

A Content Analysis of the Text Readability in the Textbook Endorsed by the Government

Aulia Azmi

Universitas Sari Mulia

Aulia.azmi@unism.ac.id

Abstrak: Materi merupakan salah satu komponen pengajaran yang penting untuk menciptakan keberhasilan proses belajar mengajar. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mendeskripsikan isi bahan bacaan dalam buku teks “Bahasa Inggris” yang didukung oleh pemerintah, khususnya keterbacaan teks bacaan. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode analisis isi deskriptif untuk menganalisis, menafsirkan, dan mendeskripsikan data buku teks. Instrumen yang digunakan untuk menganalisis keterbacaan teks adalah program How Many Syllables dan rumus Flesch Reading Ease. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa temuan penelitian berhubungan dengan tingkat keterbacaan teks dalam buku teks yang dikategorikan ke dalam tiga kategori. Pertama, teks tersebut dikategorikan layak dibaca, namun berada di bawah standar yang diharapkan yaitu kelas sepuluh dengan persentase 62,5. Kedua, teks tersebut dikategorikan layak dibaca dan ditujukan untuk siswa kelas X dengan persentase 12,5. Ketiga, teks dikategorikan tidak layak dibaca karena berada di atas batas yang diharapkan dengan persentase 25. Berdasarkan temuan penelitian ini, dapat disimpulkan bahwa program Berapa Banyak Suku Kata dan rumus Flesch Reading Ease dapat membantu guru dalam memberikan bacaan yang tepat bahan untuk siswa.

Kata Kunci: Analisis Isi, Keterbacaan, Buku Ajar.

Abstract: Material is an important component of teaching to create a successful teaching and learning process. The purpose of this study is to describe the content of reading material in “Bahasa Inggris” textbook which endorsed by the government, especially the readability of the reading texts. This study used a descriptive content analysis method to analyze, interpret, and describe the data of the textbook. Moreover, the instruments for analyzing the readability of the texts were How Many Syllables program and Flesch Reading Ease formula. The result showed that the research finding dealt with readability level of the texts in the textbook which was categorized into three categories. Firstly, the texts were categorized as readable, but they were under the expected level of the tenth grade with a percentage of 62.5. Secondly, the texts were categorized as readable, and they were intended for the tenth grade students with a percentage of 12.5. Thirdly, the texts were categorized as not readable because they were above the expected level with a percentage of 25. Based on this research finding, it can be concluded that How Many Syllables program and Flesch Reading Ease formula can help the teachers to provide appropriate reading material for students.

Keywords: Content Analysis, Readability, Textbook.

INTRODUCTION

The teaching of English emphasizes the four language skills and one of them is reading. Berardo (2006: 61) argues that the reasons for reading depend very much on the purpose for reading. Reading has three main purposes, for survival, for learning or for pleasure. Reading for survival is considered to be in response to our environment and to find out information such as street signs, advertising, and timetables. In contrast, reading for learning is considered to be the kind of reading which is done in the classroom and has a certain goal. While reading for pleasure is reading for enjoyment such as reading comics. Thus, the three main purposes for reading encourage the students to master reading skill. Moreover, it can be as an important part of the teacher’s job to make the students have good reading skill. However, in fact, many students have problems for mastering reading and comprehending texts.

The textbook is one of the materials for teaching reading which needs to be analyzed. Anjaneyulu (2014) says that textbook is the most important element of the teaching process to gain the aims and objectives of a course. Moreover, the textbooks should help the teacher in conducting the teaching and learning process, so it is important for the teacher to analyze the contents of the textbook. Actually, there are some considerations to analyze the contents of textbook, especially in the teaching reading. They are related to the readability of the reading texts in the textbook. Lendo, et al (2021)

mentioned that by analysing the readability of the text, it can help the writer or teacher to find out which text is suitable or not for students. Thus, if the contents of textbook are good, the textbook itself can really support the teaching and learning process to achieve the goal of learning.

