

The Readability Level of Reading Texts in Erlangga Straight Point Series: English for Eleventh Grade Students

Ratri Handayani¹, Furaidah¹, Francisca Maria Ivone¹

¹Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris-Universitas Negeri Malang

INFO ARTIKEL

Riwayat Artikel

Diterima: 13-11-2020

Disetujui: 27-11-2020

Kata Kunci:

*readability;
reading texts;
teachers' professional judgment;
keterbacaan;
membaca teks;
penilaian profesional guru*

Alamat Korespondensi:

Ratri Handayani
Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Universitas Negeri Malang
Jalan Semarang 5 Malang
E-mail: hanratri4@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Abstract: This study aims to describe the readability level of reading texts in *ESPS: English for the 11th grade students*. The measurement tools were Coh-Metrix RDL2, Miyazaki EFL Reading Index and teachers' professional judgment. The formula were effective in measuring the texts readability by calculating the number of words, letters, and sentences in the text. The Score of Coh-Metrix RDL2 showed that the reading texts was easier for reading level of 11th graders. MEFLRI claimed that reading texts in *ESPS* textbook are match for reading level of 11th graders. Teachers' judgment claimed, the texts were suitable for eleventh grade students.

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan tingkat keterbacaan 19 teks bacaan dalam *ESPS: English* untuk siswa kelas 11. Tiga alat ukur digunakan untuk mengukur tingkat keterbacaan yakni Coh-Metrix RDL2 dan Miyazaki EFL Reading Index, dan penilaian guru. Kedua formula terbukti efektif dalam mengukur keterbacaan teks dengan menghitung total huruf, kata, dan kalimat dalam teks. Coh-Metrix menunjukkan bahwa teks bacaan lebih mudah dipahami oleh siswa pada kelas 11, sedangkan MEFLRI menunjukkan bahwa teks bacaan sangat cocok diberikan pada kelas 11. Penilaian guru menyatakan teks bacaan sesuai untuk siswa kelas 11.

EFL which is considered as compulsory subject at secondary high school, has played significant roles in education in ASEAN countries, including Indonesia (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017). Four language skills are needed to develop the learners' ability to achieve English as a foreign language. Among the four language skills, reading is the skill that is developed at the beginning of EFL teaching and learning and it is followed by other language skills (Hadi, 2006). The needs of written texts, for EFL learners especially, are inevitable. EFL learners know limited English vocabulary, they have low English language proficiency level and have less time for learning English compared to native speaker. They intensively start learning English at secondary school (Nation, 2001; Snow, 2002). They still can enhance and maintain their deficiency of language input through reading. Luckily, these days we can accessed English written texts easily through printed documents (textbook, novel, newspapers, etc.) or in the form of digital file that can be accessed through internet (Saville-Troike, 2006; Zhang, 2016).

The students who are routinely exposed to reading texts or written texts in a target language will grow into good reader and good language learner. Good reader is able to process words quickly and accurately as an automated process even when processing a complex written text (Pressley, 1998 & Stanovich, 2000 in Mckee, 2012) and it leads to the goal of comprehension (Johnson, 2005). On the other hand, good language learner is defined as the one who has aptitude, motivation, and opportunity to learn new language for social or academic purpose (Lightbown & Spada, 2013; Rubin, 1975). To become a good language learner, a student can start to be a good reader first. Students can improve the understanding of meaningful discourse and build their knowledge by frequently reading written texts that have suitable material for their level of education, specifically in English language teaching and learning.

A good readers' positive improvement in understanding information and in building knowledge also affected by their learning setting, learning program, and learning material. According to Cahyono & Widiati (2006), the teaching of reading in Indonesia focuses on intensive reading that involves the help or intervention of the teacher. The teacher's intervention is followed by reading instructions and tasks. The intensive reading program is a good setting for nurturing good readers' ability even more with the help of appropriate reading materials. Thus, it is necessary to provide appropriate reading materials for students who learn English as a foreign language.

Due to the fact that the teaching and learning in Indonesia focuses on the intensive reading, thus the EFL teaching and learning in secondary school is delivered by utilizing textbooks. Textbook are given as primary material in English language teaching and learning since they contain reading texts, instructions, and tasks. Beside, textbooks are reliable learning source that

provide credible information and they positively support and enhance students' understanding of critical concept to strengthen students' learning (Knight, 2015). Textbook are essential in most language teaching and learning for both teachers and students as they purvey major source of material and ideas for planning teaching lessons (Richards, 2001). Textbooks in language learning class shall be comprehensible, readable, and have suitable material, including lexical features, upon students' grade and level (Nguyen, 2020; Yulianto, 2019). Thus, it is essential to select textbook that matched the teaching and learning objectives, curriculum and students' need.

