

AN EVALUATION OF TWO BUSINESS ENGLISH COURSE BOOKS, *BUSINESS PARTNER B1+* AND *BUSINESS PARTNER B2*: STUDENTS' AND TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES

Nguyen Huynh Trang*

*School of Foreign Languages, University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City (UEH),
59C Nguyen Dinh Chieu, District 3, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*

Received 04 October 2023

Revised 01 November 2023; Accepted 27 November 2023

Abstract: When discussing formal education, one may instantly think about teachers, classrooms, and teaching materials. Teaching materials such as textbooks are crucial for learning and teaching because knowledge is displayed in them, and the classroom teacher or a peer can explain it. Nevertheless, careless textbook selection can impact this learning and teaching process negatively. Therefore, this study investigated teachers' and learners' perceptions of the textbooks they use in their major. A five-point Likert scale questionnaire was administered to 15 EFL teachers and 122 business students to obtain their perceptions of the books using seven criteria: practicality, layout, activities, language, skills, topics, and content. The results show that they are generally satisfied with the textbooks. However, the teachers disagreed with one criterion, the "topics" of the books, which are inappropriate. The study also used semi-structured focus group interviews to obtain more specific participant information. Both groups agreed that the books are practical and have videos to practice listening. However, many criteria, such as language skills, activities, and content, should be improved. Several suggestions are made for improving the use of the textbooks.

Keywords: Business students, criteria, EFL teachers, textbooks, textbook evaluation

1. Introduction

According to Hasibuan and Fithriani (2022), "Course textbooks are very meaningful for teaching students how to communicate in the language of their field" (p. 290). "Since textbooks are one of the integral components of the learning process, their evaluation is essential to improve their correspondence to the learners' needs and goals" (Karimnia & Jafari, 2017, p. 219). However, finding a quality textbook for a course of study can be challenging as it has to satisfy many criteria to reach a program's goal. Thus, this project was conducted due to the need to analyze two textbooks used to teach Business students at X University in Vietnam. As declared, the two textbooks, "Business Partner B1+" and "Business Partner B2", were designed for Business students who need Business English to fulfil their discipline. However, although the books have been used, they have yet to be evaluated. A book evaluation is essential to help curriculum designers, educators, and students adjudicate their teaching and learning materials in time to satisfy their academic goals. According to Mukundan (2007), the quality of a textbook can be crucial in determining the success or failure of an English as a second language course.

Still, textbooks are often purchased without careful analysis. Usually, selecting a

* Corresponding author.

Email address: trangnh@ueh.edu.vn

textbook is based on something other than the value of intrinsic pedagogy but on the prestige of the author or publisher and even the reference by the rate of using that book in many institutions. Tomlinson (2010) writes that textbooks used in many educational contexts are chosen in advance by many teachers because those books are best-selling, and they think the books are outstanding. This subjective book selection may hinder the success of a course. Therefore, textbook evaluation plays a significant role in teaching and learning in ESL/EFL classrooms. Sheldon (1988) notes that textbook evaluation could help administrators and teachers choose the best material among plenty of them on the market. Besides, textbook evaluation helps teachers develop and grow professionally by providing information to analyze their presuppositions about the nature of language and learning (Hutchinson, 1987). Tomlinson (2003) also claims that to have a successful program, many elements must be evaluated, such as language teaching methods, materials, textbooks, and the program design. Teachers are the main actors who use textbooks to teach, and students are the main actors who use textbooks to learn, so listening to their ideas about the textbooks they use is vital. This study hopes to contribute the necessary information to the Business major program at the school so that further consideration of the program design can be made. The two following research questions are devised to obtain the study's objectives.

1. What are the Vietnamese EFL teachers' perceptions of the textbooks "Business Partner B1+" and "Business Partner B2" concerning the criteria developed by Litz (2005)?

2. How do the Business students perceive the two books, "Business Partner B1+" and "Business Partner B2", concerning the criteria developed by Litz (2005)?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definitions of Textbook Evaluation

Evaluation occurs systematically to obtain information for judgments or decisions (Lynch, 1996). Hutchinson and Waters (1987) also claim that evaluation is related to judging the fitness of something for a particular purpose, meaning to see whether something is qualified. Evaluating materials is an interactive process involving a deeper analysis of the materials being implemented (Yumuk, 1998). Evaluating materials creates an opportunity to observe the interaction between teachers, learners, and materials (Cakit, 2006). Tomlinson (2003) similarly states that material evaluation measures the value of learning and teaching materials to see the degree of impact of materials on users.

Carter and Nunan (2001) state that textbook evaluation is a measuring process to create the value of learning materials based on three methods: predictive/ pre-use evaluation, ongoing/whilst-use evaluation and retrospective/post-use evaluation.

Most scholars share a similar view about material evaluation, which requires making judgments and gathering information on the value of something. However, when giving a specific definition of textbook evaluation, these scholars have different points of view. Tomlinson (2003), for example, thinks that textbook evaluation is a judgment about the material effects on users. Yumuk (1998) evaluates the materials through in-depth analysis involving the interaction between teachers and learners and the materials. These above-mentioned scholars have their arguments to claim their definitions of textbook evaluation. These definitions help the researcher decide on the criteria for selecting a textbook. Generally, textbook evaluation can be depicted as a procedure for judging the quality of a textbook used in a particular context.

2.2. Types of Textbook Evaluation

Grant (1987), Hemsley (1997) and Tomlinson (2003) suggested that the evaluation of teaching materials can adopt a process, starting from the Initial (pre-use) evaluation, Detailed (while-use) evaluation, to the In-use (post-use) evaluation.

The "Initial (pre-use) evaluation" is based on first impressions through materials. Experienced teachers can use this method to quickly grasp the main points of materials (Tomlinson, 2003). This evaluation type is called predictive evaluation, which involves predicting the potential value of materials for users; because of the first impression of the materials, users could easily make mistakes with their options (Tomlinson, 2003).

Secondly, the "While-use evaluation" examines the users' current material. This evaluation method involves measuring materials' value while using or observing them, considering time for evaluating a textbook, clarity of instruction, appropriate layout, comprehensibility of texts, the credibility of tasks, achievability of the functions, achievement of performance, objectives, the potential for localization, the practicality of the materials, and teach-ability of the materials (Tomlinson, 2003). As Hemsley (1997) put it, this method could be more objective and reliable than the "Pre-use" evaluation. However, according to Tomlinson (2003), this method cannot measure what is in learners' brains because it can only measure learners' short-term memory.

The last stage of textbook evaluation is the "post-use (reflective) evaluation" of a textbook, which aims to assess materials after they have been utilized in an institution.