Readability is an important criteria for analyzing the content of a textbook, especially in the teaching of reading. Readability is the ease with which we read and understand a particular written text (Asem, 2013). Moreover, Brown, et al (2012) defines readability is a concept that describes the degree to which a text is easy or difficult to read. It means that readability is related to the factors that make the texts easier to be read and to be understood by the readers and it also shows the degree in which the texts are easy or difficult to be read by the readers. There are some commonly applied formulas in determining the readability of reading text, namely the Flesch Reading Ease formula, the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level, and the Fry Graph, SMOG Grading, and the Dale-Chall Formula (Bailin and Grafstein, 2016). In this study, the researcher chooses the Flesch Reading Ease formula which is one of the readability formulas because it is easier and more practical to use in measuring readability. Flesch Reading Ease formula combines the sentence length and word length in determining readability. However, in EFL context, using readability formula to determine readability is debated by many experts because in the beginning, it usually used for native readers. Meanwhile, Greenfield (2012) found in his research that the readability formulas are indeed fundamentally valid for a broad spectrum of English readers that can includes non-native as well as native readers. In other words, the formulas work quite well to predict the relative EFL/ESL difficulty of English academic texts.

In her preliminary study, the researcher found that there was a problem in using the textbook entitled "*Bahasa Inggris*" for the tenth grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK" which was endorsed by the government. It was published by the Ministry of Education and Culture (the Government) and distributed to SMA/MA and SMK/MAK in Indonesia. Then, when she interviewed the English teacher, she said that she just used it without considering the content. Furthermore, she said that the students had difficulties to understand the texts in the textbook because they were lack of vocabulary. This is in line with Assaly and Smadi (2015) who state that many English teachers do not thoroughly evaluate the textbook they use, either because they felt it is a tiring and time-consuming process, or because, in many cases, they are not qualified to do so. Thus, the researcher decided to choose this textbook to be analyzed because there is a problem in using the textbook.

In conclusion, based on the explanations above, the researcher is interested to conduct a research about "Content Analysis of the Text Readability in Textbook Endorsed by the Government. Based on the above background of the study, the problems are stated as follows:

What are the readability levels of reading texts in "*Bahasa Inggris*" textbook endorsed by the government?

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This research used a quantitative research design. Frankle, et al (2012) mention the data of the quantitative method are reduced to numerical scores and the data of the qualitative method are the preference for narrative description. In this research, the quantitative data are the results of the calculation (numerical scores) of readability level. The researcher also used content analysis. This is in line with Ary, et al. (2002) who state that content analysis focuses on analyzing and interpreting materials within its own context and the material can be textbooks. The researcher used this technique because she analyzed the content of the textbook entitled "*Bahasa Inggris*" for the tenth grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK". The analysis was intended to know about the readability of reading texts in the textbook.

Research Object

The researcher used the textbooks as the object of the research. The textbooks are entitled "*Bahasa Inggris*" for the tenth grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK. The textbooks are divided into two kinds, namely the textbook for the first semester and for the second semester. The first semester textbook contains Chapters 1st up to 9th and the second semester textbook contains Chapter 10th up to 18th. Each of them has variety of texts in reading skill. The textbooks were published by the Ministry of Education and Culture and distributed to SMA, MA, SMK and MAK in Indonesia.

Instruments

Instrument is a tool used to collect the data in order to answer the statement of problems. According to Fraenkle and Wallen (2012) instrument is a device that the researcher uses to collect data. In this research, the instrument that was used to collect the data was the document. Therefore, the researcher collected comprehension questions in the textbooks to find the data.

The researcher collected the readability of the texts as the data. The sources of the data were the textbooks entitled "Bahasa Inggris" for the tenth grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK. There were two tools used to collect the data, namely *How Many Syllables* program and readability formula. *How Many Syllables* program can be accessed at www.howmanysyllables.com for determining the number of syllables of each word or word length in the texts. In this research, this program was used before using the readability formula because the most of the readability formula combines the word length and the sentence length.

