



## Internal Evaluation of English Textbook "Vision 2" from Teachers' Perspectives

Elhameh Masoumi Sooreh <sup>1</sup>, Touran Ahour <sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1, 2</sup> Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

\*Corresponding author: ahour@iaut.ac.ir

(Received: 2020/2/9; Accepted: 2020/7/7)

Online publication: 2021/4/26

### Abstract

The present study was an attempt to evaluate the suitability of English textbook "Vision2" for the Iranian senior high-school students in grade 11 from the teachers' perception. The participants included 45 English teachers (22 males & 23 females) selected based on convenience sampling from various secondary high-schools in Tabriz, Iran. The internal evaluation of the textbook was accomplished through a materials evaluation checklist with 82 items in the form of 5-point Likert scale and the items examined internal aspects (e.g., subject and content, exercises, social and cultural contexts, language skills, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation) of the textbook. The results of descriptive statistics revealed that Vision2 matches with some of the students' needs and with a few changes it can be used as an acceptable textbook for the 11<sup>th</sup>- grade students. For example, by adding some authentic and interesting sections and exercises for listening and speaking, this textbook can be appropriate for the students and encourage them for further learning. The results can be useful for both the English teachers and curriculum designers. The results point out that textbook writers should perform learner needs analysis before writing new textbooks to make sure they meet learners' needs.

**Keywords:** high school, internal evaluation, teachers' perspectives, textbook, vision

### **Introduction**

Textbooks are well thought-out as an indispensable constituent of any EFL course, and therefore the choice of the most appropriate book for a situation requires careful analysis (Fatima, KazimShah, & Sultan, 2015). Various definitions of textbooks have been proposed by different ELT practitioners. According to Brown (2001), textbooks are the main common type of resources in language instruction. As a result, they have a great role in EFL context and are viewed as the major source of information for learners. In addition, the content of English text books guides what teachers instruct and learners study, so in the choice of the latest published textbook it is essential to carry out an assessment to guarantee its being appropriate (Nguyen, 2015). However, as proposed by Azizfar, Koosha, and Lotfi (2010), in some countries like Iran, textbooks are taken into account as the only source in language teaching programs. In this situation, the role of the textbooks gets more important and incompatibility of them can cause different problems (Rashidi & Kehtarifard, 2014). As Azizfar et al. (2010) mention if a textbook does not match learners' needs, it can demotivate them.

Textbook evaluation is an active progression that examines the different features of the textbook to improve its quality (Antic, Lvic, & Peshikan, 2013) and guarantee quality assertion and improvement, which permits constant development of learning chances (Kiely, 2009). Hence, Ansari (2004) proposes that evaluation of English textbooks that are taught in Iranian schools is necessary because there are some problems with these textbooks. That is why in Iran most of the researchers concentrate more on textbook evaluation, and a large number of the studies conducted by these researchers spotlight on three main objectives as follow. The first group has typically attempted to expand several principles to supply further thriving textbook evaluation studies (i.e., Ansari & Babaii, 2002; Najafi, Hamidi, & Mahmoudi, 2013), the second group has evaluated certain textbooks for their strengths and weak points to discover their advantages and deficiencies (e.g., Jahangard, 2007; Riazi & Aryashokouh, 2007), and the third group has considered discourse features in the textbooks (e.g., Amalsaleh, 2004).

In this regard, checklists enable researchers to record information in a practical mode to perform similarity, as checklists suggest a common

agenda for decision-making. Checklists allow teachers to evaluate textbooks more precisely (e.g., Ellis, 1997; Sheldon, 1988; Williams, 1983). As proposed by McGrath (2002), they allow teachers to accomplish an organized and cost efficient evaluation based on a set of granted-on evaluative criteria. According to Cunningsworth (1995), a meticulous checklist can act upon a thorough evaluation of any given textbook. An evaluation checklist is a mechanism that affords the assessor with a list of features for evaluating learning-teaching resources. A number of scholars including Cunningsworth (1995), Sheldon (1988), and Williams (1983) have specified that evaluative checklists should comprise some physical uniqueness of textbooks for example layout and organization as well as criteria related to language, functions, grammar, and skills content. What is more, in accordance with Pouranshirvani (2017a, 2017b), the former is considered as external evaluation and the latter as the internal evaluation of a textbook.

