

Nasrin Sedaghatgoftar ^{a,1,*}

^a Yasouj University, Iran, Islamic Republic of 1 n.s.goftar@gmail.com *

* corresponding author

Society

ARTICLE INFO

Received 2022-02-15 Revised 2022-07-28 Accepted 2022-08-01 Published 2022-08-10

Keywords

ELT textbook evaluation Materials evaluation checklist Communicative language teaching Cultural awareness Iran Language Institute

ABSTRACT

Evaluating textbooks to ensure their efficacy and consistency with the course objectives is imperative as they are considered as pivotal components in English language teaching. The present study was an attempt to analyze and evaluate a local Iranian ELT book series taught at the adult department of Iran Language Institute (the ILI). In doing so, 60 English language teachers teaching English at the ILI for at least three years were invited to check their opinions on each item of the Nativized Checklist to Evaluate General English Course Books in Iran developed by Shatery and Azargoon (2012) who adapted and validated Joshua Mickley's Checklist (2005) for the Iranian context. The design of the study was descriptive, and the data obtained were subjected to descriptive statistics to determine the frequency and percentage of the participants' responses. The findings revealed that, generally speaking, the participants held a negative standpoint toward the content of the books. It was concluded the books need thorough modification and change. More elements of communicative language teaching need to be implemented and incorporated into the books and they need to get closer and closer to the real-world needs of the learners. Besides, more cultural elements should be provided to reinforce the learners' cultural awareness and understanding of the target language. The findings have implications for materials developers, syllabus designers and language teachers.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.



1. Introduction

Textbooks are inseparable components of English language teaching and this gives them an outstanding status [1], [2]. Consequently, it seems imperative to evaluate them to ensure their efficiency and consistency with the objectives which are defined for and expected from the course [3]–[5]. Although technology and virtual learning is now widely used in all areas of language teaching and learning, textbooks live on as a pivotal component of language teaching [6]–[11]. As Skierso [9] maintains, teachers hardly indulge in teaching without relying on a textbook. Further, Ansari and Babaii [12] put forth the convincing reason that the absence of textbook can mean aimlessness in learners' views. A textbook can be relied upon as a tool for managing the time of teaching; and it can act as a source of security, guidance, and confidence for novice teachers. According to Cortazzi and Jin [13], ELT (English Language Teaching) textbooks play the role of a teacher, a map, a resource, a restrictor, and an ideology. Additionally, Richards and Renandya [14] suggest that a textbook plays an active part in what they term as "social routinization", meaning classroom interaction which becomes stereotyped to reduce the stress and unpredictability. Moreover, as Cunningsworth [15] maintains, a textbook can be a source of activities, a syllabus for pushing the teaching/learning process toward systematization, and as a scaffold for novice teachers. Other experts refer to textbooks in connection with students' needs, innovation, as well as money- and time- related issues [16]. Developing socialization and cultural reproduction is considered as another important function textbooks are expected to fulfill [17]. Additionally, Richards and Rodgers [18] believe the functions

for materials encompass objectives, content, learning activities, and learner and teacher roles. Having taken into consideration the arguments in favor of the significant role of textbooks in teaching and learning processes, one can easily realize the necessity for studying and evaluating materials.

Considering this requisite, Tomlinson [10] looks at studying materials as a bridge linking different areas of sociolinguistics, language acquisition, discourse analysis and pragmatics as well as the effectiveness of materials. There are two opposing standpoints regarding the application of textbooks. At one side of the argument are those who find fault with textbooks as they include dilemmas in areas like sexism, stereotyping, gender bias, and other problems [19]–[22] while the advocates, on the other hand, emphasize the vital role of textbooks and their advantages [8], [23], [24]. Although no comprehensive book can be developed [25], to assure the efficiency of materials presented to a course, it would certainly be crucial to assess them. However, materials evaluation must be constant and organized rather than a one-shot activity. Sheldon [26] resorted to two reasons to speak in favor of textbook evaluation: to decide on an appropriate book and to acquaint teachers with merits and demerits of the textbook. Other benefits of textbook evaluation are identifying the weak and strong points, emphasizing the strong points and improving the weak points by either modifying or replacing them [15]. To put it in a nutshell, materials evaluation, and textbook evaluation as part of it, is an inseparable part of each teaching-learning program. As a result, the present study set out to analyze and evaluate the content of the course books taught at the adult department of Iran Language Institute, shortly called the ILI.