To achieve the teaching and learning objectives, a teacher should be more active in selecting appropriate textbook or reading material based on the curriculum and students' need. Berardo, (2006) affirms that teacher, particularly in EFL classroom, act as a facilitator in preparing materials, giving awareness, and necessary skills to students as well to make them understand on how the language is actually used. Teachers need to remember that the selected EFL textbook should has adequate linguistic aspect, linguistic discourse, and syntactic structure of a foreign language. EFL teachers can utilize reputable textbook selection guidance to select proper EFL textbook proposed by experts such as (Cunningsworth, 1995), (Garinger, 2002) and (Byrd & Schuemann, 2014). They focuses on textbook selection by considering the fitness of the program and course within textbook, the language content, the aims and objectives of the target language, methodology, and also the fitness with the curriculum, and also for the students' level and needs.

Nuttall (1996) declares her ideas about selecting reading material which focuses on texts selection. She states three points in selecting reading material for language learner, namely suitability of content, exploitability, and readability. Suitability of content relates to the appropriate equipment that will arouse students' enjoyment, interest, and curiosity for their goals in learning. Secondly, exploitability is a way of how the text is used to develop students' achievement of specific or foreign language and content goals by exploring instructional tasks and technique. Then, readability is related to how comprehensible the use and the composition of lexical and structural difficulty within a text to challenge students based on their level of study and knowledge.

Pikulski (2012) defines readability in a more understandable way as a level of ease or difficulty in understanding reading texts. In addition, McLaughlin (1969, as cited in DuBay, 2004) stated that readability is seen as "the degree to which a given class of people find certain reading matter compelling and comprehensible." It leads to a conclusion that readability is the level of ease or difficulty within reading materials or texts in accordance with people's level of education and prior knowledge. In the same line with Nuttall, Ruddell (1993) and Richardson & Morgan (1990) also agree that selecting reading material or textbook can be done by using readability since readability is expressed in the terms of grade level. It means, when a text is identified as having the readability level of tenth grade then the text is readable and fit for the students in the lower grade or in the exact tenth grade. Thus, it is confirmed that readability can be utilized as a way in selecting reading materials, particularly textbooks and its reading texts, based on the students' need, grade and their competence.

The experts' notion about the use of readability might be assumed as solution in selecting reading material for Indonesian EFL learners when it is related to lexical and structural difficulty within a text. Moreover, Indonesian EFL learners are struggling during reading activity that related to vocabulary knowledge, making inferential meaning, syntactic and semantic analysis of a text (Jayanti, 2016), despite their EFL learning involving intensive reading and written texts frequently. Therefore, by utilizing readability, EFL teacher shall select the textbook as a learning source with appropriate reading materials for EFL learners' level and competence (Rahmawati & Lestari, 2014).

Readability can be measured by utilizing readability formula. Readability formula is considered as the most practical way and less time consuming in the practice when a prediction of difficulty is necessary (Richardson & Morgan, 1990). Essentially, readability formula measures two major points: semantic (vocabulary, multiple syllables and word length) and syntactic (sentence length) complexity (Ruddell, 1993). Based on those points, the assumption is that the longer the sentence and the longer the word, the harder the material will be.

This study will utilized two readability formula that can predict EFL texts readability namely Miyazaki EFL Reading Index (MEFLRI), developed and discovered by Greenfield (2003) and Coh-Metrix RDL2, developed by McNamara et al., (2014). MEFLRI is manual readability formula and the measurement includes the sum of the letters, word, and sentences within a text or passage. The point scale to decide the grade level of a text is similar with the infamous Flesch Reading Ease, a 100-point scale, to be exact. According to MEFLRI, if a text has a 100-point scale or up to 50-point scale, it is considered that the text has below average difficulty level. If a text has 50-point scale then it has average difficulty level. When a text has score below 50-point scale, then it has higher average difficulty.

Coh-Metrix RDL2 is an automatic readability formula. It means that the computation is done automatically by accessing cohmetrix.com. The measurement includes content word overlap, word frequency and syntactic sentence similarity. Coh-Metrix RDL2 does not have a benchmark in classifying the grade level of text, thus, the result included the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level and Flesch Reading Ease score in the readability section so we can identify the grade level of the text.

Nuttall (1996), Ruddell (1993), and Richardson & Morgan (1990) claim that the application of readability formulas will definitely helpful since they can predict the grade level of text in no time. Moreover, the application is simple since they mainly focus on syntactic and semantic complexity. It can be seen from the studies that had been conducted regarding the use of readability formulas by Sangia (2016), Yunita et al., (2017), Uri & Aziz, (2018) and Crossley et al. (2008).

The study of the application of MEFLRI is conducted by Sangia (2016) and Yunita et al. (2017). Their study were focused on analyzing readability texts in *Buku Bahasa Inggris Kelas 11* from the Ministry of Education and Culture although the texts being analyzed were different. Sangia analyzed all the reading texts within the textbook while Yunita, Suharsono and Munir merely analyzed report texts within the textbook. Sangia revealed that the texts being analyzed using MEFLRI had various result such as very easy, standard, fairly difficult and difficult level. At the end, he concluded that the reading texts in *Buku Bahasa Inggris Kelas 11* are suitable for eleventh grade students.