Numerous empirical studies have been conducted, abroad and in Iran, on textbook evaluation using different textbook/material evaluation checklists. To name some of them, we can find studies that were conducted abroad: in Korea, Ranalli (2002) assessed New Headway upper-intermediate, which was taught at Yonsei university in Seoul; in Canada Hong (2004) evaluated ESL textbooks; Tok (2010) examined appropriateness of “dead right” textbook that was used in state primary schools; in Saudi Arabia, Alamri (2008) evaluated sixth grade English language textbook; and in Japan Juan (2010) evaluated the textbook College English new edition for its cultural content. These studies evaluated the content of the textbooks for finding their strengths and weaknesses to see whether they are appropriate for the proposed listeners.

In the context of Iran, several studies have been conducted on the old textbooks and some of the new books published by the Ministry of Education. For example, in one study, Ansary (2004) examined Iranian High school English textbooks. The consequences of his study revealed that the design of the books is short of sufficient pictures to make the books striking and to inspire learners. What is more, the specified training does not direct learners how to perform the drills, and the complicatedness of the

reading comprehension texts of the three textbooks does not match learners' background comprehension. Rahimpour and Hashemi (2011) in their study evaluated the Iranian three high school English textbooks from the teachers' attitude. Fifty instructors completed the survey planned to evaluate the textbooks in terms of some standards involving reading comprehension, lexical items and word formation, language use in context, grammatical points, and phonological points, practical concerns, and physical outline. The results confirmed that they are not in support of the textbooks concerning all features under exploration. Zohrabi, Sabouri, and Behroozian (2012) assessed the merits and demerits of English for high school educators in Iran from the opinions of teachers and students. They paid attention to aspects of design, vocabulary, topics and content, exercises, skills, pronunciation, function, and social and cultural activities. The outcomes indicated that the book was grammar-based and more prominence was on reading than three other skills, inadequate practice was offered for pronunciation with value to target society, no social and cultural activities were incorporated and the layout of the book was supposed to be deficient in attractiveness. Shabani and Mansoori-Nejad (2013) conducted an evaluation of the third-grade high school English textbook by means of a questionnaire adapted from Litz (2005). The results of their research indicated that regardless of the course book price and accessibility, which appeared highly reasonable, it requires a profound revision on its layout and design, activities, skills, language types, and topic and content. In another study, Ahour, Towhidian, and Saeidi (2014) evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of Iranian High school "English Textbook 2" from the teachers' perspectives using a modified checklist developed by Litz (2005). Generally, it was found that the overall teachers' perspectives toward this textbook were not favorable. Likewise, Rashidi and Kehtarfard (2014) investigated the appropriateness of "English Book 3" through a needs analysis questionnaire. They concluded that this textbook failed to integrate the four language skills (reading, listening, speaking, and writing) and needs some revision in this regard.

Regarding the newly published textbooks, in a study conducted by Ahour and Golpour (2016), Iranian latest junior high school book "Prospect 1" was estimated in opposition to material assessment checklist from teachers'

outlook. Generally, English teachers had a positive view toward this textbook. Arabloo (2015) evaluated the teachers' thoughts towards the English textbook "Prospect 2"; eighteen male and female teachers from different towns in Iran were interviewed. The findings reflected teachers' positive attitudes towards "Prospect 2". Likewise, Beydokhtinezhad, Azarnoosh, and Abdolmanafi-Rokni (2015) scrutinized "Prospect 1 and 2" based on teachers' perspectives. They held interviews with ten male and female teachers to identify about their feelings towards the books. They found out that the books are based on CLT approach and their activities provide chances for integrated language use. Considering English textbooks for junior and senior high schools, Ajideh and Panahi (2016) evaluated "Prospect" and "Vision" series (only Vision 1 considered). They examined how much the developers of these textbooks considered the role of culture in language teaching and language learning. They argued that by sticking to the source culture, the developers of both textbooks chains have not adequately considered the target culture, which prevents learners from improving their intercultural communicative competence. Similarly, Yousefi, Bashirnezhad and Andi (2017) evaluated the content of the English textbook "Vision 1" from the series of English for senior high school students based on Tomlinson's (2003) model. The results of the descriptive statistics and the content analysis of the interviews revealed that the average level of the students' motivation related to this book was not desirable. The findings indicated that this book has succeeded concerning one area of ARCS namely relevance, but it has not been successful in the three other areas of attention, confidence, and satisfaction.