2. Method

2.1. Design

The design of the study was descriptive. The Nativized Checklist to Evaluate General English Course Books in Iran developed by Shatery and Azargoon [27] was utilized to evaluate the course books. Before the final implementation of the checklist, a pilot study was carried out and, as a result, it went through some modifications in that the scale for assessing the opinions of the participants was changed to a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'Strongly agree' to 'Strongly disagree'. The data obtained were subjected to descriptive statistics to determine the frequency and percentage of the participants' responses.

2.2. Instrument

A Materials Evaluation Checklist was needed to elicit the opinions of the teachers on the quality of the content of the course books taught at the ILI. Thus, after going through some checklists, the Nativized Checklist to Evaluate General English Course Books in Iran developed by Shatery and Azargoon [27] was chosen as the instrument of the study. They adopted Joshua Mickley's Checklist [28] and adapted and validated it for the Iranian context. The questionnaire was piloted before administering it to the target sample. In order to estimate the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's α was calculated to be 85%.

2.3. Materials

The materials examined in this study consisted of the English course books taught to adults at Iran English Language Institute. The books contain eight to ten units all of which are covered in one semester. Each unit includes one- or two-word lists, a conversation, a reading passage, a listening part, a number of grammar notes and 10 to 12 sets of grammar exercises and drills.

2.4. Participants

Sixty English language teachers teaching English at the ILI participated in this study. They had at least three years of teaching English at the ILI. Out of 60 teachers, 35 were B.A. graduates of English Language and Literature, 18 held M.A. in and 7 were PhD students of English Language Teaching. The participants were requested to read the items on the checklist carefully and check their opinions on each item.

3. Results and Discussion

To analyze the data obtained, descriptive statistics were utilized. Frequency and percentage of the participants' responses were calculated for each item. The results and the tables on each item of the

questionnaire will follow. There were 34 items on the questionnaire. It is worth noting that only ten of the tables are presented in the body of the paper, while the rest of the tables are presented in the appendix to avoid verbiage. The first question asked if the subject matter was presented either topically or functionally in a logical, organized manner. As can be seen in Table 1, the majority of the teachers believed that the organization of the subject matter was logical (50% agreed and around 17% strongly agreed).

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 83.3 |
| Strongly agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The second question probed to see if the content served as a window into learning about the target language culture. Table 2 shows the results which indicate that 50% of the teachers strongly disagreed with the idea that the content of the ILI course books might serve as a window into learning about the target language culture.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 83.3 |
| Agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The third question was" Is the content composed of authentic pieces of language?" As shown in Table 3 half of the participants agreed or strongly agreed while the other half disagreed or strongly disagreed that the content was authentic.

| | , | Table 3. Authentic | city | |
|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 50.0 |
| Agree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 83.3 |
| Strongly agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Item four of the questionnaire attempted to illustrate if the content of the books was in line with syllabus specifications, Table 4. Majority of the participants (more than 66%) believed that the content of the books was, in fact, in line with syllabus specifications.

| Table 4. Syllabus-bound Content | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 40 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

The next item, item 5, investigated the compatibility of the content with the needs of the learners. Half of the participants (50%) neither agreed nor disagreed with this item. The results can be seen in Table 5.

| | | - | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| lid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| neutral | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 83.3 |
| agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |

100.0

100.0

Vali

Total

60

Regarding text gradation, item 6 asked the participants if the texts were graded. It can be seen in Table 6 that around 67% of the participants agreed that the texts were graded.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly Disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 40 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 6. Text Gradation

Item 7 asked if the grammar rules were presented in a logical manner and in increasing order of difficulty. As Table 7 indicates, 50% of the participants agreed that the grammar rules were presented logically in an increasing order of difficulty.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 83.3 |
| Strongly agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |

| Table 7. | Grammar | Presentation |
|----------|---------|--------------|
|----------|---------|--------------|

Table 8 shows the results on item 8 of the questionnaire which probed to see if the new vocabulary was presented in a variety of ways, such as glosses, multi-glosses, appositives, etc. It was revealed that approximately 67% of the teachers participating in the study agreed that the new words were introduced in various ways.

