



## An Evaluation of English Textbook “Prospect 2”: Teachers and Teacher Educators’ Perceptions in the Spotlight

Behrooz Ghoorchaei<sup>1</sup>, Ali Derakhshan<sup>2\*</sup>, Alemeh Ebrahimi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran, *behroozghoorchaei@gmail.com*

<sup>2\*</sup>Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Golestan University, Gorgan, Iran, *a.derakhshan@gu.ac.ir*

<sup>3</sup>Department of Education, Golestan Province, Iran  
*Ebrahimi6578@gmail.com*

### Abstract

This study endeavored to evaluate the local English textbook named “Prospect 2” taught in junior high schools in Iran based on a group of Iranian EFL teachers and teacher educators’ perspectives. For this purpose, 10 (6 males and 4 females) teacher educators and 117 (54 males and 63 females) junior high school EFL teachers from Golestan province, Iran, took part in this study. To gather the required data, the modified version of Mukundan’s (2011) questionnaire was utilized as a textbook evaluation checklist to investigate the participants’ perspectives toward suitability, strengths, and shortcomings of the book. The outcomes of this research revealed that the participants of the two groups mainly had positive attitudes toward the book. Further findings of this research did not present any significant difference between teachers and teacher educators’ views toward the book. Finally, some concluding remarks regarding the overall findings of the study were presented. The main implications of the study were that teachers should attempt to incorporate suitable and practical methods for the instruction and promotion of the communicative language teaching approach in the class as an approach on which the book is based and try to cater for the shortcomings of the book through providing supplementary materials and alternative activities for the students.

**Keywords:** EFL Teachers, Prospect 2, Teacher Educators, Textbook Evaluation

---

Received 23 April 2020

Accepted 02 June 2020

Available online 19 February 2021

DOI: 10.30479/jmrels.2020.13156.1624

---

© Imam Khomeini International University. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Textbooks are considered an inseparable element in the process of learning and instruction within the context of both general education and English language classrooms (Shahmohammadi, 2018). In this regard, Hutchinson and Torres (1994) also regarded textbooks to be crucial for effective teaching of English language as “no teaching-learning situation, it seems, is complete until it has its relevant textbook” (p. 315). Similarly, approving the effectiveness of textbooks, Sheldon (1987), stated that “it is the visible heart of any ELT program which offers considerable advantages for both the student and the teacher” (p. 237). Textbooks can play various functions depending on whether they are regarded as a necessary element, as a supplementary source of materials, as a prompt to classroom activities, or as a basis for the classroom curriculum (Awasthi, 2006). Richards (2001) listed some key benefits for the utilization of textbooks; textbooks give order and act as a syllabus in the instructional program, bring about standardized teaching, enhance the effectiveness of instruction are good resources, be source of input and language models for learners, enhance teachers’ knowledge base, and are visually attractive. As also stated by McGrath (2006), “course book tends to dictate what is taught, in what order and, to some extent, how as well as what learners learn”(p. 171).

Due to these crucial roles of textbooks, it is necessary, especially for teachers, to be assured of the quality of the books they utilize in their classrooms. Teachers and administrators of the education program have the responsibility of ensuring what students should learn and whether their needs are met. They are one of the main users of the textbooks that can make valuable judgments about textbooks and their effects on the learners (Ahmadi & Derakhshan, 2014). As stated by Bhanegaonkar and Mahfoodh (2013), “teachers are a key factor in the successful implementation of curriculum changes and particularly in textbook” (p. 2). In fact, confidence in the appropriateness of particular textbooks can be gained through the evaluation of them by teachers individually or with other stakeholders in teams. Evaluation is necessary to find out whether a textbook is appropriate for a context or not, and how much it meets the learners’ needs. It helps teachers identify the merits of one textbook over the other, make judgments about the textbook and its potential effects on the learners, and lead to making valuable decisions. Textbook evaluation empowers teachers by understanding its content, style, strengths and weaknesses, which, in turn, help them adapt the book in order to suit learners’ needs, aims and objectives of the course, and teachers’ beliefs and expectations (Awasthi, 2006).

Tomlinson (2012) also claimed that textbook evaluation is beneficial as it provides instructors, materials developers, administrators, and supervisors to assess the potential effects that their targeted material have on their users. Such an evaluation, according to Tomlinson (2012), should be based on a set of criteria to be applied regularly in the process of textbook evaluation before, during, and after applying the textbooks in specific instructional contexts, and teachers are to adapt, supplement, or complement the materials when the need arises.

More specifically related to the context of the present study, in Iranian schools, textbooks are mostly the only medium of instruction in ELT classes; therefore, they are the primary tool in hands of teachers. In effect, textbooks are regarded as the main source of teaching the content as prescribed by Iranian Ministry of Education. In other words, in Iranian public schools, teachers do not have much agency to select the materials and methods of their instruction. Therefore, since textbooks are handed down to teachers for instruction, the only option open to them is evaluating the textbooks and make adaptations suitable for their specific teaching context (McDonough, Shaw, & Masuhara, 2013). In this regard, many studies in the past have been carried out evaluating the efficacy and suitability of English textbooks within the context of private Iranian language institutes and also within the context of Iranian high schools (e.g., Ahour, Towhidiyan, & Saeidi, 2014; Ghorbani, 2011; Jahangard, 2007; Ketabi & Talebinezhad, 2012; Nasiri, Ketabi, & Dastjerdi, 2012). Among the studies, however, only few have investigated the new series of junior secondary school textbooks (Ahmadi & Derakhshan, 2014; Kamyabigol & Baghaeeyan, 2014; Kiaahmadi, 2014). Some of the main findings of these studies were that these books suffered from a number of weak points. First, they did not provide an equal stability among all the skills and components of the language and were reading and grammar-based and as a consequence, they mainly disregarded the listening and speaking skills. Second, they were based on old methods of teaching such as grammar translation method and could not meet students and teachers' needs for the use of the language for communication. Therefore, although the students study English for seven years, four hours per week, within the Iranian school context, they are mainly unable to attain full competence in English after they finish the school program.

As a movement to remedy the mentioned shortcomings of the Iranian English textbooks, in 2013, Ministry of Education published a new English textbook, called “Prospect Series” with an eye toward compensating for the problems of the previous English textbooks. Among the studies mentioned above, many of them have focused on the previous English textbooks taught in Iranian high schools, few of them have focused on the Prospect Series

(e.g., Ahmadi & Derakhshan, 2014; Kiaahmadi, 2014; Shahmohammadi, 2018), and even no study has been done to scrutinize the textbooks from the perspectives of both teachers and teacher educators simultaneously. Therefore, in order to add to this fledgling literature and to examine the utility and effectiveness of these newly-introduced textbooks, the present study intended to uncover Iranian teachers and teacher educators' perceptions of the "Prospect 2" book from the Prospect Series, being taught in Iranian high schools as part of a six-year English program. It is also necessary to mention that this study is only a part from a larger project, and due to space limitation, only some of the research questions of the project were dealt with in this research study. In accordance with what was said, in this study, three research questions were proposed:

1. To what extent are the materials in "Prospect2" in line with the Mukundan's (2011) checklist?
2. What are teachers and teacher educators' perceptions of the Prospect 2 textbook in general?
3. What are teachers and teacher educators' perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of Prospect 2?