Pouranshirvani (2017 b) conducted an internal evaluation of "Vision1" from teachers' perspectives. The participants were 30 English teachers from high schools of Isfahan. The researcher used Abdel Wahab's evaluation checklist (2013). In the case of internal evaluation, the participants expressed their opinions about the content and skills. It was found that although the teachers demonstrated a sense of disappointment in some areas such as socio-cultural contexts and pronunciation, they were entirely delighted with the content and most of the skills. Also, Khodabandeh and Mobini (2018) scrutinized the Iranian first-grade senior high school English

textbook “Vision 1” from the teachers' and students' perspectives. They selected 30 male and female teachers, and 70 male and female students and used Litz's (2005) evaluation checklist in terms of seven standards (useful reflections, layout and design, activities, skills, language type, subject and content and cultural considerations). They concluded that some adjustments are required to be carried out to its cultural content to open new windows into learning about the target language culture.

As the literature shows almost no studies have been conducted to evaluate the internal aspects of “Vision 2”. Therefore, this study attempted to evaluate the internal suitability of "Vision 2" for the 11<sup>th</sup> grade senior high school students and discover the strengths and limitations of the textbook based on the teachers' perspectives. Having this purpose in mind, the researcher attempted to answer the following research question:

What are the Iranian EFL teachers' perspectives about internal aspects of English textbook Vision2?

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The population of this study was the Iranian senior high school teachers who were teaching newly published English textbook entitled "Vision 2". Based on convenience sampling, 45 teachers (22 males & 23 females) took part in the study. They were from different senior high schools in Tabriz. Their age range was between 31 and 54 and their teaching experience was between 9 to 27 years.

### **Instruments and Materials**

#### *Materials Evaluation Checklist*

A materials evaluation checklist which was originally developed by Abdel Wahab (2013) was used to evaluate the textbook "Vision 2". The checklist consisted of 140 items, which were categorized into external and internal evaluation items by Pouran shirvani (2017a, 2017b). The internal evaluation checklist, categorized by Pouranshirvani (2017b), consisted of 82 items, on a 5-point likert scale varying from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability and validity of the evaluation checklist was checked and confirmed by its developer (AbdelWahab, 2013). Pouranshirvani (2017b) checked for its validity and reported a high internal reliability (.91)

for this checklist in the context of Iran for "Vision 1". In the present study, the reliability of the internal evaluation checklist for Vision 2 was obtained through Cronbachs' Alpha and it came out to be acceptable (.74). The internal evaluation checklist includes the following categories and sub-categories:

*1. Learning-teaching content*

- A. Subject and content (9 items)
- B. Exercises (10 items)
- C. Social and cultural contexts (9 items)

*2. Language skills*

- A. Listening (7 items)
- B. Speaking (6 items)
- C. Reading (6 items)
- D. Writing (8 items)
- E. Vocabulary (11 items)
- F. Grammar (11 items)
- G. Pronunciation (5 items)

*Textbook "Vision 2"*

The English course book "Vision 2" written by a group of authors (Alavimogaddam, Kheirabadi, Rahimi, & Davari, 2017) for the 11<sup>th</sup> grade senior high school EFL students was used as the material of the study for evaluation. This textbook is a recently published textbook by the Ministry of Education and it was in the first year of its use in the schools. This book is taught three hours per week, consisting of three lessons and each lesson has 10 parts including get ready, conversation, new words and expressions, reading, vocabulary development, grammar, listening and speaking, pronunciation, writing, and finally what you learned, which is altogether 112 pages. There are also exercises and tasks related to the four main skills.

**Design**

This study was a descriptive survey that aimed to discover the outlooks of the senior high school teachers towards the English textbook "Vision 2" developed for Iranian EFL students at the 11<sup>th</sup> grade, and find whether it is a suitable textbook for students at this level or not. Thus, the variable of the study was the teachers' perspective about internal (i.e., subject and content,

exercises, social and cultural contexts and language skills) aspects of "Vision 2".

