determine the over-all content of a language program. Allwright, thus, believes that coursebooks hold a limited role, restricting students to merely "captive learners." Instead he advocates a "whole-person involvement," in which students, through learner-training, actively participate in the management of their learning, in such a way that coursebook-led teaching would find impossible.

A strong alliance placed on the coursebook by the teacher can reveal his considerations, or lack of, toward the over-all learning/teaching process. Additionally, to those teachers who have no input toward the materials used in their teaching context, there may be no distinction between syllabus, methodology and the coursebook used. All may be intertwined into an officially approved publication from which personal creativity is void.

Cunningsworth (1995) provides four interrelated disadvantages to an approach which is heavily dependent on a single coursebook. Firstly, there can be a lack of variety in teaching procedures. Secondly, innovations toward individual student's needs are reduced. Thirdly, spontaneity and flexibility are diminished. Fourthly, there can be a lack of creativity in teaching techniques and language use. Cunningsworth states, "Heavy

dependence on coursebooks is far from ideal as it reduces the importance of the individual contributions that good teachers make at all levels in the learning process." (Cunningsworth 1995: 10).

A well-designed coursebook which allows for adaptation and a certain degree of learner spontaneity is generally regarded as the most visible tool in the balanced teacher/learner relationship. At best they should provide only a framework for which this interaction and improvisation occurs. (O'Neill 1982, Cunningsworth 1995). As the aims of the coursebook should correspond as closely as possible to the teacher's own methodology, it is of great importance that teachers evaluate coursebooks in terms of their ability to realize these aims. Due to the recent growth of materials in the ESL publishing industry, guidelines are necessary to raise teachers' awareness to various coursebook designs. Rather than criticizing instructors who are handcuffed to a certain text, relevant evaluation criteria should instruct teachers how to best select coursebooks that fit their certain needs. (Garinger 2001).


# 3.0   COURSEBOOK  EVALUATION  METHODS


As a trip to any current bookstore will reveal, there is a vast choice of ESL coursebooks available, all with competing claims to be 'communicative', focusing on 'real English' through 'stimulating activities', and so on. With such an *embarrass de richesses* (Stern 1992: 352), it is important that teachers make informed and appropriate choices when selecting coursebooks for their students, especially in today's computer age where sophisticated learners demand high standards in materials and presentation.

In regard to these important choices teachers need to make, Nunan states,

> The selection process can be greatly facilitated by the use of systematic *materials evaluation procedures* which help ensure that materials are consistent with the needs and interests of the learners they are intended to serve, as well as being in harmony with institutional ideologies on the nature of language and learning.
> (Nunan 1991: 209)

Effective evaluation relies on asking appropriate questions and interpreting the answers to them. (Cunningsworth 1995). The creation of extensive evaluation checklists by leading experts provides criteria for detailed coursebook analysis. Cunningsworth's checklist for evaluation and selection contains 45 questions, covering criteria such as aims, design, language content, skills, and methodology, as well as practical considerations such as cost and obtainability.

Sheldon (1988) provides an expansive checklist of 53 questions classified under 17 major criteria, which appraises content factors such as accessibility, content, layout and authenticity. Because of the wide variety of ELT coursebooks available, he advocates the use of evaluative measures, yet admits dissatisfaction with the "uneven quality" of these "evaluative tools," (Sheldon 1988: 240) stating the lack of any standardized global checklist or approach to materials analysis.

Extensive checklists such as these, as well as others (Breen and Candlin 1987, Robinett, adapted by Brown 1994, McDonough and Shaw 1993, Skierso, 1991) imply that designers are striving for comprehensiveness in evaluation procedures. Swales (1980, cited in Wharton, web site) has criticized this inclination, claiming that the more questions one asks of a set of teaching materials, striving for some kind of intricate discovery, the more likely one is to be disappointed. Rather, teachers should look at the evaluation process from a more subjective view (Sheldon 1988, Cunningsworth 1995) realizing that any checklist requires adaptation before being submitted to the personal requirements of individual teachers. As Cunningsworth (1995: 5) states, the selection procedure is intended as a "framework, not a straitjacket," and any procedure should be modified to suit personal circumstances. Similarly, Sheldon explains that, "coursebook assessment is fundamentally a subjective, rule-of-thumb activity, and that no neat formula, grid or system will ever provide a definite yardstick." (Sheldon 1988: 245).