On the other hand, Yunita et al. (2017) revealed that the analyzed report texts were in fairly difficult and the difficulty level matched the ten to twelve grade. They also conduct an observation and collecting students' score related to the teaching and learning activity about report texts. From the data, they concluded that the score of readability analysis, students' score and students' grade are matched. Therefore, the report texts in *Buku Bahasa Inggris Kelas 11* is suitable for eleventh grade student.

The next study was conducted by Uri & Aziz (2018) in Malaysia. They employed Flesch Reading Ease, Gunning-Fog Index and Coh-Metrix L2 Reading Index/Coh-Metrix RDL2. Their study was focused on analyzing reading texts within the national examination of reading test in Malaysia. They scrutinized the length of the sentence, syllables, and syntax within the texts. The result showed that the reading texts were fairly easy as in the same level of seven grade and reasonably appropriate for upper secondary level students.

Crossley et al. (2008) conducted study to investigate the accuracy prediction of reading difficulty of readability formula for native English texts or for EFL texts. The research examined the correlation of observed scores of cloze tests for Bormuth passages and the score that had been predicted by some readability formulas. The readability formula for native English texts were Flesch Reading Ease, Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level, Dale-Chall formula and Bormuth formula. In the other side, the readability formula for EFL texts were Coh-Metrix RDL2 and MEFLRI. Surprisingly, Coh-Metrix RDL2 and MEFLRI had accurate result to the observed score. Additionally, the predicted readability scores from Coh-Metrix RDL2 and MEFLRI also had strong correlation (0.96), thus, they are effective in analyzing or predicting the difficulty level of EFL reading text. Knowing readability level of texts help us to predict how suitable the texts are for the EFL learners. Hence, at some point teacher assumes that readability level of the texts is not a 100% accurate and hesitate to depend on the readability result. Thus, the result of the readability testing will be more accurate if the analyzing is supported by the teacher's professional judgment (Ruddell, 1993; Rush, 1985). Singer (1992) developed Friendly Text Evaluation Scale to answer and overcome the hesitation.

Referring to the results and the facts from the previous studies, in short, readability testing is indeed necessary because they are effective in predicting the level of difficulty of English texts in a quick and simple way. Thus the current research will utilize the Coh-Metrix RDL2, MEFLRI and teachers' professional judgment in analyzing readability of reading texts. Since the object of the research in the previous research mostly came from the government, thus, it is necessary to select research object from non-government source to widen our insight and enrich the previous studies. Therefore, this current research decided to analyze readability level of reading texts from private publisher textbook, *Penerbit Erlangga*, namely *Erlangga Straight Point Series: English* for eleventh grade students. *ESPS* is utilized at MA Darul Ulum Muncar, Banyuwangi. This textbook is published in 2019 and design based on the revised 2013 *Kurikulum*. Additionally, it fulfils the national standard by Government Regulation (Permendikbud No. 8 Tahun 2016) about the standard of the functioning textbook in teaching and learning process. The study regarding the readability of reading texts in *ESPS* textbook for the eleventh grade has not been conducted before. Thus, the researcher encourages conducting this study.

METHOD

The aim of this current study is to describe the readability of English texts within *ESPS* textbook for eleventh grade students by using multiple evaluations i.e., two readability formulas (MEFLRI and Coh-Metrix RDL2) and teacher's professional judgment of reading texts adopted from Singer (1992). This research belongs descriptive research since the researcher wants to describe the readability level of reading texts in *ESPS* textbook. Descriptive research focuses on describing an incident or phenomenon as it is (Best, 1981). He stated that descriptive research involves the description, recording, analysis, and interpretation of condition that exist. This current study collected the data in the form of numerical data. This is in line with what Sukmadinata (2016) state about descriptive research i.e., descriptive research allows the researcher to collect and analyze numerical data. The numerical data obtained from the readability scores of reading texts. The 2013 Curriculum obliges five types of texts such as analytical exposition text, explanation text, cause and effect text, letter, and invitation, should be learn by eleventh grade students. Thus, nineteen reading texts consisting of those types of texts in *ESPS* were analyzed. The research instruments were two readability formulas namely MEFLRI and Coh-Metrix RDL2. The formulas were applied to test the readability level of English texts in *ESPS* textbook.

The selected texts were typed down into *Microsoft Word* data in order to count the total number of words, sentences and letters. To avoid the miscalculation and to get the accuracy of the total number of the words, sentences, and letters to be used in manual calculation in MEFLRI, accordingly, the researcher utilized word counter from countwordsworth.com. Then, the data was processed using MEFLRI and Coh-Metrix RDL2.

The readability formula of Coh-Metrix RDL2.

$$-45.032 + (52.230 \times \text{CRFCWO1}) + (61.306 \times \text{SYNSTRUT}) + (22.205 \times \text{WRDFRQmc})$$

Notes:

- CRFCWO1 : content word overlap, adjacent sentences, proportional, mean
- SYNSTRUT : sentence syntax similarity, all combination, across paragraphs, mean
- WRDFRQmc : CELEX (word frequency) Log minimum frequency for content words, mean

The readability formula of MEFLRI.

$$\text{EFL Difficulty} = 164.935 - \left(18.792 \times \frac{\text{Letters}}{\text{Words}}\right) - \left(1.916 \times \frac{\text{Words}}{\text{Sentences}}\right)$$

Notes:

- Letters : the total sum of the letters in the text.
- Words : the total sum of the words in the text.
- Sentences : the total sum of the sentences in the text.