### **Procedure**

In this descriptive study, the data were quantitatively collected through teachers' responses to the checklist (Abdel Wahab, 2013) that was adapted by Pouranshirvani (2017b). The data collection was carried out in several secondary high schools of Tabriz, Iran, among English teachers who were chosen based on convenience sampling from different senior high schools. The evaluated textbook was among the series of English for school for the 11<sup>th</sup> grade students. First, the researcher asked their friends who were teaching in high schools of Tabriz to distribute the checklists among the teachers who were teaching "Vision 2" in the male and female high schools. The researcher briefed their friends about the checklist and gave the necessary explanations. In some cases, the researcher herself attended administration sessions in order to clarify any probable ambiguities for the participants. The researcher explained the project to the participants in order to guarantee their cooperation before administrating the checklist. They were also assured that their names would be kept confidential and that their answers would not be used for any other purposes. The participants answered the checklist questions in a form of 5-point likert scale ranging from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree". Finally, the collected data were entered into the SPSS 22 for additional statistical analysis.

## **Results**

### **Results of the Research Question**

The research question concerned Iranian EFL teachers' viewpoints about internal aspects of English textbook "Vision2" in terms of (a) subject and content, (b) exercises, (c) social and cultural contexts, (d) listening e) speaking, (f) reading, (g) writing, (h) vocabulary, (i) grammar and (j) pronunciation. As it was stated before, the research question has two main categories consisting of (1) learning-teaching content, and (2) language skills. The first category has three sub-categories, that is, subject and content, exercises and social and cultural contexts and the second category has these sub-categories: four language skills and vocabulary, grammar and



pronunciation. The descriptive statistics such as means (M) and standard deviations (SD) were calculated for each item.

Table 1 reflects the whole mean and standard deviation for the main categories and sub-categories of the internal evaluation of "Vision 2".

Table 1  
*Descriptive Statistics of the Main Categories and Sub-categories of Internal Evaluation of "Vision2"*

Category	SD	M
<b>Internal Evaluation</b>		
<b>1. Learning-teaching content</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>1.14</b>
Subject and content	3.31	1.19
Exercises	3.16	1.03
Social and cultural contexts	3.11	1.22
<b>2. Language skills</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>1.34</b>
Listening	2.88	1.32
Speaking	2.88	1.10
Reading	3.58	1.18
Writing	3.59	0.97
Vocabulary	2.88	1.15
Grammar	3.54	1.05
Pronunciation	3.64	1.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>1.14</b>

Based on Table 1, the mean value for the "Subject and content" is 3.31; for the "Exercises" it is 3.16, and for the "social and cultural contexts" it is 3.11. Taking a look at the results indicates that, in this part, the subject and context anticipated the other two sub-categories, and the "social and cultural contexts" has the lowest mean among these three sub-categories. The total mean is 3.19, which is a little more than the average mean. It shows that this category is almost satisfactory for the teachers.

The second category of internal evaluation is "Language skills", including four main skills, that are, listening, speaking, reading, and writing; and

vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. The mean value for the "listening and speaking" is 2.88 for each, for the "reading" it is 3.58, for the "writing" it is 3.59, for the "vocabulary" it is 2.88, for grammar it is 3.54, and for the "pronunciation" it is 3.64. Based on the results of Table 1, the highest mean (M=3.59) is related to the "writing", while "listening" and "speaking" have the lowest mean (M=2.88) among the main language skills. In addition, the "vocabulary" shares the lowest mean (M=2.88) value with the "listening and speaking" among the whole language skills. Among the seven language skills, the "pronunciation" has the highest mean (3.64). The total mean for the "language skills" is 3.28. Except the three language skills including listening, speaking, and vocabulary, the mean value for other skills is more than the average rank (3.00). It shows that except those three, the other skills are almost acceptable for the teachers. By comparing the total mean for the first and the second categories, that is, "learning-teaching content" (3.19), and "language skills" (3.28), we can conclude that the teachers are more satisfied with language skills than the learning-teaching content. The total mean for internal evaluation is 3.25.