Table 8. Method of Vocabulary Presentation

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 40 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Item 9 of the questionnaire aimed at investigating if the new vocabulary was presented at an appropriate rate so that the text was understandable and so that students were able to retain new vocabulary. The results indicated that most of the teachers believe that the new words were presented at an appropriate rate, see Table 9.

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 83.3 |
| Strongly agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Vocabulary rehearsal and repetition throughout lessons was examined by item 10 of the questionnaire. 33% of the participants agreed while 33% disagreed on this item. Another 33% of the participants had no idea in this regard. Table 10 indicates the results.

Table 10. Vocabulary Rehearsal

| | | - | | |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Agree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Item 11 asked if the examples for grammatical points were interesting. Half (50%) of the participants agreed that the examples were interesting enough. However, 50% of the teachers strongly

disagreed with the idea that the activities were interactive and task-based requiring the students to use new vocabulary to communicate, which was probed by item 12. This could be due to the traditional grammar-translation method of materials development that is dominant in adult book series of the ILI. Item 13 attempted to see if instructions in the textbook asked the students to read for comprehension. More than 83% of the participants agreed that reading for comprehension was emphasized throughout the book. Item 14 examined if top-down and bottom-up reading strategies were used. 33% of the teachers disagreed and another 33% had no idea. Moreover, half of the participants had no idea on item 15 which asked if students were given sufficient examples to learn top-down techniques for reading comprehension. However, 33% of them disagreed or strongly disagreed on this item. Whether the activities facilitated students' use of grammar rules by creating situations in which those rules were needed was investigated through item 16 with which 33% of the teachers disagreed and 33% strongly disagreed. The findings on this item are in line with the results on item 12 which indicated that the activities of the book were not interactive or task based. Item 17 aimed at investigating if the content made comprehension easier by addressing one new concept at a time instead of multiple new concepts. 50% of the participants agreed while 50% had no idea. The concept of critical thinking was probed by item 18 which asked if the exercises promoted critical thinking of the students. Over 50% of the teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed. Item 19 dealt with the appearance of the book and asked if the covers of the books were appealing. Around 17% of the participants strongly disagreed and more than 33% of them disagreed. Besides, visual imagery of the books was examined through item 20 which attempted to answer the question "Is the visual imagery of high aesthetic quality?" The results of the analysis indicated that 33% of the participants agreed that the visual imagery utilized in the books was appealing. On the other hand, a total of 33% of the participants disagreed and strongly disagreed with this item. Item 21 was an attempt to see whether the illustrations were simple enough and close enough to the content to add to the meaning rather than detract from it. Around 67% of the teachers believed that the illustrations helped engage the students with the content. Whether the content was interesting enough so that the students would enjoy it was probed through item 22. Over 33% of the teachers disagreed and around 17% of them strongly disagreed. However, 50% of the participants neither agreed nor disagreed. One reason for this could be the fact that most or almost all of the content is fabricated and could not be considered authentic.

Cultural features of the books were investigated by items 23 through item 26. Almost all of the participants either disagreed or strongly disagreed with item 23 which attempted to answer whether the textbooks aimed to alienate students from their own culture. More than 33% of the participants disagreed and around 67% of them strongly disagreed. Item 24 probed to see if the textbooks were vehicles to advertise the Anglo-American culture. Half (50%) of the teachers strongly disagreed and 33% of them disagreed with this item. Further, whether the illustrations were culturally appropriate to the students was investigated through item 25 with which 50% of the participants strongly agreed and around 17% agreed. Finally, item 26 asked if it was possible to involve the local culture and language in the textbooks. A total 66.6% of the teachers either agreed or strongly agreed with this idea. Items 27 and 28 were also culture oriented. Item 27 aimed at examining whether the textbooks were in line with promoting the concept of World Englishes (WE). Over 33.3% disagreed and 16.7% strongly disagreed. However, 50% of the teachers took a neutral stance and neither agreed nor disagreed with this item. Additionally, item 28 tried to answer if cultural sensitivities had been taken into consideration. Totally 66.6% of the teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed. Ideological issues were dealt with through items 29 and 30. Whether the books take religious considerations into account was examined by item 29 of the questionnaire. 50% of the participants strongly agreed and 16.7% of them agreed. Item 30 asked if the books were free from ideological tendencies. Totally, 50% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the books were ideology-free. However, over 33% of them strongly disagreed. Items 31 through 34 were related to cultural aspects of the books. Item 31 asked if the books raised awareness by avoiding or realizing cultural stereotypes. Totally, half of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with this item. Item 32 probed the answer to question "Does it prepare students to interact with people from other cultures?" Over 33.3% of the teachers disagreed and 33.3% of them strongly disagreed. Moreover, whether the books aimed at international culture was investigated through item 33 with which 33.3% strongly disagreed and another 33.3% disagreed. Last but not least, item 34 investigated if the social and cultural contexts in the textbooks were comprehensible to the learners. More than 66.7% of the participants agreed and 16.7% strongly agreed.