The researcher used the readability formula as the second tool to collect the data about the readability level of the texts. Beaglehole (2010) argues that readability formulas have been used as an educational tool to match readers to texts in school and also in business and military. In this research, the researcher used the Flesch Reading Ease formula as one of the readability formulas because it is easier and more practical to determine the readability of the text.

The formula for the Flesch Reading Ease score test is as follows:

$$\text{Flesch Reading Ease} = 206.835 - 1.015 \times \left(\frac{\text{Total Words}}{\text{Total Sentences}} \right) - 84.6 \times \left(\frac{\text{Total Syllables}}{\text{Total Words}} \right)$$

According to Flesch (1949, in Beaglehole, 2010), there are some steps to analyze the text by using the Flesch Reading Ease, namely: a.) selecting a 100-word written sample; b.) calculating the average sentence length and multiplied by 1.015; c.) counting the number of syllables in the 100-word sample and multiplied by 84.6; d.) adding together the average sentence length calculated and the number of syllables calculated; and e.) subtracting this sum from 206.835. The result is the reading ease score. Then, to interpret the reading ease score, the following table was used.

Table 2. Matching the Readability Score and Suitable Grade of Students

Description of Style (Readability)	Flesch Reading Ease Score	Estimated Reading Grade
Very Easy	90 to 100	5 th grade
Easy	80 to 90	6 th grade
Fairly Easy	70 to 80	7 th grade
Standard	60 to 70	8 th and 9 th grade
Fairly Difficult	50 to 60	10 th to 12 th grade (high school)
Difficult	30 to 50	13 th to 16 th grade (college)
Very Difficult	0 to 30	College graduate

Adapted from Flesch, R. (1949). *The Art of Readable Writing*. New York: Harper. p.149 in Dubay (2004)

Data Analysis

The current research used content analysis as a technique to analyze the data. In content analysis, descriptive statistic can be used as basic data analysis technique for analyzing the data collection. Alshumaimery (2015) states that descriptive statistics such as Percentages (%) and Frequencies (F) have been used as basic data analysis techniques to analyze the collected data. The analyzed data and the obtained findings are described in numbers of tables and figures of the percentages (%) and frequencies (F) that show the degree of each item in the instrument. Therefore, the researcher analyzed the data by using descriptive statistic.

In order to answer the research questions, the steps in analyzing the data were described as follows. For analyzing readability of the text, the researcher determined the readability level of the text by using the frequency or the numbers of texts which classified into very easy, easy, fairly easy, standard, fairly difficult, difficult, and very difficult to read in the textbooks and the percentage. It was showed in the table 3.

Table 3. Analyzing the Readability of the Text

Chapter	Number of Reading Texts	Description of Style (Readability)	Percentage	Estimated School Grade
		Very Easy		5 th grade
		Easy		6 th grade
		Fairly Easy		7 th grade
		Standard		8 th and 9 th grade
		Fairly Difficult		10 th to 12 th grade (high school)
		Difficult		13 th to 16 th grade (college)
		Very Difficult		College graduate

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

In this section, the result of the analysis of the readability level of the texts in “Bahasa Inggris” textbook for the tenth-grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK” which was endorsed by the government by using the Flesch Reading Ease formula are presented into two categories of predictions. They are (1) a description of style, and (2) an estimated reading grade. The two categories of predictions were based on the result of data computation using the Flesch Reading Ease formula.