### **Discussion**

As it was mentioned before, internal evaluation has two main categories including learning-teaching content and language skills. Each one is divided into sub-categories. In general, the teachers were not so much satisfied with the first category and its sub-categories (subject and content (M=3.31); exercise (M= 3.16); social and cultural contexts (M= 3.11)). Regarding the second category, they were somehow satisfied with some of the sub-categories (Reading (M= 3.58); Writing (M= 3.59); Grammar (M= 3.54); and Pronunciation (M= 3.64)), and not satisfied with some others (Listening (M=2.88); Speaking (M= 2.88); Vocabulary (M= 2.88)). In this regard, the participant teachers reflected their satisfaction and dissatisfaction with some of the sub-categories that are discussed in detail below. It should be pointed out that the contents of the English books for schools (Vision 1 and Vision2) series are the same (get ready, conversation, new words and expressions, reading, vocabulary development, grammar, listening and speaking, pronunciation, writing, and what you learned). The only difference is that the vocabulary development section is not included in Vision 1 (for the 10<sup>th</sup>

grade students), but it has been added to Vision 2 (for the 11<sup>th</sup> grade students). For this reason and because the researchers of this study could not find any study on the evaluation of Vision 2, they compared and contrasted their results with the results of studies on Vision 1 (e.g., Ajideh & Panahi, 2016; Khodabandeh & Mombini, 2018; Pouranshirvani, 2017b; Yousefi, Bashirnezhad, & Andi, 2017)

The first sub-category of "Learning-teaching content" is subject and content. As the results showed, the teachers believe that the textbook has a variety of topics which provides a file of novel or complex words, and encourages students to state their personal views. The material used in the textbook is up-to-date. The language in the textbook is normal and real. In addition, the course components are successfully and undoubtedly structured about definite subjects. As Richards (2001) suggests in developing ELT materials, developers must consider the sequencing of the content. These findings are in line with the findings of Pouranshirvani's (2017b) about the subject and content of Vision 1. However, the findings indicated that, according to the teachers, the textbook does not contain fun elements, and the topics do not allow students to think critically. These two statements are not in line with the findings of Pouranshirvani's (2017b).

In the second part as the results illustrated, the teachers seem to be satisfied with the exercises ( $M= 3.16$ ). They believe that exercises progress from easy to difficult and have apparent directions to enlighten how every exercise can be completed; they include individual, pair and group work and can be adapted or increased easily; the grammar points and vocabulary items are introduced in encouraging and practical situations. These findings correspond with the findings of Pouranshirvani (2017b). Contrasting with the results of Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018) and Pouranshirvani (2017b) and based on the teachers' responses to some of the items related to exercises, the drills are not sufficient, focused and appealing and do not promote the strength of autonomous learning. The textbook does not provide diversity of important and involuntary exercises and activities to practice language items and skills; similarly, it does not provide models for final achievement tests.

The results of the third sub-category of learning-teaching content, that is, social and cultural contexts (M= 3.11), are mostly in line with the study of Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018), Pouranshirvani (2017b), and Ajideh and Panahi (2016) on Vision 1. They revealed that the book does not succeed to cover matters and subjects related to the second language culture. In the current study on Vision 2, the teachers admitted that the content does not present different cultures, it does not help students be conscious of how to cooperate by means of the language inside a new culture, and it also does not display different traditions and customs. According to the teachers in the current study and Pouranshirvani's (2017b) study, the social and cultural contexts in the textbook are understandable and the textbook conveys helpful insights into cultural origins, occupations, age groups and social groups.

There are cultural distinctions among different people from different nations, and according to Yousefi et al. (2017) who have done a study on "Content evaluation of Vision 1", these cultural discrepancies are brought into language learning classes and may deter language learning. Although the teachers in the present study and the participants in the Pouranshirvani's (2017b) study maintain that the content does not present different cultures and the issues of the content deal with the criteria of students' culture, the participants in both studies consider it as a disadvantage. So, the results of the current study and Pouranshirvani's (2017b) are in agreement with the view of Englebert (2004) who advocates that teaching a foreign language is also teaching a foreign culture, and it is vital to be perceptive to the truth that our students, our colleagues, our supervisors, and, if we live abroad, our neighbors do not share all of our cultural principles.

The second category of internal evaluation refers to different "language skills". This category is divided into seven sub-categories; the related discussions are presented below. About the activities of language skills, Tomlinson (2010) believes that the activities should involve and encourage the use of such high level skills as imagining, using inner speech, making connections, predicting, interpreting, evaluating, and applying.

The first language skill is "Listening". Cunningsworth (1995) mentions that as listening activities provide real information to the students, the amount and the type of listening activities should be considered. As the

results of this study indicated, the teachers mostly did not have positive views ( $M= 2.88$ ) about listening. Corresponding with the findings of Pouranshirvani (2017b), students cannot be familiar with native speakers because there is not a native CD. According to Cunningsworth (1995), activities must follow the nature of listening in real life communication. Based on the teachers' viewpoints in the current research, the listening material is not well recorded and the tasks are not efficiently graded and that the textbook does not have suitable listening tasks with definite purposes and the focus of exercises is on linguistic competence.

