

THE EVALUATION OF COURSEBOOK FOR GRADE X SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Uswatun Hasanah and Anik Nunuk Wulyani

Universitas Negeri Malang

anik.nunuk.fs@um.ac.id

Abstract: This paper describes an evaluation study of a coursebook entitled “*Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris untuk SMA kelas X*”. This present study is conducted based on the 2 gaps of previous studies (Demir & Ertas, 2014; Isnaini, 2015; and Ulum, 2016). The gaps are (1) incorrect use of method and (2) insufficient instruments of the research. The data were taken using two instruments: (1) adapted checklist (Cunningsworth, 1995 and BSNP, 2016) and (2) interview guide for the users of the coursebook that were represented by one English language teacher and 5 students (2 male and 3 female students). The conclusions are drawn from the analysis of the checklist and strengthened with the opinions from the users of the coursebook. The result reveals that the coursebook is categorized as the good coursebook scored 3.275 or it meets 82% of the eligibilities checklist criteria. Some implications and suggestions are discussed in the end of the paper.

Keywords: *evaluation study, coursebook, grade x senior high school*

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation plays a vital role in giving a review or a judgment for educational concern. The evaluation is always associated with observing, analysing and selecting significant aspects (curriculum, strategies, methodology) to meet the demand of educational development. Recently, there has been renewed interest in coursebook evolution especially in English Language Teaching (ELT). Coursebooks in ELT are considered as an important part of educational system since they cover all the general frameworks of curriculum used and also function as guides through the courses with relevant examples and practices regardless of the subject matter. As stated by Tomlinson (2003: 39), a coursebook helps to provide a route map for both teachers and learners. This situation makes them possible to look ahead to what will be done in a lesson as well as to look back on what has been done in the learning and teaching process. In addition, there are two reasons why it is necessary to conduct the present evaluation study based on review of previous studies and my personal experience. The two reasons include to the use of methodology and instruments and the one and only coursebook used in SMA Laboratorim UM.

The previous studies reveal the important information of coursebook in practice and also gaps that are used as a background in the present study. Several studies on the coursebook evaluation (Demir & Ertas, 2014; Isnaini, 2015; and Ulum, 2016) used checklists to know the quality of the coursebook. These three studies focused on methodology and instruments to assess the quality of the coursebook. Those studies used qualitative research which actually did not match the purpose of the evaluation study. The purpose of evaluation study should be to give a review or a judgment of the coursebook. In the three studies mentioned before, the instruments used were interview guide and checklists for the teacher. Unfortunately, the previous studies did not use the interview guide for students as the important users of the coursebook. This case was considered as insufficient instruments and becomes a weakness of previous studies (Demir & Ertas, 2014; Isnaini, 2015; and Ulum, 2016). Thus, the methodology and instruments from previous studies are considered as gaps and become the background to conduct present study.

The other reason to conduct the present study is because the coursebook entitled “*Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris untuk SMA kelas X*” is the only coursebook used in my internship school. The

coursebook was produced and distributed by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud). The coursebook is really important for a language class because it is the main and only source they have in the class. Professional teachers should know the weakness and strength of the coursebook. The teachers have to know whether or not the coursebook is appropriate for the teaching and learning process. From the coursebook evaluation, the teachers can figure out what to use or add in the learning teaching process.

Based on the gaps in the previous studies, the present study proposes an evaluation study of a coursebook with revised methodology and instruments. Besides, this study also intends to evaluate the course book used in SMA Laboratorium Malang where the evaluator did the internship. The coursebook entitled “Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris untuk SMA kelas X” is the only coursebook used by grade X in the school and the latest revision from the government. This coursebook is really important since it is specifically used by language class in all senior high schools in Indonesia. It will really affect students’ knowledge and ability in English. For a language class, an English coursebook is crucial because English is a major language taught in this class. Therefore this study set out to investigate how much the book entitled “Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris untuk SMA kelas X” meets the expected requirements of a good coursebook.

The research questions are formulated as follows:

1. To what extent does the course book meet the criteria of four eligibilities in the checklist?
2. What are the teacher’s and students’ opinions toward the coursebook?