## **2. Literature Review**

As it was previously mentioned, textbooks are considered as one of the inseparable elements of any language teaching and learning process (Hutchinson & Torres, 1994). However, it is usually rare to find a perfect textbook fulfilling all teachers and learners' expectations and needs and being in line with all objectives of a particular course. Therefore, one of the main responsibilities of any teacher is to evaluate the books they are teaching in order to make appropriate changes with regard to their particular teaching situation and purpose (McDonough et al., 2013). According to Tomlinson (1998), material evaluation refers to endeavors and efforts to measure the value of instructional materials. Litz (2005) expressed that textbook evaluation helps teachers recognize the particular strengths and weaknesses of the textbooks they are using and make judgments about their appropriateness and efficiency. Cunningsworth (1995) suggested that textbook evaluation aid instructors to move beyond impressionistic appraisal to a more useful, accurate, systematic, and contextual assessment of the materials.

But it needs to be stated that evaluation might be different according to the aims and objectives, preferred style, participants and their backgrounds, perceptions and experiences, and abilities of the evaluators (Amerian & Khaiivar, 2014). Cunningsworth (1995) proposed three kinds of material evaluation: the "predictive" or "pre-use"; "in-use" and

"retrospective" or "post-use" evaluation. The "predictive" or "pre-use" evaluation is probably the most prevalent type which is formed with the aim of investigating how effectively a textbook can perform in the future. The "in-use" evaluation is used for evaluating the effectiveness of the materials that are currently under use, and the "retrospective" or "post-use" (reflective) evaluation is used to evaluate the efficiency of the materials after being applied in a particular teaching context. Similarly, McGrath (2002) suggested three prevalent methods of textbook evaluation, including the in-depth checklist and impressionistic methods. In the impressionistic method, the evaluator gets a general impression of the textbook which involves looking at the publisher's recommendations, examining the content of the textbook, and skimming the textbook to find out different features of it. In-depth method has to do with the claims of the publisher(s) and author(s) by considering language descriptions, the basic assumptions about learning, or the values on which the textbooks are based. Finally, through the checklist method, the evaluator prepares some categories that are intelligible and well-understood by participants in the evaluation process while offering a common foundation or framework for decision making.

Besides, according to Bhanegaonkar and Mahfoodeh (2013), formative and summative evaluation are two other types of evaluation. In-course or formative evaluation is a continuous process of evaluation which can potentially lead to changes in the course. At the same time, summative evaluation happens at the end of a course aiding teachers to realize to what extent they have achieved the objectives in mind. McDonough et al. (2013) suggested two stages of textbook evaluation. The first stage is external evaluation in which the evaluator examines the cover page of the book, blurb, and introduction sections to get an overview of the book and to decide whether the textbook is in accordance with their expectations. If the textbook fulfills their expectations, then they can progress to the second stage, called internal evaluation which is based on an in-depth investigation of the textbook.

Some studies in the context of Iran have attended to previous Iranian high school textbooks (e.g., Hour et al., 2014; Riazi & Mosalanejad, 2010). Furthermore, four EFL textbooks instructed in Iranian high schools were evaluated by Jahangard (2007). Applying 13 criteria elicited from previous checklists in the realm of materials evaluation, he discussed the merits and demerits of the textbooks. One strong point regarding the book was that it had useful, attractive, and interesting topics and tasks. But, as to the explanation of target words, the books did not provide sufficient context hindering learners' understanding of the new target words. Another shortcoming was that the listening skill was totally neglected. In the end, Jahangard

recommended experts and professionals in the area of ELT to more closely examine textbooks instructed in high schools. Likewise, Ghorbani (2011) scrutinized another textbook instructed at Iranian senior high schools, namely the English textbook 1, to see whether it follows the most prominent features of EFL/ESL textbooks. The researcher investigated it through a new checklist which was elicited from several checklists in the area of EFL textbook evaluation and was adjusted based on the local requirements of the Iranian context. The finding showed that the textbook is perfect regarding its physical qualities, but it is not successful in making a balance among the four teaching skills, and it also lacked audio CDs, teacher's guides, student workbooks, glossaries, and communicative tasks.

Following the emergence of the newly-introduced Prospect Series by Ministry of Education to the arena of teaching English in high school system in Iran, some researchers found interest in evaluating the books (Kamyabigol & Baghaeeyan, 2014). Among them, Ahmadi and Derakhshan (2014) conducted a study on the EFL teachers' viewpoints on "Prospect1" taught in Iranian junior high schools. They attempted to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of the book in the light of 15 junior high school teachers' perceptions through applying semi-structured interviews. The findings of this research indicated that teachers were content with the book as it had some advantages such as emphasis on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, integration of the four skills with the most attention to listening and speaking, consideration of students' needs, and the existence of a balance between students' levels and new words load and sentence lengths, and the existence of useful teacher's manual. However, they pointed out that the book had some shortcomings such as the inability of presenting plenary and sufficient practice of idioms and assigning suitable tasks for bolstering reading and writing techniques as well as insufficient allocation of time for teaching. Moreover, Kiaahmadi (2014) compared Right Path to English 1 with Prospect 1 in light of the *Multiple Intelligence Theory* and examined 7<sup>th</sup> grade Iranian junior high school pupils' viewpoints about the presentation of different types of intelligence in the books through responding to the Botelho's MI checklist. Two groups of students, including 165 first grade and 135 second grade junior high school pupils participated in the study. Although the outcomes of this research indicated the existence of all types of intelligence in Prospect 1, the activities in the two-course books mainly supplied verbal/ linguistic intelligence followed by minor attention to visual-spatial, logical-mathematical, musical-rhythmic, and naturalistic intelligences.

Rather recently, CLT has dominated English language teaching worldwide and Iran follows the same tendency (Alamri, 2018). As remarked

by Richards and Rodgers (2001), the main functions of ELT materials are to enhance the quality of classroom interactions and language use and to promote communicative language use among learners. They offered three sorts of materials based on CLT, namely task-based, text-based, and realia. Examples of task-based materials are simulations, plays, games, and task-based communication activities. Examples of text-based materials are authentic texts incorporated in ELT. A lesson in this way can include "a theme, a task analysis, for thematic development a practice situation description, a stimulus presentation, comprehension questions and paraphrase exercises (Jin, 2008, p. 82).

Realia can be like signs and visual and graphic material like charts, pictures, maps, symbols, magazines, graphs, advertisements, and newspapers. The Prospect series has been a new boom in the English curriculum program in Iran as it is claimed to be based on the CLT approach and an integration of the four language skills (Goodarzi, Weisi, & Yousofi, 2020).

On the whole, although some recent studies have focused on the Prospect Series, due to its new entrance into the ELT education system of Iran, it should be further evaluated from the perspective of various stakeholders involved in the educational system. Therefore, to put more flesh on this issue, the present study aimed to examine Iranian teachers' and teacher educators' perceptions of "Prospect 2" from the Prospect Series being taught in Iranian high schools as part of a six-year English program.

### **3. Method**

#### **3.1. Participants**

Cunningsworth (1995) noted the users' opinion to be the most effective technique of evaluating textbooks. As instructors and learners are typically the major consumers of textbooks, their attitudes towards the materials are necessary. Accordingly, in this study, teachers' perceptions of Prospect 2 were collected. For this purpose, 117 Iranian EFL Junior high school teachers as well as 10 teacher educators from Gorgan, Iran, participated in the current research undertaking. The non-random sampling procedure was employed for selecting the participants, and as a result, 54 male and 63 female EFL Junior high school teachers from different public and private schools, ranging from 5 to 28 years of teaching experience, cooperated in the study. They also held BA or MA degrees in TEFL, and their age ranged from 20 to 51. The number of teacher educators was 10 (4 females and 6 males), whose experience ranged from 10 to 23, and they held MA and PhD degrees, and their age ranged from 34 to 47 years old.