Most of the teachers, in general, were not satisfied with the "Speaking" area ( $M= 2.88$ ), as well. Teachers in this study indicated that activities are fair between individual response, pair work and group work. These results correspond with those of Pouranshirvani's (2017b). Yet, the teachers revealed that some activities are not developed to support student-student and student-teacher oral communication, they do not assist students become a more self-assured English speaker or speak about their concerns and happiness, and they indicated that there is not enough material for spoken English in the textbooks. These results are in contrast with the results of Pouranshirvani (2017), and Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018). The current study does not gain support from McDonough and Shaw (2012) who believe that instructional materials should present students with helpful use of all four skills in the form of genuine tasks to boost their enthusiasm.

Brown (2001) strongly stated that in a highly literate society, hundreds of different types of written texts can be used as reading inputs. In teachers' point of view, the "Reading and writing" parts are satisfactory. They are satisfied with these two areas. In the reading area, except the first item in the checklist which points to the existence of sufficient reading material, the rest of the items are in line with the findings of Pouranshirvani (2017b). Unlike the participants of Pouranshirvani's study, the teachers in the current study believed that there are not sufficient reading materials in the textbook.

Most of the teachers in this study stated that writing tasks are not interesting and the allotted time for teaching material is not sufficient; the tasks not only have attainable aims and bear in mind learners' capabilities, but also enhance free writing opportunities; writings are guided and

controlled and some of them are easy for most of the students to manage. On the other hand, the participants in Pouranshirvani's (2017b) study indicated that writing activities are not appropriate in terms of length, degree of accuracy and amount of leadership, and also the textbook does not direct students from simple controlled writing activities to guided writing activities (the teachers in this study agreed with this). As the total mean for "Writing" ( $M= 3.59$ ) shows, the teachers in the study were almost satisfied with the writing section, though they mentioned some shortcomings. Since the results of this part show the agreement of the teachers, the result of this section is also in line with the findings of Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018).

The findings of the present study about "Vocabulary" showed that the load of new words does not correspond with the linguistic rank of students and the exercises are not rich and sufficient, which are not in line with the results of Pouranshirvani (2017b). On the other hand, the teachers of this study said that there is a good allocation of vocabulary load across the whole book, words are contextualized, new lexical items come out in each unit, the thematic nature of the vocabulary exercises is noteworthy, the sentences and examples use words that are acknowledged by learners and finally the content involves culture-specific items. Overall, as the total mean (2.88) of items related to the vocabulary section indicates, the teachers did not have a positive viewpoint on the vocabulary section of the textbook; this was similar to the viewpoints of the teachers in the Shabani and Mansoori Nejad's (2013) study on the old book. They questioned the suitability of the vocabulary items based on their evaluation checklist. This shows that Vision 2 does not remove the weak points of the old book.

Based on the results, the teachers were mostly satisfied with the "Grammar" area ( $M= 3.54$ ). As the teachers mentioned, the grammar is introduced explicitly and it is contextualized, structures are planned to be taught inductively, grammatical structures are easy to be understood, the textbook covers the main grammar items suitable to students at this status and finally the grammar tips are offered with concise and simple instances and clarifications. The results are in line with Pouranshirvani's (2017b) findings. However, the teachers stated that the exercises for grammar practice are not enough and there is no balance between form and use,

accordingly. Brown (2001) explains that teaching grammar is always needed since students need to know the correct form and structure of English sentences. The result of the current study is not in line with what Brown (2001) says. Another point is that the allotted time for teaching material is not sufficient, which is in contrast with the results of Pouranshirvani (2017b), and Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018).

The results for the "Pronunciation" showed the positive ( $M= 3.64$ ) viewpoint of the teachers. It was indicated that this part is easy to be learned and there are cassettes / CDs for its practice, and it is combined with other types of activities such as listening, dialogues, etc. The textbook reflects natural pronunciation and contains enough material for pronunciation exercises. The results of this part differed from the results of Pouranshirvani (2017b). Shabani and Mansoori Nejad (2013) complained that there was no specific section devoted to the practice of stress and intonation. Hence, due to the positive viewpoints of the teachers in the current study, the deficiency in the old book has been removed in "Vision 2".