METHOD

This study used an evaluation design. The evaluation design is part of evaluation methodology that is provided for an evaluator who wants to evaluate a coursebook. According to Baehr (2004: 1), evaluation methodology is a tool to help people understand better about steps needed to do a quality evaluation. People can determine the level of quality of a performance, product, or skill. As part of evaluation methodology, the evaluation design was chosen because it has a purpose to analyse the quality of programs, data, books or documents. The evaluation design is used to describe and derive the work, task and challenges, give advice for the task evaluated, to show how to identify the stakeholders and develop the task to prepare the use evaluation results (Meyer, 2015: 7). Related with the explanation by Baehr and Mayer (2015), this study focused on analysing the coursebook and has a purpose to give a review for the users of the coursebook about the strength and weakness of the coursebook.

The instruments used in this study were checklists and interview guides. DiTommaso (2015:7) explained that the common type of ways that are used in the evaluation design includes a review of program documents and records, administrative data, interviews (focus group) and direct observations. However, this study focused on using the interview guide for the users and checklist to observe the coursebook.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to determine the quality of the coursebook entitled “Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris untuk SMA kelas X”. The study shows that the coursebook is categorized as a good coursebook. The coursebook received the score of 3.275 or 82% from all eligibilities checklist. As stated by BNSP (2016) a cousebook under the scores 80-90 % is categorized as a good coursebook. This finding confirms the previous studies that were done by Isnaini (2015) and Lathif (2015). Isnaini (2015) who analysed the English coursebook for grade VIII Junior high school and Lathif, (2015) who analyzed “Let’s Talk: English for Students of Grade VIII

(SMP/MTs)" found that the analysed coursebooks have fulfilled the criteria of a good textbook by achieving the average fulfilment score of 82%. Both coursebooks analysed in current study are the same. They are produced by the Ministry of Education and Culture or (Kemendikbud) as the main textbook for high school students in Indonesia. It is encouraging that all the three coursebooks made the by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud) have fulfilled the criteria.

A possible explanation for this finding might be because all the coursebooks made by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud) are always revised before and after they are published and produced. It is stated by BNSP (2016) that Kemendikbud required the creator to submit the coursebook to be reviewed. The creator of the coursebook should revise the coursebook in accordance with the review that has been given by the appointed expert before it is published and produced. Additionally, as stated in coursebook description used in present study, it is written that the coursebook is made to perfect the coursebook in accordance with the 2013 curriculum. This writing means that the coursebook has been revised before it is published. Kemendikbud also explains in regulation of Kemendikbud number 8 year 2016 about coursebook used by institution (Peraturan Kemendikbud RI No 8 Tahun 2016 Pasal 10) article10 that every person can give their critics, comments and suggestions for the coursebook used in institution. All of the critics, comments and suggestions will be used by kemendikbud to revise the coursebook to improve the quality of the coursebook. This regulation supports the statement that the coursebook is also revised after the users use the coursebook.

Beside the theory above, there is also evidence that the coursebook is always revised. It can be seen in the cover of the coursebook evaluated in present study and cover of coursebook produced in 2016. In both covers of the coursebooks, there is information that says "revised version". That means the coursebook is the revision version of previous coursebook (see Appendix 28). This is also in accordance with the results of the evaluation of the coursebook where the book gets the highest score on the eligibility of content and presentation. The two eligibilities have a strong relation with curriculum 2013. As explained in the finding that the coursebook received 90% for the eligibility of content and 94% for the eligibility of presentation. In the eligibility of content, the coursebook received 3 excellent scores (4) from 5 criteria because the book has fulfilled the criteria of 2013 curriculum which is the most important part of coursebook in Indonesia. In the eligibility of presentation, the coursebook received 94%. The coursebook received 3 excellent score from 4 criteria.