4. Conclusion

English language instruction has many important components but the essential constituents to many ESL/EFL classrooms and programs are the textbooks and instruction materials that are often used by language instructors [4]. Based on the analysis of the data gathered through the answers of the ILI teachers to the items of the questionnaire, it can generally be concluded that, similar to the study by Cakit [29], the participants held a negative standpoint toward the content of the books since the number of the items which received higher percentages on disagree and strongly disagree points of the Likert scale was fairly larger than the percentages assigned to agree and strongly agree points (15 items with higher percentages on agree or strongly agree points, 16 items with higher percentages on disagree or strongly disagree points). Regarding cultural tendencies, the findings indicated that the course books under scrutiny did not represent the target culture of the countries where English is spoken as the native language, rather the books exposed the learners to English language through the window of their own culture, religion and ideology. This is in line with the findings of the study by Aliakbari [6] conducted on culture in Iranian ELT textbooks where the books were shown to be poor in culture presentation. Jamalvandi [3] also found out that one of the shortcomings with the preuniversity English textbook was its inadequacy in acquainting the students with the cultural aspects visually or in written, including different dialects and accents, English speaking countries, and the relationship between culture and language. With regard to authenticity issues, half of the participants believed that the content of the books was not authentic while the other half believed it was, in fact, authentic. However, the materials seemed far from being authentic since the dialogs or the reading excerpts were fabricated rather than derived from real-world materials. Similarly, Abdollahi-Guilani, Mohd Yasin and Hua [30] found no ties between the outside world and the world inside the ELT textbooks in Iran, the materials not being changed or revised for years. This finding also corroborates with Yarmohammadi [31] who conducted an evaluation of the senior high school textbooks based on a revised version of Tucker's model. He concluded that these textbooks suffered from a lot of shortcomings; for instance, the material was not authentic and communicative skills were ignored.

The way vocabulary and grammar are presented is one of the most significant features of every EFL/ESL textbook. The findings revealed that vocabulary items were presented through various methods at an appropriate rate. Grammatical points were also presented in a logical manner in a reasonable order of difficulty although the activities were not interactive and task-based and rarely required students to use new vocabulary and grammar to communicate. This could be due to the traditional grammar-translation method of materials development that is dominant in adult book series of the ILI. Likewise, in her analysis of high school textbooks, Moghtadi [4] came to the conclusion that the textbooks were mostly structure-based and they ignored the communicative role of the language. Moreover, CLT principles were not utilized in these textbooks. This finding also resonates with Riazi and Aryashokouh [32] who found out that the four high school and pre-university English textbooks taught at Iranian high schools presented new words and grammar points discretely and did not foster using them communicatively. Moghtadi [4] further found out that there were many inconsistencies between the learners' needs and the materials of the textbooks. The same result was reinforced by the findings of the present study which showed the content of the books was not in line with the real needs of the learners. Similarly, Azizfar, Koosha and Lotfi [33] have argued that "textbooks cannot meet the learners' and the teachers' needs within the Iranian educational system and it is a bit strange that they still emphasize structural methods and ignore the communicative role of the language". Moreover, the results indicated that the content material of the books did not promote critical thinking in the learners. On the other hand, Jamalvandi [3] concluded that pre-university English text book did enhance the students' critical thinking. Another study by Riazi and Mosalanejad [34] also displayed the prevalence of lower-order cognitive skills more than higher-order ones in ELT textbooks. Finally, the findings revealed that the illustrations were interesting and appealing and were, indeed, relevant to the content of the books. Nevertheless, the participants believed the cover was not appealing and the visual imagery lacked aesthetic quality. All in all, it can be concluded that although the books seem to fulfill the needs of the learners for the time being, they need thorough modification and change. More elements of communicative language teaching need to be implemented and incorporated into the books and they need to get closer and closer to the real-world needs of the learners. Consequently, the materials should be derived from authentic sources. Besides, more cultural elements should be added to reinforce the learners' cultural awareness and understanding of the target language.