This stage helps assess a textbook's performance more thoroughly and can identify materials' strong and weak points that have emerged throughout continuous use. This post-use evaluation is seen as the most valuable (but least administrated) evaluation method since it can measure the actual effect of the materials on users (Grant, 1987; Tomlinson, 2003).

This final stage helps related stakeholders to obtain information about motivation, impact, and instant learning regarding the materials. Put another way, this process stage can determine materials' actual outcomes after use, and users can consider materials' credibility for adapting and/or replacing materials in use. Thus, after evaluation, an educational institution can inform its material evaluation results to related stakeholders, such as the government body, educators, publishers, and policymakers.

2.3. Book Evaluation Criteria

Users may want to use specific task criteria when selecting a book. This section presents two views on the topic based on the current project, which was carried out to evaluate two textbooks for Business students. Hence, the study lends the two opinions from Cunningsworth (1995) and Ur (1996).

Cunningsworth (1995) has set many criteria for choosing an ESP textbook. For example, the ESP textbook should be based on learners' needs, clearly state objectives and goals in terms of content and performance, be learner's level appropriate, creditable, match specialist language with the subject matter, offer learners language skills and strategies, balance language skills, techniques and content knowledge, present collaborative work between the instructor and learners, provide learners with supplementary materials, give guidance to individual study, use task-based or skills-based activities to reflect real-life situations, and contain outcomes that help learners self-evaluate their performance.

Ur (1996) emphasized the importance of learners when choosing a language textbook. For example, activities in the book should motivate and be appropriate for learners (not too easy or difficult, not too childish or sophisticated); writing should be relevant to learners' needs; it should be clear whether the teacher needs to prepare in advance for any activities in the book; and if the teacher is willing to use those activities in their classroom. Besides, Ur also recommended using many stages to assess a course book, such as deciding on criteria, applying criteria, and summary.

Regarding language book coverage, Ur suggested looking for pronunciation practice, introduction of new words, vocabulary practice section, grammar instruction section, grammar practice section, audio files for listening practice, listening and speaking communicative tasks, short and long reading texts, dictionary work, previously learnt materials review section, and entertaining activities.

2. Related Studies

Hasibuan and Fithriani (2022) explored an ESP textbook evaluation criteria by Cunningsworth and Kusel (1991), and Skierso (1991) to teach a group of Fashion Design students. Many criteria were the book's purpose, methodology, layout, organisation, teaching content, language skills, subskills, such as grammar and vocabulary, and functions. Most participants were generally satisfied with the book regarding learning and teaching contents. Nevertheless, it lacks exercises and a teacher's book to guide teaching and learning.

Serasi et al. (2021) investigated 141 students and one English teacher's perceptions of two English textbooks, "Grow with English," regarding subjects and contents, skills and subskills, layout and physical make-up, and practical consideration by the teacher. The authors use a checklist provided by Demir and Ertas for EFL course book evaluation. The result uncovered that teachers and students generally liked to use the book.

Nazim (2021) examined an EFL textbook regarding language skills, grammar, vocabulary, style, and appropriateness. Twenty EFL teachers participated in the study, and most agreed that the content was acceptable and language skills, uses, and appropriateness were qualified. Nonetheless, it was found that the textbook's video was not good for practising listening skills; there were not enough strategies for practising language. Also, the book did not prompt active and passive vocabulary to teach and learn when practising language skills.

Atigh and Khabbazi (2021) used Litz's (2005) questionnaire and a semi-structured interview to achieve students' attitudes towards the textbooks they used. It was found that they had positive attitudes towards the investigated textbooks. However, the results from the interview indicate that biology and psychology students agreed that the books should help students improve their oral communication, more specifically, speaking and listening skills. Moreover, the books mainly concentrate on reading skills, and no writing activities were found, so they disagreed with how textbooks present language skills.

Regarding teachers' perceptions of English textbooks, Orfan et al. (2021) found in a survey that the instructors were satisfied with the English textbooks that they were using. Four English skills were equally presented in the textbooks, mentioning other English elements suitable to the Afghan context. Moreover, the textbooks contained a variety of assignments and assessments. Simultaneously, the school encouraged the instructors to use other English sources to maximise their teaching and learning of English.

To examine the suitability of Maritime English textbook for teachers, graduates, and cadets in a school, Sari and Sari (2020) studied it by adopting the textbook evaluation by Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979), including subject matter, vocabulary and structure, exercise, illustration, and physical make-up. It disclosed that the book had sufficiently specialised vocabulary and various grammatical structures. However, the book should have been designed systematically. The exercises in the book needed to be added more so that students had more practice proportion. Besides, the illustration and physical make-up of the book needed to be enhanced for better language acquisition.

Barus and Simanjuntak (2020) explored students' perceptions of the learning materials they used to learn Business in their English Business class. The authors used a 100-point questionnaire to obtain their opinions on the materials. They found that they generally were content with the materials regarding *comfort, content, efficient use, language, clarity, and enjoyment*.

To explore teachers' perceptions of the maritime English textbooks used in a vocational school, Khosiyono and Priyana (2019) found that teachers were satisfied with their books. The subject and the content are relevant to the current curriculum and suited to the student's needs. It also saved teachers' time for preparation. Accompanied with it were files guiding how to use the glossary and the teacher's book. Nevertheless, they wished to contribute more to all the book selection steps. They hoped to join in selecting supplementary ESP materials to judge if the textbook is authentic, if topics, texts and contexts, knowledge and language, tasks or activities represent the students' needs and level, and if the book contained pedagogical prompts.

For the purpose of obtaining users' opinions about the textbook (Vision 1), Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018) recruited 30 teachers and 70 students who used the textbook for the study. Seven criteria were applied: practical considerations, layout and design (e.g. visual intriguing), activities, skills, language type, subject and content and cultural considerations. It uncovered that the teachers and students liked the book, such as having the teacher's guidebook, CDs, and workbook. Nonetheless, they were not interested in cultural considerations.

Suhirman (2018) obtained information from 20 students and one teacher regarding their ideas about an ESP textbook they used, adopting a ten-item questionnaire developed by Garant (1987). It was found that the participants were satisfied with the book regarding learners' needs and interests. However, if language skills had been improved, learners could have benefited more from practising using English in their major.

Rezaee and Hashemi (2017) examined criteria for evaluating the ESP textbook for Civil Engineering Students using Cunningsworth's (1995) criteria, including layout, design, exercises, activities, skills, subjects, and content. The results of 30 teachers showed they were satisfied with the textbook, except that the book's quality is low. Nonetheless, the students thought that the book had low printing quality, was too broad concerning the topic, and lacked exercises, varieties, and examples. Besides, the book was not appealing, repetitive, and boring.