Contrary to the checklist result, in the interview results with the teacher, the evaluator found some weaknesses of the coursebook. These weaknesses show that even the coursebook received good score but it is still lacking to be used in learning and teaching in the class. The first weakness is supporting material in the coursebook. Although this book is equipped with a teacher's book, it does not have supporting material such as audio, video, etc. According to BNSP 2016), a good book especially a language coursebook must be equipped with audio, video and other supporting requirements. This is related with the pronunciation exercises where it requires the students to listen to the way people pronounce the words or sentences. This coursebook requires the teacher to pronounce by himself/herself and each teacher in the entire Indonesia absolutely has different ways of pronunciation. There are some exercises on pronunciation that students need. The right pronunciation in this coursebook and audio or video recorder become a need for the exercises. This is one of the weaknesses of the coursebook that must be highlighted in revising the coursebook.

The other finding in the interview is that the coursebook is the only coursebook used in SMA Laboratorium UM. This finding cannot be specified as a weakness because it also gives an advantage to the teacher. As explained in the background of this study, the coursebook is the only coursebook used by the teacher in the classroom where this makes the teacher has no other references to develop students. Graves (2000: 176) suggests that, in order to minimize difficulties when selecting textbooks, teachers should: use the textbook as a resource for students, but not the only resource; use a textbook as a guide, be free to modify, evaluate, develop, change, eliminate, or add to the material in the textbook, supplement the textbook with lots of outside readings. This finding makes the teacher find other sources that will develop his/her knowledge. It also will train the teacher to make varied exercises for the students. However, this finding can also be specified as a weakness if the teacher is too lazy to find any additional sources for the students. The teacher and students will focus on a coursebook and this condition can limit their creations. This condition is also one of the important findings that can be a reference for Kemendikbud to produce more than a coursebook so that the teacher and students do not only focus on one coursebook.

The Scores of the Coursebook

The second finding of this study is the distinct differences in the eligibilities scores. As explained in chapter III, the coursebook received scores with a considerable distance in each eligibility. The eligibility of Content scored 3.6 or 90% fulfilled the criteria. The eligibility of presentation scored 3.75 with the percentage of 94%.The eligibility of language scored 3.00 with the percentage of 75%. The eligibility of graphic scored 2.75 with the percentage of 68% fulfilling the criteria. The scores show that the eligibility of content and eligibility of presentation are different from the scores of the eligibility of language and eligibility of graphics. It can be seen from the table below.

Table of Different Scores in Four Eligibilities

| Score Difference (y-x) | X | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Eligibility of Content (3.6) | Eligibility of Presentation (3.75) | Eligibility of Language (3.00) | Eligibility of Graphics (2.75) |
| Eligibility of Content (3.6) | 0 | -0.15 | 0.60 | 0.85 |
| Eligibility of Presentation (3.75) | 0.15 | 0 | 0.75 | 1.00 |
| Eligibility of Language (3.00) | -0.6 | -0.75 | 0 | 0.25 |
| Eligibility of Graphics (2.75) | -0.85 | -1.00 | -0.25 | 0 |

The table explains that there are some big differences in the eligibility scores. The first is the score difference between the eligibility of content and the eligibility of language which is 0.60, while the score difference between the eligibility of content and the eligibility of graphic is 0.85 (see bold score). The big score difference is also shown between the eligibility of presentation and the eligibility of language which is 0.75 including also the differences between the eligibility of presentation and the eligibility of graphic which is 1.00 (see bold score). These differences are far

from the difference between the eligibility of content and eligibility of presentation which is just 0.15 (see bold score). From the table we know that there are distinct scores between the eligibilities especially in the score of eligibility of content and presentation with score of eligibility of language and graphics.

These distinct scores may be explained by the fact discussed in the first conclusion that the coursebook creators and evaluators just focused on revised the content and the presentation of the coursebook. This fact is not only revealed in this study, but it is also shown in Vahdany, (2015) study that the creators of the coursebook put more attention to the content and presentation of the coursebook. In his study, he suggested that coursebook should have a balance score in each criterion of a good coursebook because the distant comparisons can affect the value of the book. The coursebook in the present study surprisingly receives fair score in the eligibility of graphic that is inversely proportional with the eligibility of presentation and eligibility of content. Other than the bad value in the eligibility of graphic, the coursebook also has a fairly low value on the eligibility of language which is the most important part of the English lesson. The score result of eligibility of language is disappointing considering that this coursebook is produced by the Kemendikbud.