Table 1. The look-up table of MEFLRI

Words per Sentence	Letters per Word									Words per Sentence															
	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.5	5.6
2	99	97	95	93	92	90	88	86	84	82	80	78	77	75	73	71	69	67	65	63	62	60	58	56	54
3	99	97	95	93	92	90	88	86	84	82	80	78	77	75	73	71	69	67	65	63	61	60	58	56	54
4	97	95	93	91	90	88	86	84	82	80	78	76	75	73	71	69	67	65	63	61	60	58	56	54	52
5	95	93	91	90	88	86	84	82	80	78	76	75	73	71	69	67	65	63	61	60	58	56	54	52	50
6	93	91	90	88	86	84	82	80	78	76	75	73	71	69	67	65	63	61	59	58	56	54	52	50	48
7	91	90	88	86	84	82	80	78	76	74	73	71	69	67	65	63	61	59	58	56	54	52	50	48	46
8	89	88	86	84	82	80	78	76	74	73	71	69	67	65	63	61	59	58	56	54	52	50	48	46	44
9	88	86	84	82	80	78	76	74	73	71	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	56	54	52	50	48	46	44	42
10	86	84	82	80	78	76	74	72	71	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	56	54	52	50	48	46	44	42	41
11	84	82	80	78	76	74	72	71	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	56	54	52	50	48	46	44	42	41	39
12	82	80	78	76	74	72	71	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	56	54	52	50	48	46	44	42	40	39	38
13	80	78	76	74	72	70	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	55	54	52	50	48	46	44	42	40	39	37	35
14	78	76	74	72	70	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	55	54	52	50	48	46	44	42	40	39	37	35	33
15	78	74	72	70	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	55	54	52	50	48	46	44	42	40	38	37	35	33	29
16	74	72	70	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	55	53	52	50	48	46	44	42	40	38	37	36	33	31	29
17	72	70	69	67	65	63	61	59	57	55	53	52	50	48	46	44	42	40	38	37	36	33	31	29	27
18	70	68	67	65	63	61	59	57	55	53	52	50	48	46	44	42	40	38	36	35	33	31	29	27	25
19	68	67	65	63	61	59	57	55	53	51	50	48	46	44	42	40	38	36	35	33	31	29	27	25	23
20	66	65	63	61	59	57	55	53	51	50	48	46	44	42	40	38	36	35	33	31	29	27	25	23	21
21	65	63	61	59	57	55	53	51	50	48	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	33	31	29	27	25	23	21	19
22	63	61	59	57	55	53	51	49	48	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	33	31	29	27	25	23	21	19	18
23	61	59	57	55	53	51	49	48	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	33	31	29	27	25	23	21	19	18	16
24	59	57	55	53	51	49	48	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	33	31	29	27	25	23	21	19	17	16	14
25	57	55	53	51	49	48	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	32	31	29	27	25	23	21	19	17	16	14	12
26	55	53	51	49	47	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	32	31	29	27	25	23	21	19	17	16	14	12	10
27	53	51	49	47	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	32	31	29	27	25	23	21	19	17	15	14	12	10	10
28	51	49	47	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	32	30	29	27	25	23	21	19	17	15	14	12	10	10	10
29	49	47	45	44	42	40	38	36	34	32	30	29	27	25	23	21	19	17	15	14	12	10	10	10	10
30	47	46	44	42	40	38	36	34	32	30	29	27	25	23	21	19	17	15	13	12	10	10	10	10	10

Note: 50 = average difficulty (gray boundary). Above the diagonal is easier, below more difficult.

Table 2. Flesch Reading Ease Score

Reading Ease Score	Description	Estimated Reading Grade
90—100	Very Easy	5 th grade
80—89	Easy	6 th grade
70—79	Fairly Easy	7 th grade
60—69	Standard	8 th and 9 th grade
50—59	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th grade
30—49	Difficult	College
0—29	Very Difficult	College graduate

The flesch reading ease score is utilized as reference in deciding grade level scaling of the texts since it has high correlation with MEFLRI (Greenfield, 2004) and for the similarity in setting the level of readability score in the look-up table. The Flesch Reading Ease Score is automatically included in Coh-Mertix RDL2 as a benchmark in classifying the grade level of the text since Coh-Metrix RDL2 does not have look-up table. Coh-Metrix RDL2 applies Flesch Reading Ease Score and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level in its automatic calculation. The application of Flesch Reading Ease Score and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level in Coh-Metrix RDL2 facilitate the interpretation and classification process in finding the readability of the text. The data analysis will be carried out after calculating the readability of English texts using both readability formulas. The data is presented in numerical data and explanation to seek the readability level of English texts in *ESPS* textbook.

FINDINGS

The data in finding section were collected from document analysis from *ESPS* textbook. Nineteen reading texts were analysed using Coh-Metrix RDL2 and MEFLRI readability formula. The reading texts in *ESPS* textbook were typed down into *Microsoft Word* document and then the words, letters, and sentences were counted using word counter. The data, then being calculated using MEFLRI readability formula and Coh-Metrix RDL2. Hereby the result of the readability formula calculation. The researcher renamed the nineteen texts started with Text 1 up to Text 19, thus they are easier to be referred. Text 1 until Text 4 represent Invitation texts (4 texts). Text 5 until Text 7 represent Analytical Exposition text (3 texts). Text 8 until Text 11 represent Letter (4 texts). Text 12 until Text 14 represent Cause and Effect text (3 texts). Text 15 until Text 19 represent Explanation text (5 texts).

Table 3. The Result of Word Counter

Text Code	Number of Words	Number of Letters	Number of Sentences
Text 1	66	290	7
Text 2	56	229	2
Text 3	189	831	15
Text 4	115	480	7
Text 5	170	778	12
Text 6	348	1694	22
Text 7	324	1476	24
Text 8	200	807	23
Text 9	206	888	24
Text 10	140	575	17
Text 11	222	925	28
Text 12	258	1148	17
Text 13	290	1453	19
Text 14	380	1942	24
Text 15	315	1537	21
Text 16	343	1683	26
Text 17	288	1423	19
Text 18	321	1460	22

Table 4. The Result of MEFLRI Calculation

Text Code	MEFLRI Score	Style Description	Reading Grade	Quality for 11 th Grader
Text 1	64.245	Standard	8 th and 9 th	Easier
Text 2	34.24	Difficult	College	Harder
Text 3	58.115	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 4	54.585	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 5	51.285	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 6	42.585	Difficult	College	Harder
Text 7	52.625	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 8	73.107	Fairly Easy	7 th	Easier
Text 9	67.655	Standard	8 th and 9 th	Easier
Text 10	72.175	Fairly Easy	7 th	Easier
Text 11	70.865	Fairly Easy	7 th	Easier
Text 12	53.135	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 13	41.665	Difficult	College	Harder
Text 14	38.825	Difficult	College	Harder
Text 15	44.115	Difficult	College	Harder
Text 16	47.765	Difficult	College	Harder
Text 17	43.735	Difficult	College	Harder
Text 18	52.405	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Average score	53.046	Fairly Difficult	10th to 12th	Match

Table 5. The Result of Coh-Metrix RDL2 Calculation

Text Code	Coh-Metrix RDL2 Score	FRE Score	Style Description	Reading Grade	Quality for 11th Grader
Text 1	14.371	74.793	Fairly Easy	7 th	Easier
Text 2	-3.191	80.919	Easy	6 th	Easier
Text 3	13.482	75.390	Fairly Easy	7 th	Easier
Text 4	17.088	80.347	Easy	6 th	Easier
Text 5	17.018	58.788	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 6	11.367	57.887	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 7	29.999	71.520	Fairly Easy	7 th	Easier
Text 8	29.962	84.678	Easy	6 th	Easier
Text 9	22.144	80.756	Easy	6 th	Easier
Text 10	31.069	89.335	Easy	6 th	Easier
Text 11	18.507	82.700	Easy	6 th	Easier
Text 12	22.957	62.066	Standard	8 th and 9 th	Easier
Text 13	17.807	59.772	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 14	18.263	44.585	Difficult	College	Harder
Text 15	12.497	64.294	Standard	8 th and 9 th	Easier
Text 16	14.555	55.801	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 17	9.434	62.375	Standard	8 th and 9 th	Easier
Text 18	18.335	59.580	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Text 19	15.476	59.215	Fairly Difficult	10 th to 12 th	Match
Average score	17.428	68.673	Standard	8th and 9th	Easier

Coh-Metrix RDL2 showed various range of readability score on reading texts in *ESPS* textbook. To set the exact grade level of reading text, Coh-Metrix utilized Flesch Reading Ease score as a benchmark. The various range of readability was started from easy to difficult. Based on Coh-Metrix RDL2, six texts identified as easy, three texts identified as fairly easy, three texts identified as standard, six texts identified as fairly difficult and one text identified as difficult. Text 10 was found to be the easiest text with the result of Coh-Metrix RDL2 score 31.069 and Flesch Reading Ease 89.335. Text 10 classified into the reading level of 6th grade. On the other side, the hardest text is Text 14 with the result of Coh-Metrix RDL2 score 18.263 and Flesch Reading Ease 44.585. Text 14 classified into the reading level of college. The average score of Coh-Metrix RDL2 was 17.428 and equal to 68.673 score of Flesch Reading Ease. The average score identified as standard and it matched to the 8th and 9th grade.