Description of Style

Description of style is the first prediction of readability formula (FRE formula) in order to determine readability level of the texts. Based on the result of data analysis, it was found that the 16 reading texts of “Bahasa Inggris” textbook for the tenth grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK” which was endorsed by the government were categorized to six description of styles. The more detail result of the computation of the text readability in accordance with the description of styles or level of difficulties by using Flesch Reading Ease formula is presented in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4. Flesch Reading Ease Score and Interpretation

No	Reading Text (Chapter/ Page)	Total sentence	Total syllables	Flesch Reading Ease score	Description of style (Readability)
1.	1/4	8	138	77.40	Fairly Easy
2.	1/5	9	157	62.74	Standard
3.	4/45	8	136	79.09	Fairly easy
4.	5/58	7	128	84.05	Easy
5.	6/70	6	176	41.02	Difficult
6.	7/84	7	166	75.59	Fairly easy
7.	8/95	6	164	51.17	Fairly difficult
8.	9/105	4	161	45.25	Difficult
9.	9/106	5	160	51.18	Fairly difficult
10.	10/3	7	142	72.21	Fairly easy
11.	11/14	10	128	88.39	Easy

12.	12/27	8	194	30.02	Difficult
13.	13/37	6	177	40.17	Difficult
14.	14/49	8	128	85.86	Easy
15.	15/64	7	135	78.13	Fairly easy
16.	16/89	9	117	96.58	Very easy
Mean of FRE score				66.17	Standard

Based on the table above, the texts were classified into six description of styles such as **very easy**, **easy**, **fairly easy**, **standard**, **fairly difficult**, and **difficult**. The text in Chapter 16 had Flesch Reading Ease score of 77.40 which was categorized as **very easy style**. The texts in Chapters 5, 11, and 14 had Flesch Reading Ease scores of 84.05, 88.39, 85.86 which were categorized as **easy style**. The texts in Chapters 1 (page 4), 4, 7, 10, and 15 had Flesch Reading Ease scores of 77.40, 79.09, 75.59, 72.21, 78.13 which were categorized as **fairly easy style**. The text in Chapter 1 (page 5) had Flesch Reading Ease score of 62.74 which was categorized as **standard style**. The texts in Chapters 8 and 9 (page 106) had Flesch Reading Ease scores of 51.17, 51.18 which were categorized as **fairly difficult style**. Then, the texts in Chapters 6, 9 (page 105), 12 and 13 had Flesch Reading Ease scores of 41.02, 45.25, 30.02, 40.17 were categorized as **difficult style**. On the other hand, there was no text which was categorized as very difficult style. In addition, the mean of Reading Ease score was 66.17 which was categorized as **standard styles**.

Estimated Reading Grade

Estimated reading grade is the second prediction of readability formula (FRE formula) which connects the readability level to the prediction of reading grade level of the texts. Based on the result of data analysis, it was found that the 16 reading texts of “Bahasa Inggris” textbook for the tenth grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK” which was endorsed by the government were categorized into six estimated reading grade. The more detail result of the computation of the text readability in accordance with the estimated reading grade by using Flesch Reading Ease formula is presented in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 Flesch Reading Ease Score and Interpretation (Estimated Reading Grade)

No	Reading Text (Chapter/ Page)	Total sentence	Total syllables	Flesch Reading Ease score	Estimated Reading Grade
1.	1/4	8	138	77.40	7 th grade
2.	1/5	9	157	62.74	8 th and 9 th grade
3.	4/45	8	136	79.09	7 th grade
4.	5/58	7	128	84.05	6 th grade
5.	6/70	6	176	41.02	13 th to 16 th grade (college)
6.	7/84	7	166	75.59	7 th grade
7.	8/95	6	164	51.17	10 th to 12 th grade (high school)
8.	9/105	4	161	45.25	13 th to 16 th grade (college)
9.	9/106	5	160	51.18	10 th to 12 th grade (high school)
10.	10/3	7	142	72.21	7 th grade
11.	11/14	10	128	88.39	6 th grade
12.	12/27	8	194	30.02	13 th to 16 th grade (college)

13.	13/37	6	177	40.17	13 th to 16 th grade (college)
14.	14/49	8	128	85.86	6 th grade
15.	15/64	7	135	78.13	7 th grade
16.	16/89	9	117	96.58	5 th grade
Mean of FRE score				66.17	8 th and 9 th grade