McDonough and Shaw (1993) provide a flexible two-stage model for the comprehensive evaluation of coursebooks. A brief external evaluation includes criteria which gives an overview of the organizational foundation of the coursebook, 'as stated explicitly by the author/publisher' through the cover, introduction and table of contents statements. Following this is an in-depth internal investigation of the coursebook, 'to see how far the materials in question match up to what the author claims as well as to the

aims and objectives of a given teaching program." (McDonough and Shaw 1993: 64). Unique in their coverage of criteria, their 22-point framework is designed both for teachers looking to select a coursebook, *a predictive evaluation*, as well as for those teachers looking to identify strengths and weaknesses in coursebooks already used in their working context, *a retrospective evaluation*. (For a detailed look at retrospective evaluations of tasks in teaching materials, see Ellis: The Language Teacher Online). Their model "distinguishes the purpose behind the evaluation- be it to keep up-to-date with current developments or to adopt/select materials for a given course." (ibid: 65).

For the purposes of this evaluation, I will follow the model provided by McDonough and Shaw, applying pertinent criteria to the coursebook used in my working context. The model's procedural format and flexibility will allow me to fully assess the strengths and weaknesses of my materials. Furthermore, taking a retrospective approach to the evaluation will give me "insight into the organizational principles of the materials," and thus highlight "realistic ways of adapting the materials to a particular group of learners." (ibid: 65).


## 4.0    COURSEBOOK AND WORKING CONTEXT


Given the freedom of choice in selecting a coursebook, I have used *High Impact* (Ellis, Helgesen, Browne, Gorsuch and Schwab 1996) at a private two year college for the past four years, teaching Beginning and Intermediate English Conversation. In addition to the coursebook is a workbook *High Impact Workout* (Gorsuch and Schwab 1996) as well as *High Impact* Teacher's Manual and cassettes. Class size has varied from approximately 15 to 40 students, with the average age being from twenty to twenty five years old.

As is typical in the Korean educational system, students have received extensive English grammar and reading practice in their background before entering college, but have not been allowed to build up and hone oral skills production. Classes are taught by myself, an American English native speaker, without the help of Korean assistants or

translators. This is the norm in the Korean college ESL classroom, and I believe greatly benefits students' comprehension skills in such an immersion setting.

## 5.0    EXTERNAL EVALUATION

At this initial 'external, overview' stage of the evaluation of the *High Impact* coursebook, I will examine "what the books say about themselves." (Cunningsworth 1984, cited in McDonough and Shaw 1993: 67). This is done by looking at what has been stated explicitly in the 'blurb,' or claims made on the cover of the teachers/students book… [and] the introduction and table of contents." (Ibid: 67). Investigation of this kind can justify or disprove author/publisher claims. However, being quite familiar with the content of this coursebook, prior experience and knowledge will have a *retrospective* effect on my 'external' analysis.

### 5.1    THE INTENDED AUDIENCE

Although no age group is explicitly stated, *High Impact* revolves around the lives of 4 young people in their early twenties. Serving as a backdrop, the development of these characters creates interest for intended learners. Young adults are implicitly shown to be the intended audience, which fits the age group in my teaching context.

### 5.2    THE PROFICIENCY LEVEL

*High Impact* is the second of a two-level course. There is no claim to a particular level, though the 'blurb' on the back cover states that group activity tasks are 'useful for students of all levels." I have reason to dispute this claim, as vocabulary knowledge and retention required for oral production activities varies with students' level. The four Expansion Units throughout the coursebook, however, do recycle given vocabulary and expressions, allowing for extra structured focus.

## 5.3 THE CONTEXT IN WHICH THE MATERIALS ARE TO BE USED

McDonough and Shaw make reference for distinguishing between teaching general learners and teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP). As stated in the Introduction, *High Impact* is designed "to help students develop confidence and skill in using English for communication," and makes no claim to be focused on specific learners or purposes. Its effectiveness in a general English conversation class has been evident in my teaching context, my students having no specific intentions for English.

## 5.4 HOW THE LANGUAGE HAS BEEN PRESENTED AND ORGANIZED INTO TEACHABLE UNITS/LESSONS

The coursebook contains 12 main units and four expansion units. Each of the main units follows a format consisting of the following sections:

*Warm up*---introduces the theme of the unit.

*Listening*---presents tasks that develop specific information, gist and inferential listening skills.

*Conversation Topic*---presents vocabulary and dialog practice along with personalization.

*Grammar Awareness*---presents tasks to help students notice grammar usage.

*Pair Interaction*---provides opinion gap and experience gap activities which allow students to share their own ideas and experiences.