Karimnia and Jafari (2017) investigated instructors' ideas about the textbook "Visual Arts ESP" regarding its suitability, methodology, and features using the model by McDonough and Shaw (2003) as criteria for evaluation. They found that the participants wanted the book enhanced to correspond to the Iranian context. Furthermore, students were unsatisfied with the book, such as a lack of art knowledge. Overall, they considered the book did not suffice the standard framework to prepare for designing the book. In addition, they opined that as ESP textbooks typically focus on reading, the book should include more reading strategies, and

grammar or other language registers should start with functional approaches.

In some cases, teachers need clarification about the content of the textbook. For example, MR (2016) found that teachers confessed they must examine what was presented in the book to judge the sequences and activities for their students' needs; supplementary materials should accompany the text. Moreover, their experience, students' needs, interests, and abilities influenced how they perceived the textbook. Referring to book selection, the teachers wanted to participate in the process. Nonetheless, teachers also encountered problems like using inefficient time for book selection and opposing ideas about the book selection.

Salehi et al. (2015) investigated teachers' and students' perceptions of a medical English textbook through a questionnaire and an interview protocol. It uncovered that both groups were satisfied with the book's content, which was short and simple and contained a reviewing part. Besides, it was suitable for the student's level and needs.

Lim and Hew (2014) found that 36 high school students perceived the e-book they used helped promote students' involvement in learning and interaction with each other as the book guided them to construct their knowledge and share their ideas.

In a nutshell, the literature on book evaluation has provided helpful information, including many criteria: the content of the book (e.g., if it is authentic, appropriate, engaging), topics (if the context is local or international, and interesting), the subject matter (if the specialised knowledge is sufficiently displayed), organisation (how knowledge and skills are sequenced), layout (design), and printing quality. In addition, as ESP textbooks are related to language, many authors are concerned with the components and balance of language skills, sub-skills, vocabulary, grammar, and language skills practice activities/exercises. Additionally, audio files and videos are also required when considering a textbook. Furthermore, some authors are concerned with the need for supplementary materials, such as a teacher's book, for guidance and methodology. Two last points that some authors mentioned are that when selecting a textbook, users need to consider students' needs and level, as careless selection, otherwise, causes counter-effect.

Some studies also revealed that teachers want to participate in textbook selection, so schools must facilitate them.

Concerning book users, generally, many were satisfied with the books they used. However, they might have differing views on a few book criteria, and some schools even permit teachers to adjust their teaching using supplementary materials.

Although the literature provides such helpful information, the contexts and participants are different, so the author of the current study wants to investigate the above-mentioned textbook evaluation by using Litz (2005) to obtain the perspectives of teachers and students in the survey. This set of criteria covers the present textbook evaluation needs, comprising overall general criteria: practicality, layout, activities, skills, language, topics, and content. Atigh and Khabbazi (2021) have previously used this set of textbook criteria. In addition, as the author sees that it can be insufficient if only the quantitative data were collected, she collected more data from the qualitative data using the interview.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The descriptive research employs a mixed-method approach with quantitative and qualitative data collected through two questionnaires delivered to business students and EFL

teachers and in-depth interviews with two focused groups. In mixed-method research, an additional research question is usually added to answer the inquiry associated with combining quantitative results with qualitative findings (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2016).

The quantitative data were collected through two questionnaires designed based on the two evaluation forms developed by Litz (2005), targeting to elicit the information provided by students and teachers about the two investigated course books, “Business Partner B1+” and “Business Partner B2”. However, to obtain more in-depth perspectives of the evaluated textbooks, one semi-structured interview was conducted with students and teachers to gain transparent insights into how they evaluate the course books.

3.2. Participants

The study was carried out between April and May, in the academic year 2023. The study recruited 137 participants from two different groups. The first group is 15 EFL teachers with experience using the two books as teaching materials (40% using “Business Partner B1+” and 60% using “Business Partner B2”). Male teachers accounted for 26.7%, and females, 73.3%. 86,7% of teachers have taught over ten years, and 13,3% have taught between 5 and 10 years. They all have gained experience teaching undergraduates and have qualifications in teaching English as a foreign language. The second group includes 122 Business students from various academic enrollment years. They are first- and second-year students majoring in various majors related to Business, such as Accounting and Business Administration. Male students comprise 32%, females comprise 65,6%, and others comprise 3%. They were chosen since they have experience learning English using the two investigated course books.

3.3 Textbooks

The materials to be evaluated are “Business Partner B1+” (Dubicka et al., 2018) and “Business Partner B2” (Dubicka et al., 2018). These two books belong to a series of eight proficiency levels, including eight books starting from A1, A2, A2+, B1, B1+, B2, B2+, and C1 from Pearson Education Limited. The school chose B1+ as the main course book for first-semester students and B2 for second-semester students since these students were accepted into an advanced program based on their English entrance exam scores.

3.4. Instruments

3.4.1. Questionnaires

As mentioned earlier, the study utilised two instruments to collect the data. The main instruments are two sets of questionnaires whose contents are adapted from the student textbook evaluation form and the teacher textbook evaluation form developed by Litz (2005). The study adapted 38 questions eliciting the students’ and teachers’ responses about the textbooks based on the seven criteria (practicality: 4 items, layout: 8 items, activities: 8 items, skills: 6 items, language: 5 items, topics: 4 items, and content: 3 items). Their responses are prompted to be given in the box that best describes them, applying a five-point Likert Scale, from 1: strongly disagree, 2: disagree, 3: neutral, 4: agree and 5: strongly agree. The author tested Cronbach's alpha to determine whether the questionnaire questions were reliable.

3.4.2 Semi-Structured Focus-Group Interviews

Semi-structured interviews can be helpful as an adjunct to supplement and add further understanding of data from the questionnaires (Glesne, 2011; Merriam, 2009). Hence, the discussions with the participants circulate the seven criteria used to judge the textbooks so their

interview stories can assist in correctly understanding the situation.

3.5. Procedures

After completing the questionnaires, the author designed a Google form and created a link that was seen as a convenient way to conduct a survey. After receiving the classroom teachers' permission, the author came to each class and continued to seek the students' consent to provide their responses to the survey. The consent form said, "Once you participate in this survey, it means you have agreed to accept the invitation, and it is used as your signature". The author explained the purpose of the survey to the students and committed not to disclose their personal information. Then, after setting up everything, the author sat in front of them during the survey to encourage them to finish on time and ensure they did it correctly. Once they finished, the author checked the Google form's results to ensure that anyone had answered the survey. After that, the author said "thank you" to the students for their participation. Then, the author also said "thank you" to the classroom teacher. The next step is to ask many students to volunteer for the group interview of 15 students. The author interviewed them at recess in a quiet place for better recording.