## **3.2. Materials and Instruments**

The following instruments were used to collect the data.

### ***3.1.1. Prospect 2***

The material evaluated in this study was English language textbook “Prospect 2” used in Iranian junior high schools. As mentioned before, the Prospect Series was published and prescribed by the Iranian Ministry of Education. Prospect 2 consists of a book for students, an audio CD, a students’ workbook, and a book for teachers. These components are defined as follows: The student book includes seven lessons, three review units, activities for pair and group work, and a photo dictionary at the end of the book. Student Audio CD contains tracks for all conversation parts and listening exercises. The workbook contains seven lessons corresponding to the student book parts. In this respect, it involved exercises for word reading and writing. There is also a CD which involves audio files of the student book. It contains all the recorded materials for in-class use.

### ***3.1.2. Mukundan’s (2011) Textbook Evaluation Scale***

Mukundan and Ahour (2010) systematically examined 48 checklists for materials evaluation developed from 1970 to 2008 and found fault with many of them as they required high expertise on the part of the respondents, too vague to answer, too context-bound to be generalizable, too perplexing, and not having acceptable validity. Therefore, they made the conclusion that generating a clearer, more concise, and more flexible criteria is of great significance. In the present study, the modified version of the Mukundan’s (2011) textbook evaluation scale, comprising of 71 items and 14 sub-components, was employed (See Appendix A). It was a four-point Likert scale, and the answers of the respondents could range from “poor” to “excellent”. As to the aim of the current study, validity of the inventory was checked by five experts in the field in the context of Iran. The items of the scale decided to be included in the modified version met the following criteria: A) general attributes such as a) the book relating to syllabus and curriculum (1 item), b) methodology (4 items), c) suitability to learners (4 items), d) physical and utilitarian attributes (5 items), e) efficient outlay of supplementary materials (2 items), B) learning-teaching content consist of a) general (6 items), b) listening(6 items), c) speaking (6 items), d) reading (5 items), e) writing (6 items), f) vocabulary and idioms (6 items), g) grammar (8 items), h) pronunciation (6 items), and i) tasks, activities and exercises (6 items).



### 3.3. Procedure

At first, estimation of the scale reliability was performed using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient estimate. The reliability outcomes are demonstrated in Table 1. As can be seen in Table 1, reliability estimates of almost all subsections of the checklist were above .70 and acceptable. Also, the total reliability estimate of teachers and teacher educators’ checklists were .93 and .99, respectively. These findings imply that the instrument used in the study enjoyed good internal consistency and high reliability. Moreover, the validity of the instrument was confirmed by expert judgment as five university professors in the field of applied linguistics approved its validity, and the inter-coder agreement indicated that this questionnaire is suitable.

**Table 1**

*Reliability of the Scale*

Subscales	N	Cronbach’s alpha (EFL Teachers)	Cronbach’s alpha (EFL teachers’ educator)
<i>I. General attributes</i>	16	.86	.89
A. The book in relation to syllabus and curriculum	1	.71	.89
B. Methodology	4	.8	
C. Suitability to learners	4	.71	.82
D. Physical and utilitarian attributes	5	.69	.76
E. Efficient outlay of supplementary materials	2	.76	.75
<i>II. Learning-teaching content</i>	55	.90	.91
A. General	6	.78	.74
B. Listening	6	.75	.87
C. Speaking	6	.81	.90
D. Reading	5	.85	.9
E. Writing	6	.84	.88
F. Vocabulary and idioms	6	.74	.9
G. Grammar	8	.82	.92
H. Pronunciation	6	.82	.91
I. Tasks, activities and exercises	6	.76	.77
Total	71	.93	.91

Next, participants who voluntarily accepted to participate in the study were ensured that the data they provide to the researchers would be kept confidential and anonymous. Out of the 140 questionnaires distributed among junior high school teachers, only 117 were filled out and returned. Of the 13

questionnaires distributed to teacher educators, 10 of them completed the questionnaire.

### 3.4. Data Analysis

The data collected from the respondents' answers to the scale were analyzed through SPSS 22 and the results were presented in the form of descriptive, such as means and standard deviations. Because the data did not show normal distribution, the non-parametric test of Mann-Whitney U test was employed for doing the inferential statistics. In this respect, the test was used to find out any significant difference between the perceptions of the two groups.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Results

It should be mentioned that as the results of all of the research questions of the study were obtained from a single checklist, the results will be separated based on the sub-sections of this checklist.

#### 4.1.1. Results of General Attribute Section

This section of the checklist includes five subsections. The results are presented in the following tables.

##### 4.1.1.1. Results for Sections A and B of General Attribute (Syllabus and Methodology)

Table 2 presents the results of descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test for sections A and B of the general attribute subscale.

**Table 2**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Sections A and B of the General Attribute Subscale*

General attributes		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
Syllabus								
1	Teacher	3	26	62	10	2.7	-1.9	.05
	Educator	0	0	80	20	3.2		
Methodology								
2	Teacher	4	21	65	10	2.7	-2.2	.02
	Educator	10	0	50	40	3.3		
3	Teacher	9	21	53	17	2.8	-1.9	.06
	Educator	10	0	50	40	3.3		
4	Teacher	3	20	49	28	2.7	-.6	.52
	Educator	0	20	40	40	3.2		
5	Teacher	5	24	43	28	3	-2	.3
	Educator	10	0	30	60	3.5		

As Table 2 suggests, the majority of the respondents perceived that the book matched well with the specifications of the syllabus. In case of the second and third items of the checklist, most of the participants tended to choose ‘good’ as their responses. For the 4<sup>th</sup> item, the highest percentage (49) was devoted to ‘good’ for teachers, though ‘good’ and ‘excellent’ were the most popular each with 40 percent. For the 5<sup>th</sup> item, 43 percent of the teachers chose ‘good’, though the highest percent of teacher educators (60%) chose ‘excellent’. As it is evident from the means, item five had the highest mean showing that it attained the most agreement. Performing Mann-Whitney U test for the probable differences revealed no significant difference between the two groups’ attitudes since almost all sigs were higher than .05, except for items 2 and 5.

#### ***4.1.1.2. Results for Section C of the General Attribute Subscale (Suitability to Learners)***

Table 3 present the descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test results relating to section C of the General Attribute Subscale.

**Table 3**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section C of the General Attribute Subscale*

General attributes		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
<b>Suitability to learners</b>								
1	Teacher	7	21	45	27	2.9	-1.33	.18
	Educator	10	0	50	40	3.3		
2	Teacher	7	31	40	22	2.7	-.10	.89
	Educator	10	30	30	30	2.8		
3	Teacher	5	27	52	15	2.7	-2.44	.01
	Educator	0	10	40	50	3.4		
4	Teacher	9	22	50	19	2.7	-1.45	.14
	Educator	0	20	40	40	3.2		

Table 3 depicts the results of the third sub-section of the first part of the checklist which asks about the suitability of the book’s components for the learners. Clearly, most of the participants chose ‘good’ as their responses to the four items. Regarding mean values, means for items 1 to 4 for teachers were 2.9, 2.7, 2.7, and 2.7, respectively. Evidently, the first item was the most agreed upon item. Mean values for teacher educators were 3.3, 2.8, 3.4, and 3.2, respectively for these four items, which shows that item 3 was the most suitable item to the students from the teacher educators’ point of view.

Concerning the difference between the two groups' views, Mann-Whitney U test findings revealed no significant difference between the attitudes of both groups for items 1, 2, and 4; however, there was a significant difference regarding item 3.