Acknowledgment

A very special thanks goes to the ILI teachers who kindly accepted to participate in the study. I would like to extend my gratitude to all of those who helped me one way or another in completing this piece of research.

Declarations

| Author contribution | : | The author was the only contributor to this piece of research. |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Funding statement | : | The research is self-funded by the author. |
| Conflict of interest | : | The author declares no conflict of interest. |
| Additional information | : | No additional information is available for this paper. |

References

- B. Lee, "EFL Learners' Perspectives on ELT Materials Evaluation Relative to Learning Styles," *RELC J.*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 147–163, Aug. 2015, doi: 10.1177/0033688214564177.
- [2] M. Zohrabi, H. Sabouri, and R. Behroozian, "An Evaluation of Merits and Demerits of Iranian First Year High School English Textbook," *English Lang. Teach.*, vol. 5, no. 8, pp. 14–22, Jun. 2012, doi: 10.5539/elt.v5n8p14.
- [3] B. Jamalvandi, "ELT textbook evaluation in Iran, new insights," *Eur. Online J. Nat. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1068–1078, 2014. Available at: Google Scholar
- [4] L. Moghtadi, "Iranian high school EFL textbooks: Why they should be modified," *Int. J. Lang. Learn. Appl. Linguist. World*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 53–69, 2014. Available at: Google Scholar
- [5] B. Tomlinson and H. Masuhara, *The complete guide to the theory and practice of materials development for language learning*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2017. Available at: Google Books
- [6] M. Aliakbari and B. Jamalvandi, "Realization of culture in English textbooks in Chinese high school level," *Pan-Pacific Assoc. Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 10–89, 2012. Available at: Google Scholar
- [7] A. Bruton, "In what ways do we want EFL coursebooks to differ?," *System*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 275–284, Jun. 1997, doi: 10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00014-6.
- [8] W. M. Rivers, *Teaching foreign language skills*. New York: University of Chicago Press, 2018. Available at: Google Books
- [9] A. Skierso, "Textbook selection and evaluation," in *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, vol. 2, 1991, pp. 432–453. Available at: Google Scholar
- [10] B. Tomlinson, "Materials development," in *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 66–71.doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511667206.010
- [11] P. Ur, "Grammar teaching: Research, theory, and practice," in *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, Routledge, 2011, pp. 507–522. Available at: Google Scholar
- [12] H. Ansary and E. Babaii, "Universal characteristics of EFL/ESL textbooks: A step towards systematic textbook evaluation," *Internet TESL J.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1–9, 2002. Available at: Google Scholar
- [13] M. Cortazzi and L. Jin, *Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom*. Cambridge University Press, 1999. Available at: Google Scholar
- [14] J. C. Richards and W. A. Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, 2002. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511667190
- [15] A. Cunningsworth, Choosing your coursebook. Macmillan, 1995. Available at: Google Scholar
- [16] T. Hutchinson and E. Torres, "The textbook as agent of change," *ELT J.*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 315–328, Oct. 1994, doi: 10.1093/elt/48.4.315.