In order to obtain the data from the teachers, the author sent them a permission message to conduct the survey. Then, after receiving their agreement, the author sent them the Google form link so they could finish it on time. The author reminded some of the voluntary teachers who forgot to complete the survey to help with the answers so the study could be completed promptly. Finally, the 15 questionnaires were returned, and the author thanked them. The next step is that the author invited five teachers for a group interview. The author set an interview in her office and recorded the interview. Finally, the author thanked them for participating in the interview.

3.6. Data Analysis

The SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) calculated all the quantitative data. Concerning the opinions on the textbook evaluation criteria, a scale run will be run to check the reliability of the two questionnaires based on the input piloting data. After being modified, the questionnaires would be administered to the participants. The data were analysed for Cronbach alpha and descriptive statistics for each criterion's maximum and minimum scores. Then, the mean scores of the two groups between the students and teachers were compared.

The interview data were transcribed and translated for analysis. Theming on the criteria used to assess the books was executed to investigate the interviewees' perceptions.

4. Empirical Results and Discussion

4.1. Empirical Results

For the first and second research questions, the study will start with the reliability of the first questionnaire collected from the teacher participants before looking at the descriptive data. Table 1 shows the reliability of the first and second research data collected from the teacher and student groups.

Table 1*Reliability Statistics Obtained From the Teachers' and Students' Responses*

Teachers		Students	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.904	38	.981	38

The Cronbach's Alpha of 0.904 for the teachers' responses to a 38-item questionnaire about their perceptions, and the Cronbach's Alpha of 0.981 for the students' responses to a 38-item questionnaire about their perceptions of the two course books "Business Partner B1+", and "Business Partner B2" are reliable enough to look into the further individual mean scores of the two groups of the participants as shown in the descriptive data in Table 2 below. The textbook evaluation in the table uses letters to represent the following: P stands for Practicality, L for Layout, A for Activities, S for Skills, La for Language, T for Topics, and C for Content.

Table 2*Mean Scores (M) of the Two Groups Regarding Their Perceptions of the Course Books*

		N	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
P1	Student	122	3.97	.871	.079	
	Teacher	15	3.13	.990	.256	
P2	Student	122	3.80	.869	.079	
	Teacher	15	3.73	.884	.228	
P3	Student	122	4.17	.830	.075	
	Teacher	15	3.73	.961	.248	
P4	Student	122	3.95	.978	.089	
	Teacher	15	3.33	.617	.159	
Overall mean	Student	122	3.9734	.73421	.06647	
	Teacher	15	3.4833	.68444	.17672	
L5	Student	122	4.04	.876	.079	
	Teacher	15	3.93	.704	.182	
L6	Student	122	4.05	.842	.076	
	Teacher	15	3.40	1.056	.273	
L7	Student	122	4.09	.782	.071	
	Teacher	15	4.20	.775	.200	
L8	Student	122	4.01	.867	.079	
	Teacher	15	3.07	.961	.248	
L9	Student	122	3.88	1.017	.092	

	Teacher	15	3.07	1.100	.284
L10	Student	122	3.93	.937	.085
	Teacher	15	3.87	.990	.256
L11	Student	122	3.93	.860	.078
	Teacher	15	3.80	.941	.243
L12	Student	122	4.17	.869	.079
	Teacher	15	4.33	.724	.187
Overall mean	Student	122	4.0123	.69354	.06279
	Teacher	15	3.7083	.51249	.13233
A13	Student	122	3.84	1.023	.093
	Teacher	15	3.20	.941	.243
A14	Student	122	3.66	.993	.090
	Teacher	15	3.27	1.033	.267
A15	Student	122	3.99	.895	.081
	Teacher	15	3.20	.862	.223
A16	Student	122	3.98	.904	.082
	Teacher	15	3.60	.632	.163
A17	Student	122	4.02	.876	.079
	Teacher	15	3.80	.862	.223
A18	Student	122	3.82	.927	.084
	Teacher	15	3.60	.828	.214
A19	Student	122	4.05	.861	.078
	Teacher	15	3.20	.676	.175
A20	Student	122	3.89	.916	.083
	Teacher	15	3.80	.862	.223
Overall mean	Student	122	3.9068	.77265	.06995
	Teacher	15	3.4583	.51683	.13344
S21	Student	122	3.88	.858	.078
	Teacher	15	3.53	.640	.165
S22	Student	122	3.66	.924	.084
	Teacher	15	3.20	.862	.223
S23	Student	122	3.85	.888	.080
	Teacher	15	3.73	.458	.118
S24	Student	122	3.73	.945	.086

	Teacher	15	3.67	1.047	.270
S25	Student	122	3.95	.861	.078
	Teacher	15	3.80	.775	.200
S26	Student	122	3.89	.893	.081
	Teacher	15	3.60	.737	.190
Overall mean	Student	122	3.8265	.78009	.07063
	Teacher	15	3.5889	.55587	.14353
La27	Student	122	3.92	.905	.082
	Teacher	15	4.00	.756	.195
La28	Student	122	3.80	.906	.082
	Teacher	15	3.40	.910	.235
La29	Student	122	3.86	.912	.083
	Teacher	15	3.40	.910	.235
La30	Student	122	3.89	.934	.085
	Teacher	15	3.60	.828	.214
La31	Student	121	3.98	.894	.081
	Teacher	15	3.40	.828	.214
Overall mean	Student	122	3.8914	.77749	.07039
	Teacher	15	3.5600	.58162	.15017
T32	Student	122	3.92	.849	.077
	Teacher	15	3.40	.910	.235
T33	Student	122	4.02	.838	.076
	Teacher	15	3.40	.828	.214
T34	Student	122	3.68	.956	.087
	Teacher	15	3.07	.799	.206
T35	Student	122	4.11	.851	.077
	Teacher	15	3.47	.743	.192
Overall mean	Student	122	3.9324	.75175	.06806
	Teacher	15	3.3333	.64550	.16667
C36	Student	122	3.93	.942	.085
	Teacher	15	3.60	.632	.163
C37	Student	122	3.60	.906	.082
	Teacher	15	3.47	.834	.215
C38	Student	122	3.91	.971	.088

	Teacher	15	3.47	.915	.236
Overall mean	Student	122	3.8142	.82216	.07443
	Teacher	15	3.5111	.67691	.17478

The study will use standard agreement to guide and analyse the data. First, it will focus on all statements with a mean score of 4.40 and above for the participants' agreement with the statements, and the analysis centred on the criteria: practical, layout, activities, skills, language, topics, and content.

Regarding the practical criterion, the overall mean for the teachers is 3.4833, and for the students, it is 3.9734, indicating that both groups agree that the book should be practical. However, looking into some individual statements revealed that the teachers seem not to agree with some statements in this group. They are P1 (M: 3.31) and P4 (M: 3.33).