#### **4.1.1.3. Results for Section D of the General Attribute Subscale (Physical and Utilitarian Attributes)**

Table 4 presents the results of *descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test for section D of the general attribute subscale*

**Table 4**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section D of the General Attribute Subscale*

General attributes		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
Physical and utilitarian attributes								
1	Teacher	9	31	46	14	2.6	-.33	.73
	Educator	0	50	40	10	2.6		
2	Teacher	3	31	46	20	2.8	-.57	.56
	Educator	0	33	33	33	3		
3	Teacher	3	29	53	14	2.7	-1.66	.09
	Educator	0	22	33	44	3.2		
4	Teacher	7	26	51	16	2.7	-1.30	.19
	Educator	0	0	89	11	3.1		
5	Teacher	3	21	46	30	3.0	-.36	.71
	Educator	10	10	60	20	2.9		

The fourth subsection of the first part of the checklist deals with the *Physical and utilitarian attributes* of the participants towards the components of the book. As can be observed in Table 4, most of the teachers were somehow satisfied with this aspect of the book since they mostly chose 'good' as their responses. Half of the teacher educators considered the attractiveness of the design and layout of the book as 'adequate'. For the second item, 33 percent of the teacher educators considered an efficient use of text and visuals as 'adequate', 33 percent considered it as 'good', and the same percent considered it as 'excellent'. For the third item, most of the participants answered it as 'excellent'. For the fourth and fifth items, most of the participants chose the option 'good'. Comparing means of the items, item 3 with a mean of 3.2 and item 5 with a mean of 3 attained the highest means from the teacher educators and teachers' points of view, respectively. Regarding the difference between the two groups' views, Mann-Whitney U

test results showed no significant difference between the two groups regarding their attitudes toward the items in this sub-section.

#### **4.1.1.4. Results for Section E of the General Attribute subscale (Efficient Outlay of Supplementary Materials)**

Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for Section E of the General Attribute Subscale.

**Table 5**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section E of the General Attribute Subscale*

General attributes		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
Efficient outlay of supplementary materials								
1	Teacher	12	20	42	26	2.8	-2.92	.00
	Educator	0	0	30	70	3.7		
2	Teacher	6	31	46	18	2.7	-2.14	.05
	Educator	10	0	50	40	3.3		

The last subsection of the first part of the checklist deals with the efficient outlay of supplementary materials, including two items. As it can be seen in Table 5, 42 percent of the teachers believed that supplementary materials are ‘good’ while 70 percent of the teacher educators considered them as ‘excellent’. For the second item, almost half of both groups believed that the teachers’ book is very informative. According to the means of these items, it can be said that the first item was more satisfactory than the second one. However, the Mann-Whitney U test results showed a significant difference between the two groups’ views regarding this section of the checklist.

#### **4.1.2. Results of the Learning-Teaching Content Section of the Checklist**

This section of the checklist includes nine subsections.

##### **4.1.2.1. Results for Section A of the Learning-teaching Content Subscale (General)**

Table 6 depicts the descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for Section A the learning-teaching content subscale.

**Table 6**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section A of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
General								
1	Teacher	10	23	49	18	2.7	-2.33	.02
	Educator	0	10	40	50	3.4		
2	Teacher	9	29	43	18	2.7	-.74	.45
	Educator	10	20	40	30	2.9		
3	Teacher	9	30	41	20	2.7	-.24	.80
	Educator	0	30	60	10	2.8		
4	Teacher	6	26	48	21	2.8		.15
	Educator	0	0	80	20	3.2	-1.40	
5	Teacher	5	17	51	26	3.2	-1.99	.06
	Educator	10	0	30	60	3.5		
6	Teacher	8	18	48	27	2.9	-1.67	.09
	Educator	10	0	40	50	3.4		

#### *4.1.2.2. Results for section B of the Learning-teaching content Subscale (Listening)*

Table 7 describes descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for section B of the learning-teaching content subscale.

**Table 7**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section B of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
Listening								
1	Teacher	7	26	46	21	2.8	-.57	.56
	Educator	0	20	60	20	3.0		
2	Teacher	4	27	52	16	2.8	-.77	.43
	Educator	0	11	78	11	3.0		
3	Teacher	6	19	59	16	2.8	-2.2	<b>.02</b>
	Educator	0	20	20	60	<b>3.4</b>		
4	Teacher	9	23	42	26	2.8	-.55	.58
	Educator	10	0	70	20	3.0		
5	Teacher	9	26	45	20	2.7	-.23	.81

	Educator	10	10	70	10	2.8		
6	Teacher	9	31	42	19	<b>3.4</b>	-.18	.85
	Educator	10	30	30	30	2.8		

As it is evident from the table, most of the participants of both groups chose ‘good’ as their response except for items 3 and 6 in which the teacher educators answered differently. Comparing the obtained means showed that item 6 with a mean of 3.4 attained the highest mean from the teachers’ views which implies that they had the highest satisfaction on this item. On the other hand, item 3 with a mean of 3.4 attained the highest mean from the teacher educators’ views. Regarding the difference between the two groups’ views, it is clear from the table that there was no significant difference except for item 3, obtaining a *sig* value of .27, implying a significant difference between the teachers and their counterparts’ views.

#### 4.1.2.3. Results for Section C of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale (Speaking)

Table 8 reports descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for section C of the learning-teaching content subscale.

**Table 8**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test for Section C of the Learning-teaching Content Subscale*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
Speaking								
1	Teacher	5	21	56	17	3.2	-.04	.96
	Educator	0	30	50	20	2.9		
2	Teacher	1	24	54	21	2.9	-2.7	.00
	Educator	0	10	20	70	3.6		
3	Teacher	4	22	56	18	2.8	-2.1	.03
	Educator	0	10	40	50	3.4		
4	Teacher	9	25	47	19	2.7	-1.9	.05
	Educator	0	10	50	40	3.3		
5	Teacher	7	22	47	24	2.8	-.93	.35
	Educator	10	10	40	40	3.1		
6	Teacher	9	23	49	19	2.7	-.64	.51
	Educator	0	22	56	22	3.0		

Subsection C of the second section of the checklist deals with the speaking skill component of the book. As it can be observed, most of the teacher participants tended to rate the speaking items as ‘good’. Although most of the educator participants, like their counterparts, tended to choose ‘good’ for some items such as item one, four, and six, their views were

somehow different towards items 2, 3, and 5. Most of them decided to choose ‘excellent’ as their responds for items 2 and 3. In item 5, the number of participants opting ‘good’ and ‘excellent’ were similar. Comparison of the means depicts that item 1 with a mean of 3.2 was the most satisfactory one from the teachers’ views while item 2, with a mean of 3.6 was the most satisfactory item from the educators’ views. Performing Mann-Whitney U test showed that there were no significant differences in the responses of both groups except for items 2 and 3.

#### 4.1.2.4. Results for Section D of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale (Reading)

Table 9 presents descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for section D of the learning-teaching content subscale.

**Table 9**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section D of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
<b>Reading</b>								
1	Teacher	11	32	45	12	2.5	-.08	.93
	Educator	10	30	50	10	2.6		
2	Teacher	11	30	44	15	2.6	-.42	.67
	Educator	10	10	80	0	2.7		
3	Teacher	9	31	39	22	2.7	-.46	.64
	Educator	10	30	50	10	2.6		
4	Teacher	11	27	46	16	2.6	-.25	.80
	Educator	20	10	50	20	2.7		
5	Teacher	9	22	50	19	<b>2.79</b>	-.85	.39
	Educator	10	10	50	30	<b>3.0</b>		

Subsection D of the second section of the checklist deals with the reading skill component of the book. According to Table 9, most of the participants in both groups view this aspect of the book as ‘good’. Comparison of the means showed that item 5 with a mean of 2.79 was the most satisfactory item from the teachers’ and educators’ views. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test also showed no significant difference between the views of both groups towards the reading aspects of the book.