The result of MEFLRI readability test showed that the English reading texts in *ESPS* textbook has various range of readability scores from easy to difficult. The result showed that three reading texts identified as easy, two reading texts identified as standard, six reading texts identified as fairly difficult and eight reading texts identified as difficult. The easiest score came from Text 8 (73.107) that had 200 words, 23 sentences and 807 letters. Text 8 classified into the reading level of 7th grade. On the contrary, the hardest text was Text 2 (34.24), which had 56 words, 2 sentences, and 229 letters. Text 2 classified into the reading level of college. The average score of the MEFLRI readability test showed that the reading texts in *ESPS* textbook was 53.046, considered as fairly difficult, and it matched to the 10th grade up to 12th grade.

The score range of Singer's evaluation is 23 – 115. The text is interpreted as friendly if it has a score closer to 23. On the other hand, the text is interpreted as unfriendly if it has a score closer to 115. Nevertheless, the researcher concluded that the midrange score of the evaluation scale is 57.5.

Further, according to Teacher A's judgment using the Friendly Text Evaluation Scale, the English reading texts in *ESPS* textbook were friendly and comprehensible for the eleventh grade students. Then, the researcher asked her personal judgment about the reading text in *ESPS* textbook. She claimed that the reading texts were suitable for the eleventh grade students in MA Darul Ulum since the texts had various level of difficulty. However, some texts such as the Analytical Exposition and Explanation might be a little too hard for the students since the students were lacking on the vocabulary knowledge. Thus, she added that the teacher plays importance role in helping and guiding the students during reading activity, especially in building vocabulary knowledge and in nurturing their reading skill.

Teacher B's evaluation score lead to a conclusion that the friendliest reading text in *ESPS* textbook belongs to the Invitation text and then followed by the Letter text, the Analytical Exposition, the Cause and Effect. Meanwhile, the Explanation text considered as the least friendly among the other texts. Moreover, based on the Teacher B' personal judgment, the researcher was able to get more information related to the usage of reading texts in *ESPS* textbook. Teacher B stated that Explanation text contained unfamiliar words that could hinder students' reading skill and the Analytical Exposition came in second place as unfriendly texts. However, according to her, the unfamiliar words could upgrade the students' vocabulary knowledge. Thus, according to Teacher B, the nineteen reading texts in *ESPS* textbook were appropriate for the eleventh grade students in MA Darul Ulum, Muncar

Table 6. Teachers' Professional Judgment

Text	Teacher A	Teacher B
Text 1	55	48
Text 2	55	52
Text 3	55	46
Text 4	55	24
Text 5	41	50
Text 6	31	48
Text 7	31	49
Text 8	45	57
Text 9	41	52
Text 10	45	52
Text 11	45	46
Text 12	50	52
Text 13	49	51
Text 14	48	49
Text 15	59	50
Text 16	52	52
Text 17	53	50
Text 18	59	65
Text 19	54	48
Average	44.79	49.53

DISCUSSION

The calculation of MEFLRI showed that the nineteen texts had various difficulty result and score. The difficulty variation is started from *fairly easy*, the texts have reading level of 7th grade (Text 8, 10, 11). Second, *standard*, the texts have reading level of 8th and 9th grade (Text 1 and Text 9). Third, *fairly difficult*, the texts have reading level of 10th to 12th grade (Text 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, and 18) and the last one is *difficult*, the texts have reading level of college student (Text 2, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 19).

According to MEFLRI, Text 2, an invitation text, was rated as the hardest or the most difficult text in the *ESPS* textbook. Text 2 scored 34.24 and classified into the reading level of college student although it has the lowest number of words among the others. It means that according to MEFLRI, Text 2 is hard to comprehend by the eleventh grade students. In the other hand, Text 8, a personal letter, was rated as the easiest text. Text 8 scored 73.107 and had the reading level of 7th grade student. It means that Text 8 is easier to read and it can be comprehend easily by the eleventh grade student. Further, the average score of 53.046 in MEFLRI readability test revealed that the reading texts in *ESPS* textbook are suitable and appropriate for the eleventh grade students. The description showed that the reading texts are *fairly difficult* and matched the 10th grade up to 12th grade.

Coh-Metrix RDL2 revealed the various range of readability score although it does not show the exact results as in the MEFLRI. Flesch Reading Ease score is set as a benchmark to describe and identify the result. Coh-Metrix RDL2 identifies five level of difficulty. The first one is *easy*, the texts have reading level of 6th grade (Text 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11). Second, *fairly easy*, the texts have reading level of 7th grade (Text 1, 3, and 7). Third, *standard*, the texts have reading level of 8th and 9th grade (Text 12, 15, and 17). And then is *fairly difficult*, the texts have reading level of 10th up to 12th grade (Text 5, 6, 13, 16, 18, and 19). The last one is *difficult*, the text has reading level of college students (Text 14).

Further analysis showed that Coh-Metrix RDL2 rated Text 14, a cause and effect text, as the hardest text and Text 10, a personal letter, as the easiest. Text 14 scored 18.263 by Coh-Metrix and scored 44.585 by Flesch Reading Ease. Based on the word counter, Text 14 has the highest number of words among other texts. The reading level of Text 14 equals college student and considered hard to comprehend by eleventh grade students. Text 10 scored 31.069 by Coh-Metrix RDL2 and scored 89.335 by Flesch Reading Ease. Text 10 has reading level of 6th grade and considered easy to comprehend by the eleventh grade students. Additionally, the average score from Coh-Metrix RDL2 (17.428) and Flesch Reading Ease (68.673) conclude that the reading texts in *ESPS* textbook are identified as *standard* with the reading level of 8th and 9th grade. Therefore, based on Coh-Metrix RDL2 the reading texts in *ESPS* textbook are easier and do not match with the eleventh grade students.