The distinct score is clearly shown between the eligibility of presentation and eligibility of graphics. The difference score of these two eligibilities is 1.00 that is the highest difference score of the eligibilities. The possible explanation of this result might be due to error or mistakes in the production process. The creators should control the production process until the coursebook is ready to be distributed. Even though the creator has chosen the right image, colour and writing for the book there will be no guarantee that the coursebook will be produced the same as what the creators want. According to Ilham (2012), a well-implemented quality control is one of the crucial things in the process of production. It is needed because it provides an impact on the quality of products produced by the company. Although the production processes have been implemented well, but in reality it was still found mistakes where the quality of the product produced is not in accordance with the standard or in other words the product is damaged or defects in the product. The damaged of production might be in the colour of the picture, the strength of the coursebook and the colour of the design that include all the criteria in the eligibility of graphics. The error in the production process will make a fatal impact for the use of the coursebook and it should be one of the considerations of the creator to choose the right place to produce their books.

Students' and Teacher's Opinions about the Coursebook

The third finding in present study is the teacher's and students' opinions to improve the quality of the coursebook. This study used an interview guide as the second instruments after the checklist. The interview guide is used based on the suggestion by Demir & Ertas (2014) saying that to support evaluation study, the evaluators or researchers need open-ended interviews and users' comments to make the best judgment of any coursebook. The result of interview from a teacher and 5 students is that the coursebook has met 83% requirement of good coursebook. There are 4 negative responses for the coursebook from the interviewee. They are the negative comments from student 3 for the eligibility of graphics, a negative comment from student 4 for the eligibility language and presentation, and the last is a negative comment from student 5 for the eligibility of content (see Appendix 26). From all of the comments, it can be concluded that the coursebook is a good coursebook based on the opinions of the teacher and students. Moreover, from the comments, there are also several important opinions from the teacher and students about the coursebook to improve the quality of the coursebook. The opinions are

suggestions for future coursebook. The suggestions are formulated into two important points. First, the coursebook needs to be improved in terms of the selecting, grading, and the completeness of the content and exercise. The second is the coursebook needs to be improved in the quality of the graphic and practicality of the coursebook.

The teacher and students valued the coursebook after using it in the learning and teaching process for one year or two semesters. The first suggestion from them is related with the selecting, grading, and the completeness of the content and exercises. Selecting and grading are related to how the evaluator selects the coursebook's content and how balances are the coursebook's exercises in each chapter (from easy to hard). From the suggestion in the interview, it shows that the teacher and students' opinion are in line with the result of the checklist in the eligibility of presentation. Selecting and grading is one of criteria in the eligibility of presentation that received the score 3 in the checklist when the other criteria received score 4.

According to interview with the teacher, it revealed that even though the coursebook almost fulfils all the criteria in the eligibility of presentation, the coursebook still lacks in the grading. It shows by the distributions of the exercises that are not well-distributed in each chapter where evaluation questions become easier than warm up exercises. The coursebook also still lacks in the pronunciation exercises. The exercises are not balanced as there are two pronunciation exercises in two chapters from eight chapters. There is also no glossary in each chapter, which makes the students' and teachers hard to understand the content of the chapter. The students also think that the text is too long and too difficult where they need much time to understand the text. In the Appendix 21-26, one of the students said that the exercises are too difficult and it is somehow confusing for them. This result shows that the coursebook needs to grade the exercises from the easiest to the hardest exercises and select the content again. This opinion might be one of the highlights finding for the creator of the coursebook to improve the quality of the coursebook especially in selecting and grading.

The possible explanation for students' opinions if the coursebook contents are too long and too difficult might be to the condition of the students'. The students are fresh graduated from junior high schools. They are new in a language class and they still need to adapt with the lessons especially English. According to Aziz (2015), every student has different adaptability to adapt in new environment especially new students in new schools. The environment includes the condition of the place, friends, teachers, lessons, etc. The statement from Aziz (2015) shows that it is not easy for all students to directly adapt with the new situation especially for the lessons they learn in class. English is one of crucial lessons that should be learned by students in language class which means the coursebook should have good presentation especially in selecting and grading.