*Read and Response*---provides both a model and a reason to read and write.                              (High Impact Teacher's Manual 1996: iv)

The length of each main unit must be realized by the teacher when deciding how it will harmonize into a given educational program. (McDonough and Shaw 1993: 69). Each main unit of the *High Impact* coursebook has been designed for approximately three 50-minute class periods, or two 90-minute periods, or roughly 15-20 minutes per section. Expansion units are designed for two 50-minute periods, or one 90-minute period. The

coursebook provides materials for approximately 38 hours of class time. (High Impact Teacher's Manual 1996: iv).

While agreeing with McDonough's and Shaw's comment that the length of each unit must be understood to facilitate a program (and this comes from experience using the given coursebook), the times provided in the Teacher's Manual are easily adaptable in my teaching context. In my use of *High Impact*, activities which I feel create a more positive student response are given more class time, while more passive activities that do not promote oral skills production can be glanced over or skipped altogether. Given the autonomy of each section within the unit, this does not create a gap in gradation. Indeed, little gradation or sequencing exists. In addition, not finishing a unit in the allotted time doesn't affect students' interest.

## 5.5    THE AUTHOR'S VIEWS ON LANGUAGE AND METHODOLOGY

When looking at the author's view on language and methodology, it is important to consider the relationship between the language, the learning process and the learner. As stated in the coursebook's Introduction, the Impact series is designed to help develop "skill in *using* English for communication." (High Impact coursebook: 4). Priority thus given to the *process* of developing second language competence would follow what White (1988) has termed 'the Type B syllabus", a learner-based course of action in which "both the content and the processes of learning become part of the language learning experience." (White 1988:101). This is opposed to a 'Type A Syllabus,' in which functions and content are predetermined and learner involvement is non-interactive.

However, I find White's models too contrastive for analyzing a modern coursebook such as *High Impact*. Rather, I would refer to High Impact as following a 'multi-syllabus' approach, which integrates the two methods of White, thus increasing ability on a range of communicative criteria while, at the same time, acknowledging the need to provide systematic practice in the formal functions of language. (McDonough and Shaw 1993: 50). (See Internal Evaluation, Section 6.1 for more on Communicative Language Teaching).

As stated in the coursebook's Introduction, activities and tasks are designed for students to "practice information-gathering skills (listening and reading) in context... [and]... for expressing personal opinions about their own lives."(High Impact: 4). As well as advocating communicative language teaching, this statement adheres to a functional view of language, whose characteristics are provided by Richards and Rodgers (1986) below:

1. Language is a system for the expression of meaning.
2. The primary function of language is for interaction and communication.
3. The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses.
4. The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse.

(Richards and Rodgers 1986: 71)

The *High Impact* coursebook repeatedly provides activities for students to interact through the expression of meaning.

## 5.6 ARE THE MATERIALS TO BE USED AS THE MAIN 'CORE' COURSE OR TO BE SUPPLEMENTARY TO IT?

In discussing the total cost of a course, McDonough and Shaw state that sheer economics might dissuade a teacher from selecting certain materials. (1993: 70). The *High Impact* coursebook, while being reasonable priced at roughly $12.00 US, is designed to be used as the 'core' course. I have found it very satisfactory as such.

In addition to the *High Impact* coursebook, a 48-page workbook called *High Impact Workout* (Gorsuch and Schwab 1996) is available, created by two of the coursebook developers. It is designed to supplement the coursebook, "helping students focus on the learning objectives in each unit by providing additional guided comprehension and production practice." (High Impact Teacher's Manual: viii). I find the workbook especially effective for homework review. Although less communicative then in-class activities, I find the activities helpful for explicit grammar teaching. Teacher-led checking of the homework at the beginning of class provides a guided initial activity to 'warm-up' the class.

### 5.6.1 IS THE TEACHER'S BOOK IN PRINT AND LOCALLY AVAILABLE?

A teacher's manual is widely available and in my experience is sold locally wherever the coursebook and workbook are. The manual provides valuable teaching tips addressing common problems and concerns. Every chapter contains a *Teacher Reflection* section, which gives teachers a chance to evaluate the activities done. I believe the *High Impact* manual can be a useful resource for both beginning and experienced teachers.

Although offering much prescribed programs on how to teach the material, experienced teachers can benefit from the variations provided. As stated by the authors, "Different teachers want different things from a teacher's manual. New teachers often want lots of specific teaching strategies. Experienced teachers often want new or extra techniques or activities." (Teacher's Manual: vii). The manual provides support for both.

### 5.7 IS A VOCABULARY LIST/INDEX INCLUDED?

The coursebook contains an appendix of key words and expressions at the back of the book, categorized by unit. This has proved useful for my students, doing individualized, out-of-class work, as well as comprehensive preparation for exams.

Sinclair and Renouf (1988), however, dispute the addition of vocabulary lists found in many modern coursebooks. The approach taken to vocabulary is not systematic and there is little coordination in establishing targets. According to them, most modern coursebooks "attempt to coordinate several parallel threads of syllabus…the variety is often bewildering, and the actual coordination minimal." (Sinclair and Renouf 1988: 144) .

### 5.8 WHAT VISUAL MATERIAL DOES THE BOOK CONTAIN AND IS IT ACTUALLY INTEGRATED INTO THE TEXT?

Photographs, drawings and graphs are all attractively done and add an artful, contextual element to the activities. In addition, each unit contains a small comic strip that gives visual life to discourse, combining conversation with practiced functions. Most color photos and illustrations are incorporated into the tasks. In five of the twelve units,

as a pre-task to the activity, the coursebook explicitly asks the students to look at a picture and comment in some way.

## 5.8.1    IS THE LAYOUT AND PRESENTATION CLEAR OR CLUTTERED?

The layout is very professionally presented and not overly cluttered, and was an initial positive factor in my selection of *High Impact* as coursebook for my class. This 'impressionistic overview' (Cunningsworth 1995: 1) revealed that all 12 main units followed a standard format of six sections: Warm Up, Listening, Conversation Topic, Grammar Awareness, Pair Interaction and Read and Response. Each section consists of one page each, typically consisting of a three-stage activity process. This standard procedure lessened student unfamiliarity, and after covering a couple of units students know what to expect in terms of teacher direction and meta-language.

## 5.9    IS THE MATERIAL TOO CULTURALLY BIASED OR SPECIFIC...[OR]…REPRESENT MINORITY GROUPS AND/OR WOMEN IN A NEGATIVE WAY?

*High Impact* is not written explicitly for a certain nationality or cultural group, as the topics which divide each unit are universal in nature, although it seems a certain attempt has been made by the authors to focus on Asian learners. Of the seven main characters, two are of Asian descent, and both discuss their family background (in China and Japan, respectively) for use as listening exercises. In addition, on the inside of the back cover, the authors have included an acknowledgment page in which they thank those who gave suggestions for the *Impact* course. Over half of the approximate 200 listed names are Asian.

There does appear to be a couple of instances of negative cultural stereotyping in *High Impact*, revealing how coursebooks can be "biased" in subtle ways. (Littlejohn and Windeatt, cited in McDonough and Shaw 1993: 74). In one listening exercise, two non-Asian characters discuss whether to report to the police a third Asian character for committing a hit and run offence. In another listening and grammar exercise, a Chinese

character, while contrasting Chinese and American culture, comments on being frightened of the crime and violence in America. These instances could cause offense to some learners and teachers, as well as promoting negative representations of races and cultures.

## 6.0     INTERNAL EVALUATION

In this stage of the analysis, as designed by McDonough and Shaw, the internal consistency and organization of the materials is examined, to discover the extent to which external claims made by the author/publisher correlate with the internal content. (McDonough and Shaw 1993: 75).

## 6.1     THE PRESENTATION OF THE SKILLS IN THE MATERIALS

Integration of the receptive and productive skills is the trend in modern coursebook design. (Brown 1994, White 1988, Stern 1992, Cunningsworth 1995, McDonough and Shaw 1993). Each unit of the *High Impact* coursebook contains sections on listening, speaking and reading, while writing skills are integrated into most activities. Although equal weighting seems to be given to the four skills, developing oral communication skills is the authors' main intention. Three of the six sections in each *High Impact* unit provide for student interaction. This coincides with White's statement on general coursebooks, that "of the four skills speaking will have been given more weighting than any of the others, even though reading and writing will have been used as a means of presenting and practicing the language." (White 1988: 68-69).

This is parallel to my intentions as a teacher, that oral communication skills be weighted more, considering that students at my college receive writing and listening classes additionally. Writing activities in *High Impact*, though necessary in a student's ESL education, are not in following with my oral production focus. The coursebook is easily adaptable, and I find that allotting more time to more communicative activities benefits my students to a greater degree.