The main conclusion that can be drawn from the results of this study is that the teachers' perception about the English textbook "Vision 2" was positive in general. As the findings revealed, there are some advantages and disadvantages in "Vision 2". Based on teachers' beliefs, the subject and content do not contain fun elements and the topics do not allow students to think critically. Its exercises and activities do not include satisfactory communicative tasks and significant practices. The content of the textbook does not present various cultures, traditions and customs, and it does not help students to know how to interact using English language. The teachers believed that some skills were not designed appropriately in the textbook and the time allotted for teaching the material is too short and not sufficient. In general, as the results revealed, this textbook is suitable for teaching in terms of exercises, reading and writing, and grammar and pronunciation. However, by applying some changes, especially in listening, speaking and vocabulary, it can be useful for Iranian secondary high school students.

The findings can have implications for writers of the textbook as well as individuals concerned with educational managements. EFL teachers, syllabus designers, curriculum planners, material developers, and the

learners attracted in learning EFL can take advantages of this study. The findings should also be cautiously viewed since further studies are required. Additionally, findings should be evaluated by supplementary reading material designers to compensate for the shortcomings of the textbook and fulfill the educational objectives.

More research is needed to investigate the quality of the book from various perspectives. Further studies can be conducted to evaluate the external aspects of Vision 2; for example, supplementary materials, teachers guide, layout and organization, visuals, objectives, teaching aids, and teaching methods. Moreover, the attitudes of teachers in other cities through this or other checklists and interviews might give a better understanding of the strong points and weak points of the textbook and help the ministry of education to come up with some ideas for the modification of the book. Also, needs analysis is required to find the students' necessities, lacks, and wants.

**Declaration of interest:** none

### References

- AbdelWahab, M. M. (2013). Developing an English language textbook evaluative checklist. *Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 1(3), 55-70.
- Ahour, T., Towhidiyan, B., & Saedi, M. (2014). The evaluation of "English Textbook 2" taught in Iranian high schools from teachers' perspectives. *English Language Teaching*, 7( 3), 150-158.
- Ahour, T., & Golpour, F. (2016). Iranian new junior high school book (Prospect1) weighted against material evaluation checklist from teachers' perspective. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 6(13), 16-35.
- Ajideh, P., & Panahi, M. (2016). An analysis of culture-related content in English textbooks for Iranian students entitled 'Prospect' and 'Vision' series. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(6), 87-93.
- Alamri, A. A. M. (2008). *An evaluation of the sixth grade English language textbook for Saudi boys' schools* (Unpublished master's thesis). King Saudi University, Riyadh.
- Alimorad, Z. (2014). Examining identity options in native and nonnative produced textbooks taught in Iran: A critical textbook evaluation. *Journal*



- of Research in *Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 95-112.
- Alavimogaddam, S. B., Kheirabadi, R., Rahimi, M., & Davari, R. (2017). *The English textbook vision2: English for schools*. Tehran: Ministry of Education of Iran.
- Amalsaleh, E. (2004). *The representation of social actors in the EFL text books in Iran*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Shiraz University, Shiraz.
- Ansary, H., & Babaii, E. (2002). Universal characteristics of EFL/ESL textbooks: A step towards systematic textbook evaluation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 8(2), available on-line at: <http://iteslj.org/Ansary-textbooks/>
- Ansary, T. (2004). *An analytic look at high school English textbook and introducing a sample lesson based on communicative syllabus design*. Unpublished master's thesis, Islamic Azad University- Tabriz Branch, Iran.
- Antic, S., Ivic, I., & Pesikan, A. (2013). *Textbook quality: A guide to textbook standards*. Gottingen: V & R Unipress.
- Arabloo, P. (2015). The Iranian Junior High School English textbook "Prospect 2" from the Teachers' point of view. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 9(1), 85-91.
- Awasthi, R. J., (2006). Textbook and its evaluation. *Journal of NELTA*, 11(12), 1-10.
- Azizfar, A., Koosha, M., & Lotfi, A. R. (2010). An analytical evaluation of Iranian high school ELT textbook from 1970 to the present. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Published by Elsevier Ltd.*, 3, 336-344.
- Beydokhtinezhad, S., Azarnoosh, M., & Abdolmanafi-Rokni, S. J. (2015). The strengths and weaknesses of the Iranian junior high school English textbooks" PROSPECT 1 and 2" from teachers' attitude. *Veda's Journal of English Language and Literature (JOELL)*, 2(2), 165-17.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An interactive approach to language Pedagogy* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). New York: Longman.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing Your Course book*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 36-42.
- Englebert, J. (2004). Character or culture? *EFL Journal*, 24(2), 37-41.
- Fatima, G., KazimShah, S., & Sultan, H. (2015). Text book analysis and evaluation of 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> grade in Pakistan context. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 79-97.