- [17] O. S. Skliar, "Gender representations and gender bias in ELT textbooks published in the Middle East: A case study of ELT textbooks published in Turkey and Iran." Middle East Technical University, 2007. Available at: Google Scholar
- [18] J. C. Richards and T. S. Rodgers, Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press, 2001.doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511667305
- [19] E. Amalsaleh, "The representation of social actors in the EFL textbooks in Iran," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Shiraz University, Shiraz. 2004. Available at: Google Scholar
- [20] M. Amini and P. Birjandi, "Gender Bias in the Iranian High School EFL Textbooks," *English Lang. Teach.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 134–147, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.5539/elt.v5n2p134.
- [21] J. Clarke and M. Clarke, "Stereotyping in TESOL materials," *Cult. Lang. classroom. ELT Doc.*, vol. 132, pp. 31–44, 1990. Available at: Google Scholar
- [22] I. Kızılaslan, "Student teachers' perceptions of gendered texts in English language textbooks," *Procedia* - Soc. Behav. Sci., vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 3528–3531, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.546.
- [23] A. Jahangard, "Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools," vol. 9, no. 2. 2007. Available at: Google Scholar
- [24] P. Ur, A course in English language teaching. Cambridge University Press, 2012.doi: 10.1017/9781009024518
- [25] N. Grant, Making the most of your textbook, vol. 11, no. 8. Longman London, 1987. Available at: Google Books
- [26] L. E. Sheldon, "Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials," *ELT J.*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 237–246, Oct. 1988, doi: 10.1093/elt/42.4.237.
- [27] H. Shatery and M. Azargoon, "Designing and developing a native checklist to evaluate general English course books in Iran and comparing it with other existing checklists in the world," *Retrieved on January*, vol. 6, p. 2018, 2012. Available at: Google Scholar
- [28] J. Mickley, A. Nazari, and S. Park, "CS-450-2: The Mach Operating System Fall 2005 Doug Hill Liza Hill." 2005. Available at: Google Scholar
- [29] C. Engin Demir, "Evaluation of the EFL textbook" New Bridge to Success 3" from the perspectives of students and teachers." Middle East Technical University, 2006. Available at: Google Scholar
- [30] M. A. Guilani, M. S. M. Yasin, and T. K. Hua, "Authenticity of Iranian English Textbooks for Schools," *English Lang. Lit. Stud.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 25–30, Nov. 2011, doi: 10.5539/ells.v1n2p25.
- [31] L. Yarmohammadi, "The evaluation of pre-university textbooks," *Newsl. Iran. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 70–87, 2002. Available at: Google Scholar
- [32] A. Riazi and A. Aryashokouh, "Lexis in English Textbooks in Iran: Analysis of Exercises and Proposals for Consciousness-Raising Activities," J. Pan-Pacific Assoc. Appl. Linguist., vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 17–34, 2007. Available at: Google Scholar
- [33] A. Azizifar, M. Koosha, and A. R. Lotfi, "An analytical evaluation of Iranian high school ELT textbooks from 1970 to the present," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 3, pp. 36–44, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.010.
- [34] A. M. Riazi and N. Mosalanejad, "Evaluation of Learning Objectives in Iranian High-School and Pre-University English Textbooks Using Bloom's Taxonomy," *TESL-EJ*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1–16, 2010. Available at: Google Scholar

Appendix

Table 11. Interesting Grammar Examples

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 12. Interactive and Task-based Activities

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 66.7 |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
| Agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 13. Reading for Comprehension

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid neutral | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Agree | 50 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 14. Top-down and Bottom-up Reading Strategies

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 50.0 |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 83.3 |
| Strongly agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 15. Sufficient Examples for Top-down Techniques

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 |
| Neutral | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 83.3 |
| Strongly agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 16. Creating Situations to Use Grammar Rules

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Agree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 17. Creating Situations to Use Grammar Rules

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid neutral | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Agree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 18. Critical Thinking

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 50.0 |
| Neutral | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