#### 4.1.2.5. Results for Section E of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale (Writing)



Table 10 indicates descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for section E of the learning-teaching content Subscale. As the above table suggests, most of the participants in both groups considered the goals of writing tasks ‘good’. Item 2 deals with an interesting aspect of writing tasks which most of the teachers considered as ‘adequate’ while 60% of the teacher educators considered it as ‘excellent’. In case of item 3, 44 percent of the teachers regarded this aspect as ‘adequate’ while 70% of the educators regarded it as ‘good’. For the fourth item, 39% of the teachers believed that these tasks enhance free writing opportunities well, while 60 percent of the educators rated in favor of this item. In the case of item 5, 38% of the teachers believed that the allotted time for teaching writing skill was ‘adequate’ while 40 percent of the educators rated it as ‘poor’. Concerning the rating of the sixth item, 40% of the teachers considered it as ‘good’, while 50% of the educators considered it as ‘adequate’. Comparison of the means showed that item 1 with a mean of 2.55 was the most satisfactory item for teachers; whereas, item 3, with a mean of 2.60 was the most satisfactory item for the educators. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test also showed no significant difference between the views of both groups towards writing aspects of the book.

**Table 10**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section E of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
<b>Writing</b>								
1	Teacher	11	36	39	14	<b>2.55</b>	-1.47	.14
	Educator	10	0	80	10	2.9		
2	Teacher	10	41	36	13	2.51	-.14	.88
	Educator	10	0	30	60	2.5		
3	Teacher	14	44	32	11	2.4	-.99	.31
	Educator	10	20	70	0	<b>2.60</b>		
4	Teacher	15	38	39	9	2.41	-.13	.89
	Educator	20	20	60	0	2.40		
5	Teacher	26	38	29	8	2.18	-.90	.36
	Educator	40	30	30	0	1.90		
6	Teacher	14	33	40	14	2.53	-.87	.38
	Educator	10	50	40	0	2.30		

#### *4.1.2.6. Results for Section F of the Learning-teaching Content Subscale (Vocabulary and Idioms)*

Table 11 reports descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for section F of the learning-teaching content subscale. According to Table 11, most of the participants of both groups viewed this aspect of the book as ‘good’ for all items except for item 4 which was mainly regarded as ‘excellent’. Comparison of the means showed that item 4 with the means of 3.11 and 3.50 from the teachers and educators’ views, respectively, was the most satisfactory item. The results of Mann-Whitney U test also showed no significant difference between the views of both groups towards vocabulary and idioms aspects of the book.

**Table 11**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section F of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale.*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
Vocabulary and idioms								
1	Teacher	11	31	46	12	2.58	-.47	.63
	Educator		20	60	10	2.70		
2	Teacher	7	26	56	11	2.71	-.01	.98
	Educator	10	20	60	10	2.70		
3	Teacher	9	28	50	13	2.67	-.06	.94
	Educator	0	40	50	10	2.70		
4	Teacher	10	15	17	29	<b>3.11</b>	-1.94	.05
	Educator	0	20	10	70	<b>3.50</b>		
5	Teacher	14	25	46	15	2.63	-.56	.57
	Educator	10	40	40	10	2.50		
6	Teacher	8	33	47	12	2.63	-.07	.94
	Educator	10	30	50	10	2.60		

#### *4.1.2.7. Results for Section G of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale (Grammar)*

Table 12 describes descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for section G of the learning-teaching content subscale. As it is evident by the above table, most of the teachers were inclined to choose ‘good’ for this aspect of the book except for item 5 which was mostly perceived as ‘adequate’ by 44% of the teachers. Regarding the teacher educators’ views, most of them regarded item 1 as ‘poor’ and item 2 as ‘excellent’. 33% of the educators regarded item 3 as ‘adequate’ and the same percent regarded it as ‘good’. Item 4 was considered as ‘adequate’ by 44 percent of the educators. In case of item 5, this aspect was perceived as ‘good’ by 67 percent of the educators. Items 6, 7, and 8 were also regarded as ‘good’ by 56, 67, and 50 percent of the educators, respectively. Comparison

of the means shows that item 2 with the mean of 2.78 was the most satisfactory item for the teachers; whereas, item 7 with the mean of 2.66 was the most satisfactory item for the educators. The results of Mann-Whitney U test also showed no significant difference between the views of both groups towards the items.

**Table 12**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section G of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale.*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
Grammar								
1	Teacher	8	35	39	18	2.67	-.67	.49
	Educator	40	10	20	30	2.4		
2	Teacher	7	27	46	20	<b>2.78</b>	-.53	.59
	Educator	40	10	10	40	2.5		
3	Teacher	14	35	42	9	2.45	-.41	.67
	Educator	22	33	33	11	2.33		
4	Teacher	11	37	44	9	2.49	-1.0	.30
	Educator	22	44	22	11	2.22		
5	Teacher	7	44	31	19	2.61	<b>-.23</b>	.81
	Educator	22	11	67	0	2.44		
6	Teacher	9	32	46	14	2.64	-.67	.50
	Educator	11	33	56	0	2.44		
7	Teacher	10	26	48	16	2.70	-.26	.79
	Educator	0	33	67	0	<b>2.66</b>		
8	Teacher	21	33	35	10	2.34	-.16	.86
	Educator	25	25	50	0	2.25		

#### *4.1.2.8. Results for Section H of the Learning-teaching Content Subscale (Pronunciation)*

Table 13 presents descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for section H of the learning-teaching content subscale. According to Table 13, most of the participants of both groups viewed this aspect of the book as ‘good’ for all items except for item 5. As the table shows, 38 percent of the teachers perceived this aspect as ‘adequate’ while the same percent perceived it as ‘good. Also, in case of the educators, this item was regarded as ‘adequate’ by 33 percent and as ‘good’ by the same percentage of the educators. Comparison of the means showed that item 1 with the mean of 2.82 was the most satisfactory aspect from the teachers’ views, while item 6 with the mean of three was the most satisfactory aspect from the educators’ views. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test also showed no significant

difference between the views of both groups toward the pronunciation aspects of the book.

**Table 13**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section H of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
<b>Pronunciation</b>								
1	Teacher	5	23	56	16	<b>2.82</b>	-1.13	.25
	Educator	22	11	67	0	2.44		
2	Teacher	9	31	47	13	2.63	-.86	.38
	Educator	22	22	56	0	2.33		
3	Teacher	4	30	52	14	2.75	-.39	.69
	Educator	22	11	56	11	2.55		
4	Teacher	9	21	58	13	2.75	-.19	.84
	Educator	11	11	67	11	2.77		
5	Teacher	8	38	38	17	2.64	-.92	.35
	Educator	22	33	33	11	2.33		
6	Teacher	9	26	46	19	2.74	-.83	.40
	Educator	0	11	78	11	<b>3</b>		

*4.1.2.9. Results for Section I of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale (Tasks, Activities and Exercises)*

Table 14 reports descriptive statistics and Mann-Whitney U test results for the section I of the learning-teaching content subscale.