Based on the table above, the texts were classified into six estimated reading grade such as the 5th grade, the 6th grade, the 7th grade, the 8th and the 9th grade, the 10th to the 12th grade, and the 13th to the 16th grade. The text in Chapter 16 had Flesch Reading Ease score of 77.40 which was intended for the 5th grade. The texts in Chapters 5, 11, and 14 had Flesch Reading Ease scores of 84.05, 88.39, 85.86 which were intended for the 6th grade. The texts in Chapters 1 (page 4), 4, 7, 10, and 15 had Flesch Reading Ease scores of 77.40, 79.09, 75.59, 72.21, 78.13 which were intended for the 7th grade. The text in Chapter 1 (page 5) had Flesch Reading Ease score of 62.74 which was intended for the 8th and 9th grade. The texts in Chapters 8 and 9 (page 106) had Flesch Reading Ease scores of 51.17, 51.18 which were intended for the 10th to 12th grade. Then, the texts in Chapters 6, 9 (page 105), 12 and 13 had Flesch Reading Ease scores of 41.02, 45.25, 30.02, 40.17 were intended for the 13th to 16th grade. Meanwhile, there was no text which was intended for college graduate level. In addition, the mean of Reading Ease score was 66.17 which was intended for the 8th and 9th grade.

Based on the result of the data analysis, it was found the 16 texts which were analyzed were classified into six readability levels (level of difficulty) of the texts, such as **very easy, easy, fairly easy, standard, fairly difficult, and difficult**. Furthermore, the texts were also classified into six estimated reading grade such as the 5th grade, the 6th grade, the 7th grade, the 8th and the 9th grade, the 10th to the 12th grade, and the 13th to the 16th grade.

The more detail result of the computation of the text readability by using Flesch Reading Ease formula is presented in Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3 Flesch Reading Ease Score and Interpretation

No	Reading Text (Chapter/ Page)	Flesch Reading Ease score	Description of style (Readability)	Estimated Reading Grade
1.	1/4	77.40	Fairly Easy	7 th grade
2.	1/5	62.74	Standard	8 th and 9 th grade
3.	4/45	79.09	Fairly easy	7 th grade
4.	5/58	84.05	Easy	6 th grade
5.	6/70	41.02	Difficult	13 th to 16 th grade (college)
6.	7/84	75.59	Fairly easy	7 th grade
7.	8/95	51.17	Fairly difficult	10 th to 12 th grade (high school)
8.	9/105	45.25	Difficult	13 th to 16 th grade (college)
9.	9/106	51.18	Fairly difficult	10 th to 12 th grade (high school)
10.	10/3	72.21	Fairly easy	7 th grade
11.	11/14	88.39	Easy	6 th grade
12.	12/27	30.02	Difficult	13 th to 16 th grade (college)
13.	13/37	40.17	Difficult	13 th to 16 th grade (college)

14.	14/49	85.86	Easy	6 th grade
15.	15/64	78.13	Fairly easy	7 th grade
16.	16/89	96.58	Very easy	5 th grade
Mean of FRE score		66.17	Standard	8 th and 9 th grade

Table 4.3 shows that the 16 texts which were analyzed were categorized into six readability levels and six estimated reading grades. In other words, Table 4.3 displays that one text was categorized as very easy style which was intended for the 5th grade; three texts were categorized as easy style which were intended for the 6th grade; five texts were categorized as fairly easy style which were intended for the 7th grade; one text was categorized as standard style which was intended for the 8th and 9th grades, and two texts were categorized as fairly difficult style which were intended for the 10th to 12th grades.