- Ghorbani, M. R. (2011). Quantification and graphic representation of EFL textbook evaluation results. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(5), 511-520.
- Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluation of the EFL materials taught at Iranian high schools. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 130-150.
- Juan, R. (2010). A content analysis of the cultural content in the EFL textbooks. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(5), 137-144.
- Khodabandeh, F., & Mombini, R. (2018). Iranian EFL teachers' and students' perceptions towards the first grade high school English textbook (Vision1). *The Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 11(22), 141-167.
- Kheibari, S. (1999). *Text analysis and evaluation of TEPSOL course books*. Unpublished (Unpublished Master's thesis), Shiraz University.
- Kiely, R. (2009). Small answers to the big question: Learning from language program evaluation. *Language Teaching Research*, 13, 9-16.
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and Methods in ELT: A teacher's guide* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edn.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Najafi, S., Hamidi, H., & Mahmoudi, R. (2013). A critical look at textbook evaluation. A case study of evaluating an ESP course book: English for international tourism. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Science*, 4(2), 312-380.
- Nguyen, T. M. (2015). *Textbook evaluation: The case of English textbooks currently in use at Vietnams upper-secondary school*. Unpublished research report, Singapore: RELC SEAMEO.
- Pouranshirvani, M. (2017a). The external evaluation of new English textbook "Vision1" for tenth-grade students in Iranian high schools from teachers' perspectives. *Science Arena Publications Specialty Journal of Language Studies and Literature*, 1(2), 11-21.
- Pouranshirvani, M. (2017b). The internal evaluation of new English textbook "Vision1" for tenth-grade students in Iranian high schools from teachers' perspectives. *Science Arena Publications Specialty Journal of Language Studies and Literature*, 1(3), 1-14.
- Rahimpour, M & Hashemi, R. (2011). Textbook selection and evaluation in EFL context. *World Journal of Education*, 1(2), 62-68.
- Rashidi, N., & Kehtarfard, R. (2014). A needs analysis approach to the evaluation of Iranian third-grade high school English textbook. *Sage Publication*, 4(3), 1-9.

- Riazi, A. M., & Aryashokouh, A. (2007). Lexis in English textbooks in Iran: Analysis of exercises and proposals for consciousness- raising activities. *Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 17-34.
- Richard, J. C. (2001). The role of text books in a language program. *Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 5, 19-29.
- Shabani, M. B., & Mansoori Nejad, A. (2013). An Evaluation of the Third-Grade High School English Textbook: An Iranian Case Study. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 2(1), 67-80.
- Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42, 237-246.
- Soori, A., Kafipour, R., & Souri, M. (2011). ELT textbook evaluation and graphic representation. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 26(3), 481-493.
- Tok, H. (2010). TEFL textbook evaluation: From teachers' perspectives. *Educational Research and Review*, 5(9), 508-517.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Developing materials for language learning*. London: Continuum.
- Tomlinson, B. (2010). Principles of effective materials development. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice* (pp. 81-98). Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for course book evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 37(3), 251- 255.
- Yousefi, A., Bashirnezhad, H., & Andy, A. (2017). Digital storytelling listening influence on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' pronunciation. *Revista QUID (Special Issue)*, 1702- 1707.
- Zohrabi, M., Sabouri, H. & Behroozian, R. (2012). An evaluation of merits and demerits of Iranian first year high school English textbook. *English Language Teaching*, 5(8), 14-22.

### Biodata

**Tooran Ahour** is an assistant professor of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz branch. She is mainly interested in material evaluation, teaching second language theories (SLA), syllabus design, research methods, and SPSS.

**Elhameh Masoumi Sooreh** is a postgraduate MA student in teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz branch. She is teaching at senior high school for 15 years. She is also interested in material evaluation, teaching language skills, and testing.