**Table 14**

*Descriptive Statistics and Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Section I of the Learning-Teaching Content Subscale*

Learning-teaching content		Poor (%)	Adequate (%)	Good (%)	Excellent (%)	Mean	Z	Asymp. Sig
<b>Tasks, activities, exercises</b>								
1	Teacher	8	25	56	12	2.71	-.93	.34
	Educator	10	0	80	10	2.9		
2	Teacher	5	31	50	15	2.73	-1.55	.12
	Educator	10	10	40	40	<b>3.1</b>		
3	Teacher	7	28	50	16	2.8	-.30	.76
	Educator	0	40	50	10	2.7		
4	Teacher	10	28	44	17	<b>2.94</b>	-.24	.80
	Educator	0	44	44	11	2.66		

5	Teacher	12	28	47	13	2.61	-1.35	.17
	Educator	0	11	78	1	3		
6	Teacher	6	27	50	17	2.77	-.29	.77
	Educator	0	33	44	22	<b>2.88</b>		

According to Table 14, most of the participants of the both groups viewed this aspect of the book as ‘good’ for all items except for items 2 and 4. Also, 40 percent of the educators perceived this aspect as ‘good’ while the same percent perceived it as ‘excellent’. Also, in case of item 4, this aspect was regarded as ‘adequate’ by 44 percent of the educators and as ‘good’ by the same percentage of the educators. Comparison of the means showed that item 4 with the mean of 2.94 was the most satisfactory aspect from the teachers’ views, while item 2 with the mean of 3.1 was the most satisfactory aspect from the educators’ views. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test also revealed no significant difference between the views of both groups toward tasks, activities, and exercises aspects of the book.

#### 4.2. Discussion

As stated before, the present study sought to examine Iranian EFL teachers and teacher educators’ views toward the newly-introduced English language books published by Iran’s Ministry of Education, named Prospect Series. Based on the findings of this study, in general, the two groups of teachers and teacher educators had a positive attitude with regard to the book Prospect 2. Comparing these results with findings of previous studies in this area showed that the users perceived the Prospect books to contain improvements as they attempted to compensate for the weaknesses found in those books previously published by Ministry of Education and instructed in Iranian high schools. Approving this claim, in this study, it was found that the participants perceived the Prospect 2 book to be mainly student-centered and based on the CLT approach.

Furthermore, in the present study, it was found that both the teacher and teacher educator groups perceived the book as appropriate in terms of its methodology, tasks, and activities. This finding was in line with that of Jahandard (2007), reporting that English textbooks taught in Iran’s public schools contain tasks, activities, and topics which are quite relevant and attractive to Iranian EFL learners. One main justification for this finding may be that English textbooks instructed in Iran’s public schools are local textbooks produced by Iran’s Ministry of Education which takes the country’s nationality, religion, and culture fully into account when developing materials for Iranian EFL learners. In addition, further results of the current study gave credence to the claim that Prospect 2 was successful

regarding the inclusion of the listening skill through providing authentic or close to real language situation tasks for learners. This finding was in contrast to that of Jahangard's (2007) study, revealing that the teachers perceived the books to neglect the listening skills and there was no specific topic, activity, or material allocated to listening practice within or outside of the classroom. This finding also shows the improvement of the prospect book as it compensated for the weaknesses found in the books taught before it.

As to the speaking skills, the participants of the present study showed high satisfaction with the book in terms of developing initial meaningful communication opportunities, providing pair or group work activities for improving the students' speaking skills, and including communicative tasks such as role-play and dialogue which de-emphasize the role of the teacher as the sole authority in the classroom and aid the students to participate more in input provision, negotiation, and output production. Likewise, the results of Kamyabigol and Baghaeeyan's (2014) study indicated some strong points of Prospect 1 such as integration of the four language skills, enhanced interaction opportunities between the teacher and students, and more attention to pair and group work.

This finding was in disagreement with that of Ghorbani's (2011), who reported that the teachers evaluated the previous English textbooks taught in Iran's public high schools to be perfect regarding their physical qualities but not regarding their content as they were not successful in making a balance between the four language skills, lacked audio materials, paid much attention to the formal aspect of language, and disregarded the communicative aspects being crucial for successful communication in the target language. As to the reading skill, the results of the present study demonstrated positive attitude of the participants toward the book since it included authentic reading materials appropriate to the learners in terms of text length, level of difficulty, and topic. This finding was in line with that of Riazi and Mosalanejad's (2010), who through examining English textbooks in various grades of high school, found a logical sequence of text length and difficulty appropriate for each grade. In light of the writing skill, the present study reported outcomes uncovering that although the participants did not have negative perceptions of the book, they did not regard the book as sufficiently appropriate as it had some shortcomings in terms of providing interesting topics for writing, developing writing skills, and allocating sufficient time for writing activities. In fact, the participants perceived that as a book resting on the CLT approach, it mostly focused on speaking and listening to the disregard of reading and writing skills. These findings were in agreement with those of Ahmadi and Derakhshan's (2014), who reported that although the teachers were mainly satisfied with the Prospect 1 book, the book attended less to the writing skill

and was unable to assign suitable tasks and activities for bolstering reading and writing skills.

With regard to the vocabulary aspect, it was found that the participants of the study were satisfied with the textbook as there was correspondence between students' levels and the new words load, good distribution of vocabulary from simple to complex items, and enough recycling of the target words throughout the lessons. The satisfaction gained from this aspect of the Prospect 2 book in this study was in contrast to teachers' dissatisfaction with the vocabulary aspect of the previous Iranian high school textbooks as found in Jahangard's (2007) study in which he reported that the textbooks suffered from providing enough context for easier understanding of the target words by learners. However, the findings of the current study were in agreement with those of Ahmadi and Derakhshan's (2014), showing that Prospect 1 enjoyed some advantages such as considering students' needs, providing good balance between learners' level on the one hand and new word loans and sentence lengths on the other hand. However, they also reported that the book was unable to provide insufficient practice for idioms. Similarly, Kamyabigol and Baghaeeyan's (2014) study also revealed some shortcomings of Prospect 1 as it lacked authenticity in dialogues and contexts, provided no recycling of the new words in the following lessons, and presented no phonetic transcription for new words.

Similar results were reported in the present study pertaining to the grammar aspect as the participants showed positive attitudes toward the book since the book was perceived to be able to provide contextualized grammar instruction and practice opportunities and linguistic items with brief and easy examples to facilitate understanding. Concerning the pronunciation aspect, both teachers and teacher educators had a positive attitude toward the book in respect of presenting contextualized pronunciation and adequate pronunciation practices.

It was also found that both groups were highly satisfied with the content of the book. Similarly, the findings of Mahdavi and Abdolmanafi-Rokni's (2015) study approved that English instructors held a more favorable attitude toward the authenticity of the content of Prospect 1 compared to its previous counterpart, which was Right Path to English 1. On the contrary, the outcomes of Hour et al. (2014) showed that Iranian English teachers had negative perceptions of the previous English Textbook 2 since content of the book was not tailored to subject matters and students' needs and interests.

## **5. Conclusion and Implications**

This study explored Iranian EFL teachers and teacher educators' perceptions of the new English textbook "Prospect2". On the whole, according to the outcomes of the current research study, it is concluded that both teachers and teacher educators had mainly positive attitudes toward the Prospect 2 textbook. However, it should be noted that such positive perceptions should not lead one to conclude that the book is perfect because, as rightly maintained by McDonough et al. (2013), no textbook or set of materials is likely to be perfect and they need to be evaluated and subsequently adapted against the specific context of its implementation. In fact, textbook evaluation and adaptation are two requirements for teachers, and more specifically for public school teachers who have not that much freedom to choose the material they are going to teach as they are usually handed down to them by Ministry of Education to be implemented in the classroom. In such situations that teachers are given the materials, the only logical action that they can take is to evaluate the books with regard to the specific needs of the students, course objectives and syllabus, and teachers' own goals in mind. In case that teachers have found any incongruence, they can subsequently adapt the material to better suit the situation at hand. Therefore, the results of the present study can be fruitful for teachers as users of such textbooks as the findings can inform their practice in order to present more effective instruction to learners as recipients of the content of the textbooks. Moreover, by comparing the results of the present study against those of previous ones, teachers, materials developers, and other stakeholders can become aware of the advantages and disadvantages of the newly published Prospect Series.