13

## 6.2    THE GRADING AND SEQUENCING OF THE MATERIALS

If language is a system, gradation is of great importance. (Mackey, in White 1988:48), "for in a system one thing fits into another, one thing goes with another, and one thing depends on another." However, there seems to be few guidelines or principles following the assumption that language can be divided into structures for organizing language content. In the *High Impact* coursebook, there are no criteria for sequencing the topics of the 12 main units. Indeed, Unit 1, titled "Lifestyles," could easily be interchanged with Unit 12, "Memories." The Appendix (High Impact: 107) lists vocabulary words and expressions as they appear in each of the 12 units. There seems to be no sequencing to these lexical items, other then in the provided Expansion Units. In my teaching context, this apparent lack of grading and sequencing is of little concern.

## 6.3    WHERE READING/'DISCOURSE' SKILLS ARE INVOLVED, IS THERE MUCH IN THE WAY OF APPROPRIATE TEXT BEYOND THE  SENTENCE?

The written materials in each unit of *High Impact* provide reading practice using a variety of writing style extracts, such as magazine articles, biographies, advertisements, and personal and business letters. Scanning, identifying and evaluating skills are practiced for comprehension, as well as preparation for 'shared writing,' where students read and react to partners' ideas.

In addition to extended readings, scripted dialogues are also central to the High Impact coursebook. These I believe provide valuable pieces of natural sounding discourse, not only as examples for study, but to raise the consciousness of students' through exposure to English linguistic data.

## 6.4    WHERE LISTENING SKILLS ARE INVOLVED, ARE RECORDINGS  'AUTHENTIC' OR ARTIFICIAL?

There is much debate concerning the use of 'authentic' language in coursebook activities. Nunan defines 'authentic' language as samples of spoken and written language that have not been specifically written for the purpose of teaching language, "which

learners will encounter outside the classroom." (Nunan 1991: 37-38). Its use allows for students' unconscious mechanisms for acquiring language to operate effectively. (Swan and Walter 1987, in Nunan 1991: 226, Skehan 1996, Carter 1998, D. Willis 2000, J. Willis 1996). In addition, authentic materials can bring greater realism and relevance while increasing learner motivation. (Cunningsworth 1995: 66).

However, the 'hurly burly' (J. Willis 1996: 88) of native speech creates difficulties for students needing to focus on certain lexical items. The role of coursebooks, then, is how to select, idealize and simplify the language to make it more accessible to students (Cook 1998: 61), while still providing natural input for unconscious acquisition.

Recordings in *High Impact*, though not authentic according to Nunan's definition, do provide semi-authentic input for learning purposes, as the following script excerpt reveals:

Jordan:     It was fun being with you, talking and…

Laura:      You know I haven't really talked to a guy this much in a long time.

Jordan:     Yeah, you really did talk a lot tonight, didn't you?

Laura:      I hope I didn't talk too much.

Jordan:     No, no, no. You were so quiet the first time we went out. I actually
            thought you might be a …

Laura:      A what?

Jordan:     You know, boring. An airhead.

Laura:      An airhead? What do you mean?

Jordan:     Well, I mean, you just kind of looked at me. You didn't say anything.

Laura:      Well, now you know I do have a lot to say.

While being available for specific grammar and lexical study, recordings found in *High Impact* still retain a degree of natural authenticity. This quasi-authentic form harmonizes with my methodology aiming for a 'usable competence', or fluency in English, in which learning is unpredictable and depends on exposures to the language. (Willis 2000: 72).

## 6.5    DO YOU FEEL THAT THE MATERIAL IS SUITABLE FOR DIFFERENT LEARNING STYLES…AND IS IT SUFFICIENTLY

## 'TRANSPARENT' TO MOTIVATE BOTH STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ALIKE?

Teachers, course designers, and materials writers must be aware that the input provided by them will possibly be processed by learners in ways different than intended. (Ellis 1993: 4). It is important, then, that materials meet students' needs by allowing for different learning styles.

In the case of *High Impact*, pair work and group activities are popular strategies for practicing information-gathering skills and expressing personal opinions. Four of the six sections of each unit explicitly require group work of some kind. For students preferring a more teacher-led approach, this could create discouraging affects, leading to a lack of motivation. Being aware of this inevitable situation, students must be reminded that the more they engage in oral communication, the more their overall communicative competence will improve. As explained by Brown, many students will find group work frustrating because they are accustomed to the answers being given to them. Language learning is not a skill "where you can simply bone up on rules and words in isolation." (Brown 1994: 177).