In terms of layouts of the course books, the overall mean for the teacher is 3.7083, and for the students is 4.0123, suggesting that both groups agree with this criterion. When looking into individual statements, the author observed three statements that obtained a mean score below 4.40 (L8 and L9, M: 3.07) and L12 (M: 4.33), orderly.

Examining the activity criterion, generally, the mean for the teachers is 3.4583, and for the students is 3.9068. Notably, some statements in the teacher group obtain means below 4.40 (e.g. A13, A15, A19, M: 3.20, A14, M: 3.27).

Investigating the overall mean score of the skill criterion, the teacher group obtained 3.5889, and the student group received 3.8265. More specifically observed, one statement has a mean below 4.40 (S22, M= 3.20).

The two groups' overall mean scores for the language used in the textbooks are 3.5600 for the teachers and 3.8914 for the students. No means were observed below 4.40, which indicates that both groups agreed with all the statements in this criterion.

Concerning topics of the textbooks, the teachers' overall mean score is 3.3333, and the students' is 3.9324. This value showed that the teachers are in a neutral position for this criterion. Closely looking, only one item was observed to attain a mean score below 4.40 (T34: 3.07).

Finally, about the content of the textbooks, generally, the mean score for the teachers is 3.5111, and for the students, it is 3.8142, indicating they agree with the importance of content in the textbooks. Closely exploring, no items were seen to experience a mean score below 4.40.

To see if there were any mean differences between the two groups, an Independent Sample T-test was analysed regarding the seven overall means for the seven criteria that the teachers and the students perceived of the textbooks, as seen in Table 3 below.

As it is often difficult to tell the statistical mean difference between the two groups through numbers, this study performed this extra analysis to provide readers with information about the issue.

Table 3

Independent Samples Test of the Overall Means of the Two Groups of Responses

			ig.		f	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Overall mean for Practical use	Equal variances assumed	.000	.990	.456	35	.015	.49003	.19952	.0954	.8846
	Equal variances not assumed			.595	.20	.018	.49003	.18881	.0937	.8864
Overall mean for Layout	Equal variances assumed	.223	.138	.641	35	.103	.30396	.18524	.062	.6703
	Equal variances not assumed			.075	0.89	.051	.30396	.14647	-.001	.6087
Overall mean for Activities	Equal variances assumed	.892	.091	.185	35	.031	.44843	.20526	.042	.8544
	Equal variances not assumed			.976	2.55	.007	.44843	.15067	.136	.7605
Overall mean for Skills	Equal variances assumed	.297	.072	.143	35	.255	.23761	.20792	-.173	.6488
	Equal variances not assumed			.485	1.46	.152	.23761	.15996	-.095	.5698
Overall mean for Language	Equal variances assumed	.757	.187	.595	35	.113	.33139	.20782	-.080	.7424
	Equal variances not assumed			.998	0.71	.059	.33139	.16585	-.014	.6766

	Equal variances not assumed			.753	7.71	.013	.625	.227	.147	1.102
Overall mean for Topics	Equal variances assumed	405	526	.953	35	.004	.59904	.20287	.1978	1.0003
	Equal variances not assumed			.328	8.99	.004	.59904	.18003	.2222	.9759
Overall mean for Content	Equal variances assumed	455	501	.370	35	.173	.30310	.22116	-.134	.7405
	Equal variances not assumed			.596	9.47	.127	.30310	.18997	-.094	.7001

The Sig (2-tailed) item is the two-tailed *p*-value that will be interpreted to determine the mean difference between the two responses. The standard value to look for unequal values of the responses is 5% (0.05), and values more significant than this value are regarded as no statistical difference. As seen in Table 2, the means of the two groups for the topic of the textbooks (Teachers: 3.3333, Students: 3.9324) are statistically different. After comparing, as seen in Table 3, this pair is different, with a *p*-value of $0.04 < 0.05$. However, the mean difference between the groups for the activity criterion was observed not to be different, with a *p*-value of 0.07, surpassing 0.05, indicating that the two groups’ perspectives are not statistically different. Likewise, other means have no statistical difference, as the *p*-values are much greater than the standard value. For more details about the mean score differences of individual items, please refer to the appendix attached at the end of the study.

The author also conducted semi-structured focus group interviews with both groups to support the quantitative data. The interview questions centred on the following open-ended questions: (1) What is your general sense of the two textbooks you have used regarding practicality, layout, activities, skills, language, topics, and content? (2) What other good points of the books do you think? (3) What other weak points of the books need to be improved? To allow a convenient way of collecting the quantitative data, the author summarized the scripts by grouping them into positive and negative evaluations, as shown in Table 4 below.

Teachers	Students
<p><i>Positive evaluation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They like the books as they have the vocabulary for practice and audio files for practising listening skills. • The books are practical, vivid, and updated. • Writing activities and videos in the books are suitable. 	<p><i>Positive evaluation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They like the books because they include online exercises facilitating time flexibility for practice. <p><i>Negative evaluation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They prefer a more specialized vocabulary load and videos to practice listening skills, not

<p><i>Negative evaluation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, some consider videos because most are too long (5-6 minutes). The books have more exercises on listening than reading, so they discourage students' vocabulary mastery. • The books lack a variety of exercises, such as listening exercises, which are sometimes repeated from level B1+ to B2. • Most listening exercises are questions that require complete, short answers, which makes students unable to take notes properly. The listening part is too bad because it lacks a variety of degrees of difficulty, and the question and answer section is complex to understand. • Weaker or passive students cannot catch up with the book activities. • The designs need improvement for variety as they look dull. Some teachers consider vocabulary is not the strong point of the books, which are not as good as those preceding them, such as Market Leader. • The books lack balance in allocating skills. • The format of the books is boring, and they do not know what to do with the books except to follow the faculty and have no further ideas. • The layout is not convenient for students because the size of the words is small and causes some confusion. The books are designed purposefully to equip learners with international exam preparation, such as PTE, BEC, or BULATS. However, the university has other exam preparation directions, such as IELTS, TOEIC, or TOEFL, so the books cannot satisfy all the students' needs, making some discouraged. • The actual teaching by the faculty seems to differ from the university's educational objectives. Selecting the textbook should stick to the educational purposes and students' needs. 	<p>writing exercises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two books should be designed differently to increase motivation and excitement when learning with the books. • They complain that some long videos have made them unable to focus on information to answer listening questions. • Most listening exercises require students to provide complete, short answers. Hence, the books should have a variety of activities, such as True/ False or Gap fillings. • The books should have more activities for practising the reading skill. Many contexts in the books should be better for those employed. • The books are designed appropriately for employees rather than students. • The books should start with brainstorming activities preceded by other activities.
---	---

As can be seen, the results from the interview can be more detailed compared to the information obtained from the quantitative data through the mean scores showing agreement. First, not all the criteria received absolute agreement from the participants in the survey. Thus, this interview response helps bring more ideas about the related criteria used in the survey. Second, more ideas were gathered in addition to the mean scores showing agreement with the

seven criteria used in the survey. For example, the participants are also concerned with the faculty's objectives and appropriateness (Regarding the students' scripts: e.g., the books are designed appropriately for employees rather than students).