However, the present study was not without its limitations. First of all, in this empirical study, the sample was chosen through the convenience sampling strategy from one of the provinces of Iran. Hence, findings should be cautiously generalized to teachers and teacher educators working in other provinces of Iran. Besides, in this study, only the participants' perceptions were taken into account, not the real implementation of the textbook in the classroom by them. Thus, future studies can examine Prospect 2 through both quantitative and qualitative approaches to achieve more solid findings by going through various types of triangulation. Last but not least, in this study, only Prospect 2 was investigated. Future research undertakings can examine other textbooks within the Prospect Series to reach more conclusive findings regarding the effectiveness of the series in general.



## References

- Ahmadi, A., & Derakhshan, A. (2014). The strength and weaknesses of the Iranian junior high school English textbook "Prospect 1" from teachers' perception. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistic World*, 7(4), 47-58.
- Ahour, T., Towhidiyan, B., & Saeidi, M. (2014). The evaluation “English textbook 2” taught in Iranian high schools from teachers’ perspectives. *English Language Teaching*, 7(3), 150-158.
- Alamri, W. A. (2018). Communicative language teaching: Possible alternative approaches to CLT and teaching contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 11(10), 132-138.
- Amerian, M., & Khaivar, A. (2014). Textbook selection, evaluation, and adaptation procedures. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 6(1), 523-533.
- Awasthi, J. R. (2006). Textbook and its evaluation. *Journal of NELTA*, 11(1-2), 1-10.
- Bhanegaonkar, S. G., & Mahfoodh, M. (2013). New approach for evaluating EFLM: An eclectic developed checklist. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 3(10), 1-8.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Heinemann of Illinois Press.
- Ghorbani, M. R. (2011). Quantification and graphic representation of EFL textbook evaluation results. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(5), 511-520.
- Goodarzi, A., Weisi, H., & Yousofi, N. (2020). CLT in Prospect Series: A predictive evaluation of Iranian junior high school English textbooks. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, 8(1), 195-221.
- Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal*, 48(3), 315-328.
- Jahangard, A. (2007). The evaluation of the EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 9(2), 130-150.
- Jin, G. (2008). Application of communicative approach in college English teaching. *Asian Social Science*, 4(4), 81-85.
- Kamyabigol, A., & Baghaeeyan, J. (2014). A critical evaluation of prospect one Iranian junior high school English book. *The First Regional Conference on New English Language Course Book*, 16, 35-45.

- Ketabi, S., & Talebinezhad, M. R. (2012). Socio-cultural patterns in Iranian high school textbooks from the view point of motivation for research. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 28(1), 41-69.
- Kiaahmadi, E. (2014). *An evaluation study on the 1<sup>st</sup> grade junior high schools' English textbook in the light of multiple intelligence theory* (Unpublished M.A. thesis). Islamic Azad University of Gorgan, Science and Research Branch, Iran.
- Litz, D. R. A. (2005). Textbooks evaluation and ELT management: A South Korean case study (2nd Edition). *Asian EFL Journal*, 48(2), 1-53.
- Mahdavi, H., & Abdolmanafi-Rokni, S. J. (2015). A comparative study on the authenticity of the new English textbook prospect 1 with the old one right path to English 1 taught at junior high schools in Iran. *Journal of English Language and Literature*, 2(1), 161-173.
- McDonough, J., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide* (3rd Edition). Wiley-Blackwell.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh University Press.
- McGrath, I. (2006). Teachers' and learners' images for course books. *ELT Journal*, 60(2), 171-180.
- Mukundan, J. (2011). Developing an English language textbook evaluation checklist: A focus group study. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(12), 100-106.
- Mukundan, J., & Ahour, T. (2010). A review of textbook evaluation checklists across four decades (1970-2008). In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp. 336-352). Continuum.
- Nasiri, M., Ketabi, S., & Dastjerdi, H. (2012). Multiple Intelligences in locally-published ELT textbooks in Iran. *Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4, 258-266.
- Riazi, A. M., & Mosallanejad, N. (2010). Evaluation of learning objective in Iranian high school and per-university English textbook using Bloom's taxonomy. *TESL-EJ*, 13(4), 1-14.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *The role of textbooks in a language program*. Retrieved in November 201<sup>^</sup> from: <http://8pic.ir/images/s15uxmiv22ocvezrxp8b.pdf>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shahmohammadi, S. (2018). Textbook evaluation: looking at Prospect Series through teachers' perspective. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, 6(2), 182-204.
- Sheldon, L. E. (1987). *ESL textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development*. Modern English Publications.

- Soleimaini, H., & Dabbaghi, A. (2012). Textbook evaluation: A reflection on the ‘New Interchange’ series. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 1(2), 19- 32.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 45(2), 143-179.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Mukundan’s (2011) Textbook Evaluation Scale

Instruction: In the following situations, if you would like to say something to your classmate, please write down the exact words you have said. Thank you for your cooperation.

#### English Language Textbook Evaluation Questionnaire Adopted from Mukundan (2011)

Dear respondent,				
This project aims at finding out the teachers’ perceptions towards Iranian Junior High school textbook, “ <b>Prospect 2</b> ”. Please fill out the following questionnaire regarding your personal and professional background. Your feedback will be valuable to us for scientific and scholarly purposes.				
1. Gender: Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>				
2. Age: years 20-30 <input type="checkbox"/> 31-40 <input type="checkbox"/> 41-50 <input type="checkbox"/> 51 <input type="checkbox"/>				
3. Level of education: Diploma <input type="checkbox"/> BA <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> PhD <input type="checkbox"/>				
4. Major: TESL <input type="checkbox"/> Others <input type="checkbox"/>				
5. Teaching context: University <input type="checkbox"/> School <input type="checkbox"/> Language institute <input type="checkbox"/>				
6. Teaching experience: ... years 1-5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-20 <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/>				
7. Have you ever participated in any textbook evaluation workshops, seminars, courses, etc.? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/>				
8. If your answer to question 7 is Yes, please list the courses you attended.				
a) _____				
b) _____				
9. Have you ever evaluated a textbook? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>				
In the following section, you will find a list of criteria that will be used to develop a checklist for evaluating English language teaching textbooks. You are requested to mark (1-4) to indicate the level of importance of each criterion according to this key:				
<b>1: Poor    2: Adequate    3: Good    4: Excellent</b>				
Evaluative criteria				
Comment				
<b>I. General attributes</b>				
<b>A. The book in relation to syllabus and curriculum</b>				
1. It matches to the specifications of the syllabus	1	2	3	4
<b>B. Methodology</b>				
2. The activities can be exploited fully and can embrace the various methodologies in ELT.	1	2	3	4
3. It focuses on the latest ELT approaches and methodology	1	2	3	4
4. The methods used are student-centered.	1	2	3	4
5. The methods used allow students to talk more than teachers.	1	2	3	4
<b>C. Suitability to learners</b>				
1- It is culturally accessible to the learners, there is	1	2	3	4