## 7.0    SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

One key reason for a retrospective appraisal of materials is to provide insight into organizational principles, and therefore make apparent possible techniques for adaptation. (McDonough and Shaw 1993: 65). Through the multi-syllabus approach followed in *High Impact*, students receive a merging of two broad procedures; that of a view of language as use, including categories of function, context and language skill, and a more formal linguistic syllabus comprising elements of grammar and vocabulary (McDonough and Shaw 1993: 51). An approach of this kind makes *High Impact* easily adaptable to more precisely fit my focus on oral production skills, given the autonomy of individual exercises which can be modified or deleted. The Teacher's Manual, in addition, provides

several suggestions for supplementing the coursebook to acquire a more communicative approach.

It is through the evaluating process, as shown in this paper, that I have gained a more thorough understanding of the *High Impact* series. This, when combined with my knowledge of retrospective classroom implementation, will help more precisely meet the learning needs of my students.

## REFERENCES

1. Allwright, R. I. 1981. "What do we want teaching materials for?" ELT Journal Vol. 36/1, Oxford University Press.

2. Breen, M. and Candlin, C. 1987. "Which materials? A consumer's and designer's guide." In Sheldon, L. E. (ed.): <u>ELT Textbooks and Materials: Problems in Evaluation and Development.</u> ELT Documents 126. London: MEP/ The British Council, 13-28.

3. Brown, H. D. 1994. <u>Teaching by Principles.</u> Prentice Hall.

4. Carter, R. 1998. "Orders of reality: CANCORDE, communication and culture." ELT Journal Vol. 52/1, Oxford University Press.

5. Cook, G. 1998. 'The use of reality: a reply to Ronald Carter." ELT Journal Vol. 52/1. Oxford University Press.

6. Cunningsworth, A. 1984. <u>Evaluating and Selecting ELT Materials.</u> Heineman.

7. Cunningsworth, A. 1995. <u>Choosing your Coursebook.</u> Macmillan Heineman.

8. Ellis, R. and Hedge, T. 1993. "Second Language Acquisition research: how does it help teachers? An interview with Rod Ellis." ELT Journal Vol. 47/1, Oxford University Press.

9. Ellis, R. 1996. "Does it 'Work'? Evaluating Tasks in Language Teaching." The Language Teacher Online 20.sept: [www.jalt-publications.org](http://www.jalt-publications.org).

10. Ellis, R., Helgesen, M., Browne, C., Gorsuch, G., Schwab, J. 1996. High Impact Coursebook. Longman.

11. Ellis, R., Helgesen, M., Browne, C., Gorsuch, G., Schwab, J. 1996. High Impact Teacher's Manual. Longman.

12. Garinger, D. 2001. "Textbook Evaluation." TEFL Web Journal: [www.teflweb-j.org/garinger.html](http://www.teflweb-j.org/garinger.html).

13. Gorsuch, G. and Schwab, J. 1996. High Impact Workout. Longman.

14. McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. 1993. Materials and Methods in ELT. Blackwell.

15. Medgyes, P. 1986. "Queries from a communicative teacher." In Rossner, R. and Bolitho, R. (eds.) Currents of Change in English Language Teaching. Oxford University Press.

16. Nunan, D. 1991. Language Teaching Methodology. Prentice Hall.

17. O'Neill, R. 1982. "Why use textbooks?" ELT Journal Vol. 36/2, Oxford University Press.

18. Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. 1986. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press.

19. Sheldon, L. 1988. "Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials." ELT Journal Vol. 37/3, Oxford University Press.

20. Sinclair, J. McH. and Renouf, A. 1988. "A lexical syllabus for language learning." In Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. Vocabulary and Language Teaching. Longman.

21. Skehan, P. 1998. A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning. Oxford University Press.

22. Skierso, A. 1991. "Textbook selection and adaptation." In Celce-Murcia, M. (ed.) <u>Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Langauge.</u> Newbury House.

23. Stern, H.H. 1992. <u>Issues and Options in Language Teaching.</u> Oxford University Press.

24. Wharton, S. "Approaches to Materials Analysis." [www.philseflsupport.com](www.philseflsupport.com).

25. White, R. 1988. <u>The ELM Curriculum.</u> Blackwell.

26. Willis, D. 2000. <u>Syllabus and Materials: Open Distance Learning Postgraduate Programmes.</u> The Centre for English Language Studies, The University of Birmingham.

27. Willis, J. 1996. <u>A Framework for Task-Based Learning.</u> Longman.