In addition, the findings revealed that the whole selected reading texts in the textbook can be categorized into three levels: 1) the low level of the texts that involved the estimated reading grades ranging from the 5th to 9th grades; 2) the appropriate level of the texts that embraced the estimated reading grades of the 10th grade level (the 10th to 12th grades or high school level); and 3) the high level of the texts that involved the estimated reading grades ranging from the 13th to 16th grades (college level). In other words, the researcher classified the readability level of the texts into three categories. Firstly, the texts were readable, but they were not intended for the tenth grade students. The texts were intended for under the expected level which were ranging from the 5th to 9th grades. There were 10 texts which were included in this following category. Secondly, the texts were readable, and they were intended for the tenth grade students (10th grade). There were two texts which were included in this following category. And the last, the texts were not readable, and they were not intended for the tenth grade students. The texts were intended for higher than the expected level which were ranging from the 13th to 16th grades. There were four texts which were included in the following category.

Furthermore, in order to know how far each of the readability levels of the texts in “Bahasa Inggris” textbook for the tenth grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK”, the percentages were used. The complete classification and the percentages can be seen on the table below.

Table 4.4 Classification and Percentages of Readability Level of the Texts

Chapter	Number of Reading Texts	Description of Style (Readability)	Estimated School Grade	Percentage
16	1 text	Very Easy	5 th grade	6.25 %
5,11,14	3 texts	Easy	6 th grade	18.75 %
1,4,7,10,15	5 texts	Fairly Easy	7 th grade	31.25 %
1	1 text	Standard	8 th and 9 th grade	6.25 %
8,9	2 texts	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th grade (high school)	12.5 %
6,9,12,13	4 texts	Difficult	13 th to 16 th grade (college)	25 %
-	-	Very Difficult	College graduate	0 %

Based on the classification and percentages of readability level of the texts above, it can be concluded that out of 16 texts which were analyzed, one text (6.25%) was categorized as very easy style which was intended for the 5th grade. Three texts (18.75%) were categorized as easy style which were intended for the 6th grade. Five texts (31.25%) were categorized as fairly easy style which were intended

for the 7th grade. One text (6.25%) was categorized as standard style which was intended for the 8th and 9th grades. Two texts (12.5%) were categorized as fairly difficult style which were intended for the 10th to 12th grades. The following texts were readable with the percentage of 75. On the other hand, four texts (25%) were categorized as difficult style which were intended for the 13th to 16th grades. The following texts were not readable with the percentage of 25. Moreover, no text (0%) was not readable and was intended for college graduate students.

Therefore, based on the researcher's classification of readability level, it can be concluded that 62.5% (or 10 texts) were categorized as readable texts but they were appropriate for the 5th to 9th grade students. Next, 12.5% (or two texts) were categorized as readable texts and they were intended for the 10th grade (10th to 12th or high school level). However, the rest 25% (or four texts) were categorized as not readable because they were appropriate for the 13th to 16th grades (college level).

Discussion

Based on the result of the data analysis about readability of the texts, it was found that 16 texts of "Bahasa Inggris" textbook for the tenth grade students of SMA/MA and SMK/MAK" which was endorsed by the government by using FRE formula are presented into two categories of predictions. First prediction is description of style in order to determine the readability level of the texts. The result of analysis showed that the description of style of the texts were divided into six categories such as **very easy, easy, fairly easy, standard, fairly difficult, and difficult**.

Furthermore, the second prediction is estimated reading grade which connects the readability level to the prediction of reading grade level. The findings showed that the texts were classified into six estimated reading grade such as the 5th grade, the 6th grade, the 7th grade, the 8th and the 9th grade, the 10th to the 12th grade, and the 13th to the 16th grade. Thus, the following two categories of the predictions are close related. The readability refers to the difficulty level (description of style) of the texts in accordance to the level of students' educational background (estimated reading grade). This is in line with Chall (1995, in Pikulski, 2002) who states that the purpose of readability assessment is to effect a "best match" between intended readers and texts. In other word, the readability is the tool to help the teachers select the most appropriate reading materials. Moreover, readability formulas have been proven useful in predicting the ease or difficulty of reading material.