a relationship between the content of the textbook and real life situation.				
2. It is compatible to the age of the learners.	1	2	3	4
3. It is compatible to the needs of the learners.	1	2	3	4
4. It is compatible to the interests of the learners.	1	2	3	4
<b>D. Physical and utilitarian attributes</b>				
1. Its layout and design is attractive.	1	2	3	4
2. It indicates efficient use of text and visuals.	1	2	3	4
3. It is durable.	1	2	3	4
4. It is cost-effective.	1	2	3	4
5-Its size is appropriate.	1	2	3	4
<b>E. Efficient outlay of supplementary materials</b>				
1. The book is supported efficiently by essentials like audio- materials, work book and teacher's guide book.	1	2	3	4
2-The teacher's book that accompanies the book is informative.	1	2	3	4
<b>II. Learning-teaching content</b>				
<b>A. General</b>				
1-Most of the tasks in the book are up-to-date and interesting.	1	2	3	4
2. Tasks move from simple to complex.	1	2	3	4
3. Task objectives are achievable.	1	2	3	4
4. Cultural sensitivities have been considered.	1	2	3	4
5. The language in the textbook is natural and real .	1	2	3	4
6. The situations created in the dialogues sound natural and real.	1	2	3	4
<b>B. Listening</b>				
1. The book has appropriate listening tasks with well-defined goals.	1	2	3	4
2. Tasks are efficiently graded according to complexity.	1	2	3	4
3. Tasks are authentic or close to real language situations.	1	2	3	4
4. The listening passages help students develop their listening comprehension skills.	1	2	3	4
5. Listening material is accompanied by background knowledge, questions and activities.	1	2	3	4
6. The listening exercises focus on linguistic competence such as stress, intonation and form.	1	2	3	4
<b>C. Speaking</b>				
1. Activities are developed to initiate meaningful	1	2	3	4

communication.					
2. Activities are balanced between individual response ,pair work and group work.	1	2	3	4	
3. Activities help students develop their speaking skills and become a more confident English speaker.	1	2	3	4	
4. There is enough material for spoken English(e.g. role-plays , dialogues,...) that help to de-emphasize teacher’s talk .	1	2	3	4	
5. The situations in the dialogues sound natural.	1	2	3	4	
6. Speech exercises encourage students to talk about their interests and concerns.	1	2	3	4	
<b>D. Reading</b>					
1. There is sufficient reading material that can engage students cognitively and affectively.	1	2	3	4	
2. The content helps student develop reading comprehension skills.	1	2	3	4	
3. Texts are graded from simple to complex.	1	2	3	4	
4. Texts are up-to-date, interesting and meaningful.	1	2	3	4	
5. The textbook uses authentic (real world) reading material at an appropriate level.	1	2	3	4	
<b>E. Writing</b>					
1. Tasks have achievable goals and take into consideration learner capabilities.	1	2	3	4	
2. Writing Tasks are interesting.	1	2	3	4	
3. The content helps students develop writing skills.	1	2	3	4	
4-The writing tasks enhance free writing opportunities.	1	2	3	4	
5. The time allotted for teaching the writing material is sufficient.	1	2	3	4	
6. The textbook leads students from simple controlled writing activities to guided writing activities.	1	2	3	4	
<b>F. Vocabulary and idioms</b>					
1. The load (number of new words in each lesson) is appropriate to the level of the student.	1	2	3	4	
2. There is a good distribution (simple to complex) of vocabulary load across chapters and the whole book.	1	2	3	4	
3. Words are efficiently repeated in subsequent lessons for reinforcement.	1	2	3	4	

4. There is a list of vocabulary items tagged at the end of the textbook.	1	2	3	4
5. There is a complete and adequate practice of idioms.	1	2	3	4
6. The content helps student develop culture-specific vocabulary\ idioms.	1	2	3	4
<b>G. Grammar</b>				
1. Structures are designed to be taught inductively.	1	2	3	4
2. The grammar is contextualized.	1	2	3	4
3. The text book covers the main grammar items appropriate to student's level.	1	2	3	4
4. Grammar is introduced explicitly and reworked Incidentally throughout the book.	1	2	3	4
5. There is a gradual increasing of structure complexity to suit the growing reading ability of the students.	1	2	3	4
6. There is a logical sequence of sentences and paragraphs.	1	2	3	4
7. The linguistic items are presented with brief and easy examples to facilitate understanding.	1	2	3	4
8. The time allotted for teaching the material is sufficient.	1	2	3	4
<b>H. Pronunciation</b>				
1. It is contextualized.	1	2	3	4
2. It is learner-friendly with no complex charts and easy to be learnt.	1	2	3	4
3. The content helps students develop Pronunciation skills.	1	2	3	4
4. Pronunciation is built through other types of activities, such as listening ,dialogue ,etc.	1	2	3	4
5. The textbook highlights and practices natural Pronunciation (stress and intonation).	1	2	3	4
6. The pronunciation practices are complete and adequate and there are CDs for them.	1	2	3	4
<b>I. Tasks , activities and exercises</b>				
1. The book provides a variety of meaningful and mechanical exercises and activities to practice language items and skills.	1	2	3	4
2- It provides communicative exercises and activities that help students carry out their communicative tasks in real life.	1	2	3	4
3- The exercises can be modified or supplemented easily to help students who are under/over	1	2	3	4

achievers.					
4-The exercises are adequate, purposeful and interesting.	1	2	3	4	
5-The book provides a pattern of review within lessons and cumulatively testes new materials by the book .	1	2	3	4	
6-The exercises have clear instructions that explain how each exercise can be done.	1	2	3	4	
<b>Thank you very much for your cooperation</b>					

communication.					
2. Activities are balanced between individual response ,pair work and group work.	1	2	3	4	
3. Activities help students develop their speaking skills and become a more confident English speaker.	1	2	3	4	
4.There is enough material for spoken English(e.g. role-plays ,dialogues,...) that help to de-emphasize teacher’s talk .	1	2	3	4	
5. The situations in the dialogues sound natural.	1	2	3	4	
6. Speech exercises encourage students to talk about their interests and concerns.	1	2	3	4	
<b>D. Reading</b>					
1. There is sufficient reading material that can engage students cognitively and affectively.	1	2	3	4	
2. The content helps student develop reading comprehension skills.	1	2	3	4	
3. Texts are graded from simple to complex.	1	2	3	4	
4. Texts are up-to-date, interesting and meaningful.	1	2	3	4	
5. The textbook uses authentic (real world) reading material at an appropriate level.	1	2	3	4	
<b>E. Writing</b>					
1. Tasks have achievable goals and take into consideration learner capabilities.	1	2	3	4	
2. Writing Tasks are interesting.	1	2	3	4	
3. The content helps students develop writing skills.	1	2	3	4	
4-The writing tasks enhance free writing opportunities.	1	2	3	4	
5. The time allotted for teaching the writing material is sufficient.	1	2	3	4	
6. The textbook leads students from simple controlled writing activities to guided writing activities.	1	2	3	4	
<b>F. Vocabulary and idioms</b>					
1. The load (number of new words in each lesson) is appropriate to the level of the student.	1	2	3	4	
2. There is a good distribution (simple to complex) of vocabulary load across chapters and the whole book.	1	2	3	4	
3. Words are efficiently repeated in subsequent lessons for reinforcement.	1	2	3	4	

---

***Bibliographic information of this paper for citing:***

Ghoorchaei, B., Derakhshan, A., & Ebrahimi, A. (2021). An evaluation of English textbook Prospect 2: Teachers and teacher educators' perceptions in the spotlight. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 8(2), 59-90.