The second suggestion from the teacher and student is focused on the practicality and physical appearance of the coursebook. This suggestion is related with the eligibility of graphic where the coursebook received the lowest score. The opinions are about the design of the coursebook that needs to change because it is not interesting and also the opinion of the blurry pictures in the coursebook that make them hard to understand the picture or read the sentence in the picture. This comment is addressed to chapter 6 about the event advertisement. In this chapter, most of the advertisements are in the form of picture and most of them are blurry. The explanation of this opinion might have something to do with the fact that most students in language class of SMA Laboratorium grade x are visual learners. As mentioned in the review of literature, Wibawa (2014) stated that there are some kinds of learners in the class. They are visual learners, kinaesthetic learners and auditory learners. The visual learners are the learners who are

easier to understand the lesson if they are using media that have good visualization and mostly they judge the media by the visualization of the coursebook. This might be the strong reason why all of the students give suggestions to revise the design, picture and also the cover of the coursebook. Since the coursebook is the media they use every day for English lesson.

The suggestion for the eligibility of graphic is not only about the coursebook physical appearance but also the practicality of the coursebook. According to Cunningsworth (1995), a coursebook has one important aspect to become a good coursebook and it is practicality of the coursebook. As mentioned in the review of literature, the practicality of the coursebook covers the cost, the materials and coursebook endurance. In the interview result, the teacher suggested that the creator needs to improve the quality of the coursebook bind because it is too weak that it cannot survive even for one semester. In fact, the coursebook will be used for 2 or three years before the government makes the new revised version make it important to be one of creator consideration to improve the quality of the coursebook. It is also experienced by the evaluator when the binding of the coursebook not last than 2 months from the first day of evaluation study process. This suggestion can be also one of highlighting suggestions to revise the coursebook because the quality of the coursebook not only focused on the content but all of the requirement criteria should be fulfilled by the creator of the coursebook.

This possible explanation of this suggestion might be the same in the previous suggestion about the error production process. As mentioned by Ilham (2012), well-implemented quality control is one of crucial things in the process of production. It is needed because it provides impact on the quality of products produced by the company. The quality control not only covers the colour of the design and picture or the size of the font but also the quality of the materials used to produce the coursebook. The quality of materials consists of the quality of the paper, bind, etc. The quality of the materials will decide how long the coursebook can be used. This point includes one of important criteria in the practicality of the coursebook by Cunningsworth (1995). This last suggestion strengthens the previous result that the creators of the coursebook should pay attention to the production process.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study was designed to know the quality of the coursebook used in SMA Laboratorium UM. Specifically this study is aimed to know how much the coursebook entitled "Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris untuk SMA kelas X" meets the criteria of a good coursebook. After analyzing the data, the evaluator arrives at finding that the coursebook produced by Kemendikbud has a good quality. It was shown from the good score of present study (82% of the book has fulfilled the criteria). This finding is supported by previous studies by Isnaini (2016) and Lathief (2016). They also found out that the coursebook produced by Kemendikbud is good. Another finding in present study is related to the scores of the coursebook. This finding is based on the scores obtained from the checklist. The highest difference from all the scores is 1.00 that is between the score of eligibilities of presentation and eligibility of graphics. The possible reason for these different scores might be the error in the production process. Besides the findings, the present study also highlights two important suggestions from the users' (a teacher and students of SMA Laboratorium UM). The suggestions are to improve the selection and grading in the coursebook content (eligibility of presentation) and to improve the quality of picture and practicality of the coursebook (eligibility of graphics). Therefore, the final result of the study proves that the coursebook Entitled "Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris untuk SMA kelas X" meets the expected requirements of good coursebook with score 80%.