Based on the purpose of readability assessment in order to match the texts to the intended reader, the researcher classified the texts into three categories. First category is the texts were categorized as readable but they were under the expected level in this case for the tenth grade students. Out of 16 texts which were counted, one text (6.25%) was categorized as very easy styles which was intended for the 5th grade, three texts (18.75%) were categorized as easy styles which were intended for the 6th grade, five texts (31.25%) were categorized as fairly easy styles which were intended for the 7th grade, one text (6.25%) was categorized as standard style which was intended for the 8th and 9th grade. Therefore, the texts which were under the student's level can effect to the students' interest. Johnson (2000) argues that an accomplished reader is likely to be bored by simple monotonous texts. It means that when the students read the texts which were under their level, it decreases their motivation to read it.

The second category is the texts were categorized as readable and they were intended for the tenth grade students. Two texts (12.5%) were categorized as fairly difficult which were intended for the 10th to 12th grade. In other word, the following two texts were the appropriate level of the texts that embraced the estimated reading grade for the 10th grade level (the 10th to 12th grade). Dubay (2004) says that the students learn reading in steps, and they learn best with materials written for their current reading level. Thus, when the students read the materials which match to their reading grade, it can help them easier to gain the purpose of reading or understand the texts.

The last category is the texts were categorized as not readable because they were above the expected level. Four texts (25%) were categorized as difficult which were intended for the 13th to 16th grade. Sibanda (2013) states that the texts which are categorized as above the students' reading level may cause the frustration level of comprehending it, especially low achiever. However, it could give the benefit for high achiever. He argues that very difficult texts adversely affect comprehension and lead to frustration, which is likely to affect negatively the mood and mental readiness of the reader. It is also supported by by Abadzi (2008) that if a text is too difficult, they are forced to read it slowly

thereby making greater demands on their memory which may compromise their understanding. It means that the texts were above the expected level can be obstacle which is related to students' interest and long-term memory in order to understand the texts.

On the contrary, the texts were above the expected level could give the benefit for high achiever. Krashen and Tracy (1995) state that a handbook or supporting media for learning should be challenging one more step higher than their level. If it reached, this supporting media expected that classroom would full a lot of enthusiasm, active students and creative idea. Therefore, the texts were above the expected level lead the students who categorized as high achiever will arrange up their level. Moreover, in the classroom, it always contains low achiever, medium achiever and high achiever and there is no texts which exactly match to every students' reading level. Sibanda (2013) assumes that in the classroom context, where a text is not perfectly matched to a reader's level, it is then the teacher's task to scaffold it. In conclusion, the teachers' task is to make the text interesting and accessible by connecting reading with prior knowledge, pre-reading, discussing the text, giving illustrations, examples and where necessary, simplifying the language of the text.

Based on the findings of readability of the texts, the textbook needs to be revised which is related to the readability of reading texts. There are several reasons why the textbook need to be revised, namely: 1.) 10 texts (62.5%) were readable but they were under the expected level. The following category of the texts can cause the students are bored and decrease their motivation to read. Moreover, the following category is the most dominant in this textbook based on the calculation of percentage, 2.) 4 texts (25%) were readable but they were above the expected level. The following category of the texts can cause the students leads frustration especially for lower achiever and effects to the students' interest to read, and 3.) only 2 out of 16 texts (12.5%) were readable and intended for the expected level. However, the following category of the texts can help the students easier to understand the texts in the textbook.

CONCLUSION

The research finding deals with readability level of the texts in the textbook which is categorized into three categories. Firstly, the texts are categorized as readable, but they are under the expected level of the tenth grade. Out of 16 texts which were analyzed, one text (6.25%) was categorized as very easy styles which was intended for the 5th grade, three texts (18.75%) were categorized as easy styles which were intended for the 6th grade, five texts (31.25%) were categorized as fairly easy styles which were intended for the 7th grade, one text (6.25%) was categorized as standard style which was intended for the 8th and 9th grades.