Both readability formula are able to identify six texts that matched with the reading level of eleventh grade students. Based on Coh-Metrix RDL2, Text 5, Text 6, Text 13, Text 16, Text 18, and Text 19 are matched the reading level of eleventh grade. On the other side, MEFLRI discovered Text 3, Text 4, Text 5, Text 7, Text 12, and Text 18 are matched the reading level of eleventh grade. The analysis of both readability formulas are hardly similar. Despite those dissimilarity results, both readability formula agreed that the Text 18 and Text 5 are appropriate for eleventh grade student.

Despite the high correlation of Coh-Metrix RDL2 and MEFLRI readability formula (Crossley et al., 2008), the interpretation asserts that the MEFLRI and Coh-Metrix RDL2 has different result in predicting the readability of the texts. Coh-Metrix RDL2 generated one level easier than the MEFLRI does. The different result of the readability score might be caused by the readability index or variable within Coh-Metrix RDL2 such as word frequency from CELEX database (WRDFRQmc), content word overlap (CRFCWO1) and sentence syntax similarity (SYNSTRUT).

The word frequency index (WRDFRQmc) utilizes CELEX database in analyzing the words in the texts. Based on CELEX database, text difficulty will increase if the text has rare words or the text does not have words that listed in the CELEX database or corpus. Thus, it affects the difficulty level of comprehension or readability. The second index is content word overlap (CRFCWO1), related to the proportion of explicit content words that overlap between pairs of sentence. The last one is sentence syntax similarity (SYNSTRUT). The third index is based on parse tree similarities and measure the uniformity and consistency of the syntactic constructions in the text. It can be concluded that automatic computation of word frequency in this formula have a great effect on the result of the text readability and the computation result was affected by the database input from the Coh-Metrix RDL2's variables.

Above all, the readability formula is indeed effective in predicting readability of the texts based on the semantic (vocabulary, multiple syllables, and word length) and syntactic (sentence length) complexity in a quick overview (Nuttall, 1996; Richardson & Morgan, 1990; Ruddell, 1993). However, the score of the readability formulas do not have a conversion score that describe the proficiency level of EFL students in Indonesia and not 100% always accurate since they cannot measure students' competence accurately. Thus, it became the drawback of the readability formula scoring. Moreover, we cannot always depend on the result of the readability formula computation itself. Readability formula only measures the surface of the text and cannot measure the factor that related to the students'/readers' prior knowledge and other learning context related (Pikulski, 2012).

According to Teacher A, the nineteen English reading texts were suitable for the eleventh grade students at MA Darul Ulum. She acknowledged that there were reading texts that would hinder their reading activity, because of the vocabulary complexity. The discussed text were the Analytical Exposition and Explanation text. Teacher A stated that those texts were harder to comprehend for the eleventh grade students at MA Darul Ulum, however, this problem could be overcome by the teacher assistance during reading activity. From the evaluation scale, the nineteen English reading text were categorized as friendly text with the average score of 44.76.

Further, Teacher B also stated that the nineteen English reading texts were suitable for the eleventh grade students at MA Darul Ulum. Her average evaluation scored 49.53, slightly higher than the Teacher A's average evaluation score. The evaluation scale indicated that the nineteen English reading texts were friendly. In addition, she claimed that the Explanation texts contained unfamiliar vocabularies or words and might hinder their comprehension. She also added that the Analytical Exposition texts also had the similar problem. However, she took this problem as a challenge to the students' vocabulary building and suggested that students would maintain their vocabulary by reading those texts.

Moreover, Teacher A and Teacher B agreed that the Invitation texts, the Letter and Cause & Effect texts were comprehensible compared to the Explanation texts and Analytical Exposition texts. The nineteen reading texts in *ESPS* textbook are suitable and align the readability level of the eleventh grade students in MA Darul Ulum, Muncar.

CONCLUSION

After finished the data analysis and gathered the result of the study, it can finally be concluded that the readability formula are effective in predicting readability of the nineteen reading texts in *ESPS* textbook. The application of readability formula, manual an automatic, was quite simple as long as the researcher had gathered the data of words, letters, and sentences that need to be measure. Readability formula, unfortunately only measure the context of the text, thus the learning context factors such as vocabulary difficulty and readers' or students' prior knowledge cannot be measured using readability formula.

To sum it all, the combination of readability measurement and teachers' professional judgment are proofed to be more effective in determining appropriate and suitable reading material for EFL students. By using the combination of readability formula and teachers' professional judgment, the researcher is able to conclude that the nineteen English reading texts in *ESPS* textbook are appropriate for the eleventh grade students at MA Darul Ulum, Muncar, Banyuwangi.