4.2 Discussion

This study is the first to investigate the teachers' and students' perspectives of the investigated textbooks. Textbook evaluation is one of the elements that can contribute to the program's success. This current study is not an exception when it has provided the users' opinions about these two textbooks for related stakeholders' consideration of whether or not to use the books. The quantitative results show that both groups, generally, are satisfied with the course books "Business Partner B1+" and "Business Partner B2". The questionnaire used seven textbook evaluation criteria (practical, layout, activities, language, skills, topics, and content) with 38 items. The students tend to agree more with the statements than the teachers. With all the overall mean scores, the students tend to be greater than those provided by the teachers. This result aligns with those found in the studies conducted by previous researchers (e.g. in cases of teachers' perceptions found in Hasibuan and Fithriani (2022), Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018), Khosiyono and Priyana (2019), Nazim (2021), Orfan et al. (2021), and Serasi et al. (2021), and in case of students' perceptions as found in the studies by Atigh and Khabbazi (2021), Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018), and Serasi et al. (2021), who found that the participants were satisfied with most of the criteria used to judge the textbooks. However, in this study, the two groups' means are different in terms of the criterion for the topics of the books. For the activity criterion, both groups show no significant difference.

In terms of interviews, the study will direct its discussion toward the three criteria used in this study. First, many ideas provided by the two groups are similar. For example, language skills are not balanced. While more listening practice is designed, other skills like reading are not practised enough. This is consistent with the findings of Hasibuan and Fithriani (2022). I thought it was challenging to balance language skills if students' needs were unclear. The problem has been discussed extensively, e.g. by Atigh and Khabbazi (2021) and MR (2016), who emphasised the interaction between related stakeholders during the textbook selection process.

Another example is that teachers and students complained that the listening exercises were too long, distracting them from understanding the main points. The books should be redesigned based on such ideas to balance language skills. The issue has been mentioned by Atigh and Khabbazi (2021). They found that the book they evaluated lacked communicative skills, and reading exercises mainly focused on writing. Similarly, the current books lack in-class exercises, especially about reading skills. Hence, the book designers and other related stakeholders must reconsider this point.

Another noteworthy remark is about the content and topics of the books. The mean score obtained from the teachers was not positive. They said the books are designed to help students better prepare for some international tests. However, the books' content and topics do not match the university's educational goals. For instance, the students in this university must take other international examinations, so the content and topics must be revised and updated. This response is aligned with the quantitative data. The teachers disagreed with this criterion (topics of the book with $M= 3.3333$). This issue has been discussed by Nazim (2021), who said that a good book must have a good design of strategies to practise language appropriately to help them reach their goals. Again, the question is who will decide the criteria used to design a textbook, as mentioned by Lynch (1996), Yumuk (1998), Cakit (2006), and Tomlinson (2003). Any

selected textbook would receive less negative feedback if this answer were answered. The topics are essential since they decide on the content selection, which can impact students' ultimate goals and motivation to use a book in the long run.

Regarding the upsides of the books, most teachers like them as they are practical and vivid, and the students like the books since they offer online listening exercises that they can practise flexibly. Such responses align with the results collected from the quantitative survey. Both students and teachers agreed with this criterion (Practical).

Several suggestions are humbly made to improve the situation of the textbooks. Firstly, all related stakeholders should sit side by side to reevaluate the books after a course or a year of study. Some teachers in the interview complained that they did not want to have more ideas about the books as they had no authority to change anything about the books or find other suitable books. Secondly, students' needs should be clearly stated, so that the school's administrative board can address those needs and proceed with book selection. In the interview, some teachers also noted that the books are designed for international test preparation. Nonetheless, the current international tests are different from those initially proposed. Finally, when selecting a textbook, the selection board should use a framework to guide the selection process, as suggested by researchers like Cunningsworth (1995) and Ur (1996).

5. Limitations

The study's sample, especially for the teacher participants, is modest as it was difficult to find more teachers available, so the perceived ideas can be subjective. Second, the study could not explore students in other schools to see their perceptions of the two textbooks since doing this could yield more varied responses. Third, the study could not interview all the teachers in this university to have a more objective picture of the books. Finally, some teachers have not explored the full content of the textbooks, so they could not provide a more detailed evaluation of the books. Future studies may want to consider these limitations when researching the same topic.

6. Conclusion

The current study explores two groups of participants' perceptions of the textbooks they used. More specifically, the teachers evaluated the books based on their experience using them to teach specialised English to students in economics. In contrast, the students assessed the books based on their experience learning technical English with the books. The study used a questionnaire with seven textbook evaluation criteria to elicit the participant's perceptions of the books within this framework. The results are positive in a general sense; however, regarding the teachers, they regarded the topics of the books as not helpful for students, and they disagreed with this criterion. Regarding the designs of books, they tend to facilitate readers with jobs rather than students. Regarding interviews, the teachers have more ideas than the students. However, both groups agree that the books need to balance language skills and add more exercises to practise necessary language skills. Then, although the videos in the books are helpful, their length should be shortened to assist students in catching information more quickly and motivate them to learn. Overall, they are satisfied with the books.

References

- Atigh, R. B., & Khabbazi, S. K. (2021). The evaluation of ESP textbooks based on students' perspectives. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 4(5), 56-62.