Secondly, the texts are categorized as readable, and they are intended for the tenth grade students. Two texts (12.5%) were categorized as fairly difficult which were intended for the 10th to 12th grades. In other word, they were the appropriate level of the texts that embraced the estimated reading grade for the 10th grade level (the 10th to 12th grade). Thirdly, the texts are categorized as not readable because they are above the expected level. Out of 16 texts which were analyzed, four texts (25%) were categorized as difficult which were intended for the 13th to 16th grades. It can be concluded that the texts which are categorized as readable but they are under the expected level are more dominant in this research with a percentage of 62.5.

REFERENCES

- Abadzi, H. (2008). *Efficient Learning for the Poor: New Insight into Literacy Acquisition for Children*. International Review of Education, 54(5), 581-604
- Alyousef, H.S. (2005). *Teaching Reading Comprehension to ESL/EFL Learner*. The Reading Matrix, 5(2), 143-154
- Anasy, Z. (2016). *HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills) in Reading Task*. Tarbiya: Journal of Education in Muslim Society, 3(1), 51-63.
- Anjaneyulu, T. (2014). *A Critical Analysis of the English Language Textbooks in Andhra Pradesh, India*. ELT Research Jurnal, 3(4), 181-200.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., and Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to Research in Education (6th ed.)*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Asem, B. (2013). *Evaluation of Textual Readability- An Analysis of its Varying Approaches*. Impact Journals, 1(4), 7-12.
- Bailin, A., & Grafstein, A. (2016). *Readability: Text and context*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

- Beaglehole, V. (2010). *The Full Stop Effect: Using Readability Statistics with Young Writers*. Journal of Literacy and Technology, 11(4), 54-83.
- Berardo, S. (2006). *The Use of Authentic Materials in the Teaching of Reading*. The Reading Matrix, 6(2), 60-69.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd edition)*. New York: Longman
- Brown, J.D., Janssen, G., Trace, J., and Kozhevnikova, L. (2012). *A Preliminary Study of Cloze Procedure as a Tool for Estimating English Readability for Russian Students*. Second Language Studies, 31(1), 1-22.
- Cahyono, B.Y., and Widiyati, U. (2006). *The Teaching of EFL Reading in the Indonesian Context: The State of the Art*. TEFLIN Journal, 17(1), 36-58.
- Dubay, W.H. (2004). *The principles of Readability*. Costa Mesa: Impact Information.
- Fraenkel, J.R., Norman E.W., and Hyun, Helen. H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education Eighth Edition*. New York. McGraw-Hill Companies
- Febrina, Usman, B., & Muslem, A. (2019). *Analysis of Reading Comprehension Question by Using Revised Bloom's Taxonomy on Higher Order Thinking Skills(HOTS)*. English Education Journal, 10(1), 1-15
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching Third Edition*. England: Longman.
- Lendo, Noviyanti., Liando, Nihta., and Olii, Sanerita. (2021). *An Analysis of Readability of Reading Texts on English National Examination on Junior High School*. E-Clue Journal of English, Culture, Language, Literature, and Education published by English Education Department Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Manado, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 128-143
- Ling, Y.C., Tong, C.S., and Jin, N.Y. (2012). *Evaluating the ESL Reading Texts for Intermediate Learners of English from the Perspective of Students*. Global Journal of Human Social Science, 12(7), 55-59.
- Pikulski, J. (2002). *Readability: A Definition*. Houghton Mifflin Company: University of Delaware
- Rosyita, E. (2007). *Readability Level of Reading Texts in Linked to the World Textbook Published by Yudhistira Used for the Eleventh Grade Students of Social Program of Senior High School*. Malang: Muhammadiyah University of Malang.
- Sibanda, L. (2013). *A Case Study of the Readability of Two Grade 4 Natural Sciences Textbooks Currently Used in South African Schools*. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Snow, C. (2001). *Reading for Understanding*. U.S. : RAND Education
- Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Materials development in Language Teaching Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zamanian, M and Heydari, P. (2012). *Readability of Texts: State of the Art. Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(1), 43-53.