REFERENCES

- Azarfam, A. A. Y., & Noordin, N. (2014). Evaluating an English Textbook for Application in Iranian EFL Academic Context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(3), 618–623. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.3.618-623>
- Aziz, H., A. (2015). Peranan Kemampuan Bersosialisasi Dan Beradaptasi Terhadap Motivasi Belajar Siswa Kelas Xi Jurusan Teknik Gambar Bangunan Smkn 3 Yogyakarta. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. Yogyakarta, ID.
- Baehr, M. (2004). *Evaluation Methodology*. Pacific Crest. Retrieved from https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/ele/scholars/Practices/Evaluating_Projects/Resources/Evaluation%20Methodology.pdf.
- BNSP. (2016). *Prosedur Operasi Standar Penyelenggaraan Penilaian Buku Teks Pelajaran Dan Buku Panduan Guru Pola "Inisiatif Masyarakat."* Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan. Retrieved from www.bnsp-indonesia.org
- Cunningsworth. (1995). *Choosing your Coursebook*. New York: Macmillan.
- Demir, Y., & Ertas, A. (2014). A Suggested Eclectic Checklist for ELT Coursebook Evaluation. *The Reading Matrix*, 14(2), 243–252.
- DiTommaso, A. (2015). *Evaluation Designs*. AmeriCorps State and National 2015 Symposium. Retrieved from <http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/4cmas/0946evaldesign.pdf>.
- Fatima, G., Shah, S. K., & Sultan, H. (2015). Textbook analysis and evaluation of 7th & 8th grade in pakistani context. *European Centre for Research Training and Development UK*, 3(4), 79–97.
- Ghufron, M. Ali & Saleh Mursid. (2016). Students,, Differences and Students,, Outcomes in English Learning. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, X/2.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing Language Course, A Guide for Teachers*. Boston. Heinle. Cengage Learning.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Third edition. Longman Pearson Education Limited.
- Ilham, N., M., Analisis Pengendalian Kualitas Produk Dengan Menggunakan Statistical Processing Control (Spc) pada Pt. Bosowa Media Grafika (Tribun Timur). Unpublished Thesis. Universitas Hasanuddin Makassar. Makassar, ID.
- Isnaini, A.P. (2015). *The quality of the content of an English Coursebook for Senior High School*. Unpublished Thesis, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, ID.
- Kemendikbud. (2016). *Peraturan Kemendikbud RI No 8 Tahun 2016 tentang buku ajar yang digunakan oleh lembaga*. Indonesia: Kemendikbud
- Lathif, M. (2015). *An Evaluation of English Textbooks for The Eight Graders of Junior High School*. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. Retrieved from eprints.uny.ac.id/
- Meyer, W. (2015). *Introduction to Evaluation Design*. Ceval Consult. Retrieved from <http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/4cmas/0946evaldesign.pdf>.
- Mukundan, J. (2007). Evaluation of english language textbooks: Some important issues for consideration. *Journal of NELTA*, 12(1–2), 80–85. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v12i1.3432>
- Osborn, M. and Smith, J. A. (2007) Pain as an Assault on the Self: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis of the Psychological Impact of Chronic Benign Low Back Pain. *Psychology and Health*, 22, 517-534. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14768320600941756>
- Sadiqah, M. (2014). *A Content Analysis of English Textbook "When English Rings a Bell" Used in First Grade Junior High School Based on Curriculum 2013*. Universitas Negeri Islam Syarif Hidayatullah. Retrieved from repository.uinjkt.ac.id
- Tok, H. (2010). TEFL textbook evaluation: From teachers' perspectives. *Educational Research and Review*, 5(9), 508–517.

- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum.
- Ulum, O. G. (2016). A descriptive content analysis of the extend of bloom's taxonomy in the reading comprehension questions of the Course Book Q: Skills for Success 4 Reading and Writing. *The Qualitative report*, 21 (9), 1674-1683. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss9/7>
- Vahdany, F. (2015). Evaluating PNU General English Textbook from Two Perspetive: Science Vs. Humanities Students. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 11(5), 678–693. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1/2015.5.11/1.11.678.693>
- Zohrabi, M. (2011). Coursebook Development and Evaluation for English for General Purposes Course. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 213–222. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p213>