- Barus, I. R. G., & Simanjuntak, M. B. (2020). Evieta-based learning material in English business class: Students' perceptions. *SELTICS*, 3(2), 73-82.
- Cakir, I. (2006). The use of video as an audio-visual material in foreign language teaching classroom. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 5(4), 67-72.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your course book*. Heinemann of Illinois Press.
- Dubicka, I., O'Keeffe, M., Dignen, B., Hogan, M., & Wright, L. (2018). *Business partner B1+: coursebook*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Dubicka, I., Rosenberg, M., Dignen, B., Hogan, M., & Wright, L. (2018). *Business partner B2: coursebook*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Edmonds, W. A., & Kennedy, T. D. (2016). An applied guide to research designs: *Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage Publications.
- Glesne, G. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Pearson.
- Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook*. Longman.
- Hasibuan, R., & Fithriani, R. (2022). Evaluation of an ESP textbook for the students of fashion design. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 6(2), 287-298.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hemsley, M. (1997). The evaluation of teachers' guides-design and application. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 3(1), 72-83.
- Johar, N. A., & Aziz, A. A. (2019). *Teachers' perceptions on using the pulse 2 textbook*.
- Karimnia, A., & Jafari, F. M. (2017). Critical ESP textbook evaluation: The case of visual arts textbook. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 11(1), 219-236.
- Khodabandeh, F., & Mombini, R. (2018). Iranian EFL teachers' and students' perceptions towards the first grade high school English textbook (Vision 1). *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 11(22), 141-167.
- Khosiyono, B. H. C., & Priyana, J. (2019). Teachers' perceptions towards the use of maritime English textbooks in vocational school. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(3), 1042.
- Lim, E. L., & Hew, K. F. (2014). Students' perceptions of the usefulness of an E-book with annotative and sharing capabilities as a tool for learning: A case study. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 51(1), 34-45.
- Litz, D. R. (2005). Textbook evaluation and ELT management: A South Korean case study. *Asian EFL journal*, 48(1), 1-53.
- Lynch, K. B. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- MR, E. R. (2016). Teachers' perceptions toward the use of English textbook. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 9(1), 43-54.
- Mukundan, J. (2007). Evaluation of English language textbooks: Some important issues for consideration. *Journal of NELTA*, 12(1&2), 80-84.
- Nazim, M. (2021). Textbook evaluation: A case study of cutting edge. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(6), 1021-1033.
- Nunan, D., & Carter, R. (Eds.). (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Orfan, S. N., Noori, A. Q., & Akramy, S. A. (2021). Afghan EFL instructors' perceptions of English textbooks. *Heliyon*, 7(11), e08340.
- Rezaee, P., & Hashemi, A. (2017). English textbook evaluation in EFL classroom: A critical approach. *Proceeding of the 15th International TELLSI Conference* (pp. 150-156).
- Salehi, H., Khadivar, Z., & Mehrabi, M. (2015). Evaluation of an ESP medical textbook: Instructors and learners' perceptions in focus. *International education studies*, 8(7), 97-107.

- Sari, L. I., & Sari, R. H. (2020, May). ESP course book evaluation from the perspectives of teachers, cadets, and graduates: The case of maritime English. In *International Conference on English Language Teaching (ICONELT 2019)* (pp. 56-60). Atlantis Press.
- Serasi, R., Fatimah, L., Hakim, M. A. R., & Anggraini, D. (2021). A textbook evaluation on English textbook entitled "Grow With English" used by students of MI Nurul Huda Bengkulu City. *Jurnal Bahasa*, 10(1), 21-31.
- Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 237- 246.
- Suhirman, L. (2018). ESP textbook evaluation: English for Islamic learning for college students. *Indonesian Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 3(1), 13-22.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2023). *Developing materials for language teaching*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Tomlinson, B. (2010). Principles of effective materials development. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and Practice* (pp. 81-108). Cambridge University Press.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yumuk, A. (1998). *A case study on evaluating the effectiveness of English language Support 201 course materials for bureau management and secretarial studies at Bilkent University* (Doctorate dissertation). Middle East Technical University.

APPENDIX

			ig.		f	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
1	Equal variances assumed	.410	237	.446	35	.001	.834	.242	.355	1.312
	Equal variances not assumed			.116	6.774	.006	.834	.268	.269	.399
2	Equal variances assumed	.000	984	.294	35	.769	.070	.238	-.401	.541
	Equal variances not assumed			.290	7.494	.775	.070	.241	-.438	.578
3	Equal variances assumed	.437	510	.899	35	.060	.439	.231	-.018	.896
	Equal variances not assumed			.692	6.670	.109	.439	.259	-.109	.987
4	Equal variances assumed	.907	170	.383	35	.019	.617	.259	.105	1.130

	Equal variances not assumed			.387	3.714	.002	.617	.182	.241	.994
P	Equal variances assumed	000	990	.456	35	.015	.49003	.19952	.09544	.88461
	Equal variances not assumed			.595	8.200	.018	.49003	.18881	.09367	.88639
5	Equal variances assumed	.412	038	458	35	.648	.108	.235	-.357	.573
	Equal variances not assumed			543	9.756	.593	.108	.198	-.306	.522
6	Equal variances assumed	.217	272	.739	35	.007	.649	.237	.180	1.118
	Equal variances not assumed			.294	6.262	.035	.649	.283	.050	1.248
7	Equal variances assumed	048	827	.514	35	.608	-.110	.214	-.533	.313
	Equal variances not assumed			.518	7.697	.611	-.110	.212	-.556	.336
8	Equal variances assumed	279	598	.922	35	.000	.942	.240	.467	1.416
	Equal variances not assumed			.617	6.923	.002	.942	.260	.392	1.491
9	Equal variances assumed	080	778	.887	35	.005	.810	.281	.255	1.366
	Equal variances not assumed			.715	7.077	.015	.810	.299	.181	1.440
10	Equal variances assumed	067	795	231	35	.818	.060	.258	-.451	.570

	Equal variances not assumed			221	7.230	.828	.060	.269	-.508	.627
11	Equal variances assumed	038	846	566	35	.573	.134	.238	-.336	.604
	Equal variances not assumed			527	7.001	.605	.134	.255	-.404	.673
12	Equal variances assumed	256	614	.689	35	.492	-.161	.234	-.624	.302
	Equal variances not assumed			.795	9.333	.436	-.161	.203	-.585	.263
L	Equal variances assumed	.223	138	.641	35	.103	.30396	.18524	-.06239	.67031
	Equal variances not assumed			.075	0.892	.051	.30396	.14647	-.00073	.60865
13	Equal variances assumed	209	648	.290	35	.024	.636	.278	.087	1.185
	Equal variances not assumed			.446	8.322	.025	.636	.260	.090	1.182
14	Equal variances assumed	012	915	.457	35	.148	.397	.273	-.142	.937
	Equal variances not assumed			.412	7.335	.176	.397	.281	-.196	.990
15	Equal variances assumed	253	616	.245	35	.001	.792	.244	.309	1.274
	Equal variances not assumed			.343	7.925	.004	.792	.237	.294	1.290
16	Equal variances assumed	.057	306	.559	35	.121	.375	.241	-.101	.852

	Equal variances not assumed			.055	1.762	.052	.375	.183	-.004	.754
17	Equal variances assumed	005	944	938	35	.350	.225	.239	-.249	.698
	Equal variances not assumed			951	7.752	.355	.225	.236	-.272	.721
18	Equal variances assumed	270	604	875	35	.383	.220	.251	-.277	.716
	Equal variances not assumed			956	8.598	.351	.220	.230	-.262	.701
19	Equal variances assumed	913	341	.678	35	.000	.849	.231	.393	1.306
	Equal variances not assumed			.442	0.047	.000	.849	.191	.450	1.248
20	Equal variances assumed	107	744	375	35	.708	.093	.249	-.399	.586
	Equal variances not assumed			393	8.122	.699	.093	.238	-.405	.592
A	Equal variances assumed	.892	091	.185	35	.031	.44843	.20526	.04249	.85437
	Equal variances not assumed			.976	2.554	.007	.44843	.15067	.13641	.76045
21	Equal variances assumed	666	416	.498	35	.136	.344	.229	-.110	.797
	Equal variances not assumed			.882	0.762	.074	.344	.183	-.036	.724
22	Equal variances assumed	085	771	.848	35	.067	.464	.251	-.032	.960

	Equal variances not assumed			.952	8.191	.067	.464	.238	-.035	.963
23	Equal variances assumed	.373	.038	.510	.35	.611	.119	.233	-.343	.581
	Equal variances not assumed			.833	9.217	.411	.119	.143	-.173	.411
24	Equal variances assumed	.056	.813	.240	.35	.811	.063	.262	-.455	.580
	Equal variances not assumed			.222	6.929	.827	.063	.283	-.535	.661
25	Equal variances assumed	.297	.587	.647	.35	.519	.151	.233	-.310	.612
	Equal variances not assumed			.703	8.527	.491	.151	.215	-.299	.601
26	Equal variances assumed	.324	.570	.188	.35	.237	.285	.240	-.190	.760
	Equal variances not assumed			.380	9.435	.183	.285	.207	-.147	.717
S	Equal variances assumed	.297	.072	.143	.35	.255	.23761	.20792	-.17359	.64882
	Equal variances not assumed			.485	1.455	.152	.23761	.15996	.09461	.56984
27	Equal variances assumed	.751	.100	.336	.35	.737	-.082	.244	-.564	.400
	Equal variances not assumed			.387	9.304	.703	-.082	.212	-.525	.361
28	Equal variances assumed	.067	.796	.626	.35	.106	.403	.248	-.087	.894

	Equal variances not assumed			.620	7.586	.123	.403	.249	-.121	.927
29	Equal variances assumed	052	820	.847	35	.067	.461	.249	-.033	.954
	Equal variances not assumed			.849	7.638	.081	.461	.249	-.063	.985
30	Equal variances assumed	126	723	.161	35	.248	.293	.253	-.206	.793
	Equal variances not assumed			.276	8.672	.218	.293	.230	-.188	.775
31	Equal variances assumed	025	874	.401	34	.018	.583	.243	.103	1.064
	Equal variances not assumed			.551	8.296	.020	.583	.229	.103	1.063
LL	Equal variances assumed	.757	187	.595	35	.113	.33139	.20782	-.07960	.74239
	Equal variances not assumed			.998	0.712	.059	.33139	.16585	-.01381	.67660
32	Equal variances assumed	123	727	.213	35	.029	.518	.234	.055	.981
	Equal variances not assumed			.095	7.131	.051	.518	.247	-.003	1.039
33	Equal variances assumed	044	835	.728	35	.007	.625	.229	.172	1.077
	Equal variances not assumed			.753	7.713	.013	.625	.227	.147	1.102
34	Equal variances assumed	.892	029	.384	35	.019	.614	.257	.105	1.123

	Equal variances not assumed			.744	9.293	.013	.614	.224	.146	1.081
35	Equal variances assumed	001	976	.783	35	.006	.640	.230	.185	1.095
	Equal variances not assumed			.094	8.820	.006	.640	.207	.207	1.073
T	Equal variances assumed	405	526	.953	35	.004	.59904	.20287	.19784	1.00025
	Equal variances not assumed			.328	8.997	.004	.59904	.18003	.22224	.97585
36	Equal variances assumed	.584	210	.336	35	.184	.334	.250	-.161	.830
	Equal variances not assumed			.815	2.494	.083	.334	.184	-.047	.716
37	Equal variances assumed	342	560	536	35	.593	.132	.246	-.355	.618
	Equal variances not assumed			572	8.315	.575	.132	.230	-.352	.615
38	Equal variances assumed	011	916	.678	35	.096	.443	.264	-.079	.965
	Equal variances not assumed			.757	8.098	.096	.443	.252	-.086	.973
C	Equal variances assumed	455	501	.370	35	.173	.30310	.22116	-.13429	.74049
	Equal variances not assumed			.596	9.465	.127	.30310	.18997	-.09387	.70006

ĐÁNH GIÁ HAI CUỐN GIÁO TRÌNH TIẾNG ANH THƯƠNG MẠI, *BUSINESS PARTNER B1+* VÀ *BUSINESS PARTNER B2*: QUAN ĐIỂM CỦA SINH VIÊN VÀ GIẢNG VIÊN

Nguyễn Huỳnh Trang

*Khoa Ngoại ngữ, Đại học Kinh tế TP.HCM,
59C Nguyễn Đình Chiểu, Quận 3, TP.HCM, Việt Nam*

Tóm tắt: Khi nói đến giáo dục chính quy, người ta sẽ sớm nghĩ đến giáo viên, lớp học và tài liệu giảng dạy. Tài liệu giảng dạy, ví dụ như sách giáo khoa, giáo trình, rất quan trọng cho việc học và dạy vì kiến thức được thể hiện trong đó và giáo viên đứng lớp hoặc đồng nghiệp của họ có thể sử dụng để giảng dạy. Việc lựa chọn sách giáo khoa, giáo trình không phù hợp có thể tác động tiêu cực đến quá trình dạy và học. Vì vậy, nghiên cứu này điều tra ý kiến của giảng viên và người học về giáo trình họ sử dụng trong chuyên ngành của mình. Một bảng câu hỏi thang đo Likert năm điểm đã được đưa ra cho 15 giảng viên phụ trách lớp và 122 sinh viên đã và đang sử dụng giáo trình để họ đưa ra nhận xét của mình theo 7 tiêu chí: giá trị thực tiễn, bố cục, hoạt động dạy và học, ngôn ngữ, kỹ năng, chủ đề và nội dung. Kết quả cho thấy nhìn chung, họ hài lòng với hai cuốn giáo trình này. Tuy nhiên, các giảng viên không đồng ý với một tiêu chí là “chủ đề” của sách là không phù hợp. Nghiên cứu cũng sử dụng các cuộc phỏng vấn nhóm tập trung bán cấu trúc để có được thông tin cụ thể hơn về người tham gia. Cả hai nhóm đều đồng ý rằng hai cuốn giáo trình rất thiết thực và có video để luyện nghe. Tuy nhiên, nhiều tiêu chí như kỹ năng ngôn ngữ, hoạt động, nội dung cần được cải thiện. Một số đề xuất được đưa ra nhằm hoàn thiện hai cuốn giáo trình hơn.

Từ khóa: sinh viên thương mại, tiêu chí, giảng viên giảng dạy tiếng Anh như ngoại ngữ, giáo trình, đánh giá tài liệu giảng dạy