English teachers are recommended to use readability formula in predicting the readability of the text for its practicality. The readability formula are appropriate for the English teachers who want to decide whether their reading text taken from authentic material or textbook suitable for their students' level of competence or not. Hence, one thing to be considered, the application must be followed by their subjective judgment, the alignment to the learning objectives and the current curriculum being used in their school. Thus, the text that will be used will be more readable and understandable.

Further, for the future researchers who want to conduct similar study about readability, I suggest that, in the first place, they should make and utilize on established English language proficiency standard such as CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference) for language based on the students' competence in reading comprehension for Indonesian educational setting. It would be better if the conversion score can categorized the reading comprehension level from the sixth grade up to twelfth grade. The conversion score is necessary to attain accurate result of the text readability level based on students' language proficiency even though the calculation tool is facilitated by readability formula. Further researchers also suggested to use another object and subject of the research for the higher education level such as in the university level.

REFERENCES

- Berardo, S. A. (2006). The Use of Authentic Materials in the Teaching of Reading. *The Reading Matrix*, 6(2), 60–69.
- Byrd, P., & Schuemann, C. (2014). English as a Second/Foreign Language Textbooks: How to Choose Them-How to Use Them. In M. Celce-Mucia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (4th Ed, pp. 380–393). National Geographic Learning: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Cahyono, B. Y., & Widiati, U. (2006). the Teaching of Efl Listening in the Indonesian Context: the State of the Art. *TEFLIN Journal*, 20(2), 194–211. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v20i2/194-211>
- Crossley, S. A., Greenfield, J., & McNamara, D. S. (2008). Assessing Text Readability Using Cognitively Based Indices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(3), 475–493. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00142.x>
- Garinger, D. (2002). Textbook Selection for the ESL Classroom. *CAL Digests, December 2002*, 3.
- Greenfield, J. (2004). Readability Formulas for EFL. *JALT Journal*, 26(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.37546/jaltjj26.1-1>
- Hadi, A. (2006). Reading Based-Classroom Activities: An Effort Toward the Integration of Language Skills in Teaching English As a Foreign Language in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 17(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v17i1/61-71>
- Jayanti, F. G. (2016). Reading Difficulties: Comparison on Students and Teachers Perception. *Fourth International Seminar OnEnglish Language and Teaching*, 296–301.
- Johnson, J. C. (2005). What Makes a “Good” Reader? Asking Students to Define “Good” Readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(8), 766–770. <https://doi.org/10.1598/rt.58.8.6>
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2017). Language Education Policy and Practice in East and Southeast Asia. *Language Teaching*, 50(2), 155–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000027>
- Knight, B. A. (2015). Teachers’ Use of Textbooks in the Digital Age. *Cogent Education*, 2(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1015812>
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How Language are Learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Mckee, S. (2012). Reading Comprehension, What We Know: A Review of Research 1995 to 2011. *Language Testing in Asia*, 2(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2229-0443-2-1-45>
- McNamara, D. S., Graesser, A. C., McCarthy, P. M., & Cai, Z. (2014). *Automated Evaluation of Text and Discourse with Coh-Metrix*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nguyen, C. D. (2020). Lexical Features of Reading Passages in English-language Textbooks for Vietnamese High-school Students: Do they Foster both Content and Vocabulary Gain? *RELC Journal*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688219895045>
- Rahmawati, I. Y., & Lestari, L. A. (2014). The Readability Level of Reading Texts in The English Language Textbooks Used by The Tenth Grade. *Retain*, 2(3), 1–7.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *The Role of Textbooks in a Language Program The Role of Textbooks in a Language Program*. June, 1–6.
- Richardson, J. S., & Morgan, R. F. (1990). *Reading to Learn in the Content Areas*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Ruddell, M. R. (1993). *Teaching Content Reading and Writing*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Rush, R. (1985). Assessing Readability: Formulas and Alternatives. *Reading Teacher*, 39(3), 274–283.
- Sangia, R. A. (2016). Assessing Reading Text in English Textbook for Eleventh Grader Published by Ministry of Education and Culture. *Paramasastra*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.26740/parama.v3i1.1544>
- Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing: Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Snow, C. E. (2002). *Reading for Understanding: Towards an R & D Program in Reading Comprehension*. RAND.
- Sukmadinata, N. S. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya Offset.
- Uri, N. F. M., & Aziz, M. S. A. (2018). Assessing Readability of a National Exam Reading Texts in Malaysia. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 149–164. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1463061>
- Yulianto. (2019). An Analysis of Readability Level of English Reading Texts for Eight Grade Students. *Journal of English for Academic (J-SHMIC)*, 6(1).
- Yunita, L. R., Suharsono, S., & Munir, A. (2017). Readability in Classroom Practice of Report Text as Reading Material of Eleventh Graders. *Journal of English Language and Literature*, 8(3), 673. <https://doi.org/10.17722/jell.v8i3.278>
- Zhang, L. J. (2016). Teaching Reading and Viewing to L2 Learners. *English Language Teaching Today: Linking Theory and Practice* (pp. 127–141). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_10