| Table 19. Appealing Cover | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percen | |
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 50.0 | |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 83.3 | |
| Agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | Table 2 | 0. Aesthetic Quali | ty of Visual Imagery | | |
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percen | |
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | |
| Disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 | |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 | |
| Agree Total | 20 60 | 33.3 100.0 | 33.3 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| 100 | | | elevant Illustrations | | |
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percen | |
| Valid neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | |
| Agree | 40 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 10010 | |
| | Table | e 22. Interesting an | d Enjoyable Texts | | |
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percen | |
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 50.0 | |
| Neutral | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | | Table 23. Culture | e Alienation | | |
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percen | |
| Valid strongly disagree | 40 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 66.7 | |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | Table 24 | 1. Advertising Ang | lo-American Culture | | |
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percen | |
| Valid strongly disagree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 83.33 | |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | Table 25. C | ulturally Appropri | ata Illustrations | | |
| | | инитапу Арргорп | ate musuations | | |
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | | |
| | Frequency 10 | Percent 16.7 | Valid Percent 16.7 | 16.7 | |
| Disagree | Frequency 10 10 | Percent 16.7 16.7 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 | 16.7 33.3 | |
| Disagree Agree | Frequency 10 10 10 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 | 16.7 33.3 50.0 | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree | Frequency 10 10 10 30 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 | 16.7 33.3 | |
| Disagree Agree | Frequency 10 10 10 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 | 16.7 33.3 50.0 | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 | 16.7 33.3 50.0 | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree Total | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 Table 2 Frequency | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 6. Local Culture In Percent | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 16.7 10.0 100.0 avolvement Valid Percent | 16.7 33.3 50.0 100.0 Cumulative Percen | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree Total Valid strongly disagree | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 Table 2 Frequency 20 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 16.7 10.0 6. Local Culture In Percent 33.3 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 16.7 10.0 nvolvement Valid Percent 33.3 | 16.7 33.3 50.0 100.0 Cumulative Percen 33.3 | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree Total Valid strongly disagree Agree | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 Table 2 Frequency 20 20 20 20 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 6. Local Culture In Percent 33.3 33.3 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 nvolvement Valid Percent 33.3 33.3 | 16.7 33.3 50.0 100.0 Cumulative Percen 33.3 66.7 | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree Total Valid strongly disagree | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 Table 2 Frequency 20 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 6. Local Culture In Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 nvolvement Valid Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 | 16.7 33.3 50.0 100.0 Cumulative Percen 33.3 | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree Total Valid strongly disagree Agree | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 Table 2 Frequency 20 20 20 60 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 6. Local Culture In Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 100.0 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 nvolvement Valid Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 100.0 | 16.7 33.3 50.0 100.0 Cumulative Percen 33.3 66.7 | |
| Agree Strongly agree Total Valid strongly disagree Agree Strongly agree | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 Table 2 Frequency 20 20 20 60 Table 2 Table 2 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 6. Local Culture In Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 100.0 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 nvolvement Valid Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 00.0 of World Englishes | 16.7 33.3 50.0 100.0 Cumulative Percen 33.3 66.7 100.0 | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree Total Valid strongly disagree Agree Strongly agree Total | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 Table 2 Frequency 20 20 20 60 Table 2 Table 2 Frequency Constant Table 27. Prom Frequency | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 6. Local Culture In Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 100.0 oting the Concept Percent | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 nvolvement Valid Percent 33.3 33.3 100.0 of World Englishes Valid Percent | 16.7 33.3 50.0 100.0 Cumulative Percen 33.3 66.7 100.0 Cumulative Percen | |
| Disagree Agree Strongly agree Total Valid strongly disagree Agree Strongly agree | Frequency 10 10 10 30 60 Table 2 Frequency 20 20 20 60 Table 2 Table 2 | Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 6. Local Culture In Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 100.0 | Valid Percent 16.7 16.7 16.7 50.0 100.0 nvolvement Valid Percent 33.3 33.3 33.3 33.3 00.0 of World Englishes | 33.3 50.0 100.0 Cumulative Percen 33.3 66.7 | |

Nasrin Sedaghatgoftar (Evaluation of an Iranian ELT Book Series)

| Neutral | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
|---------|----|-------|-------|-------|
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

| Table 28. Con | nsideration of | Cultural | Sensitivities |
|---------------|----------------|----------|---------------|
|---------------|----------------|----------|---------------|

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Strongly agree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 29. Consideration of Religious Issues

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 50.0 |
| Strongly agree | 30 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

| Table 30. Ideological Tendencies | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|--|
| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | |
| Valid strongly disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | |
| Disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 50.0 | |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 83.3 | |
| Agree | 10 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Table 31. Awareness-raising by Avoiding or Realizing Cultural Stereotypes

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 50.0 |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 83.3 |
| Agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 32. Preparing Students to Interact with People from other Cultures

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 83.3 |
| Agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table 33. International Culture

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid strongly disagree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Agree | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Neutral | 20 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

 Table 34. Comprehensible Social and Cultural Contexts

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Valid disagree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 |
| agree | 40 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 83.3 |
| Strongly agree | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |