

A Checklist-Based Evaluative Study of English Textbook “Prospect 3” from Teachers’ and Students’ Perspectives

Mohammad Ahmadi Safa¹, Fatmeh Karampour²

¹Corresponding author, Associate Professor, English Language Department, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Bu Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran, Email: m.ahmadisafa@basu.ac.ir

²M.A., English Language Department, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Bu Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran, Email:fatima.karampour@gmail.com

Abstract

A key component of any educational program is the “textbook”, the efficiency of which greatly contributes to the accomplishment of the pedagogical goals of the program. The grave significance of the textbook necessitates its rigorous evaluation (Tomlinson, 2008). This study aimed to investigate EFL teachers’ and students’ perspectives on a recently developed Iranian EFL junior high school textbook entitled “Prospect 3”. The participants were 218 third-grade junior high school students and 103 EFL teachers conveniently selected from different junior high schools of Khuzestan, Golestan, Hamedan, and Qom provinces. The evaluation of the textbook was carried out quantitatively through a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire. The analyses revealed that EFL teachers were partially satisfied with Prospect 3; however, EFL students were rather neutral. For the teachers, “*Vocabulary and Grammar*” was the most meritorious aspect, while “*Language Type*” was the least acceptable dimension. From the students’ perspective, the most meritorious aspect of the text was “*Vocabulary and Grammar*”, while “*Layout and Physical Appearance*” was viewed as the least satisfactory dimension. The findings of this work might be of interest to Iranian EFL teachers, syllabus designers, materials developers, and the stakeholders involved in the materials preparation Bureaus of the Iranian Ministry of General Education.

Keywords: textbook evaluation, prospect 3, EFL teachers, EFL learners

1. Introduction

Educational materials constitute one of the most basic parts of any educational curriculum (Nunan, 1999), and in language education fields (e.g., English Language Teaching) they are defined as “anything which can be used to facilitate the learning of a language” (Tomlinson, 2001, p. 66). Given the significant role of textbooks in educational programs and their cognitive, affective, and educational impacts on Second or Foreign Language learners (SL/FL) (Nunan, 1988), teachers are recommended to choose “only those materials which are developed based on sound linguistic and pedagogical principles” (Williams, 1983, p. 255). It is quite evident that such a critical choice entails careful materials evaluation as “a procedure which involves measuring the value (or potential value) of a set of learning materials” (Tomlinson, 2003, p. 15). Materials evaluation is mostly carried out through different methods including checklists, in-depth interview, and integrated methods which make a combination of the two previous procedures (McGrath, 2001) and provided that the evaluation process is carried out systematically, it helps teachers to get effective, accurate, systematic, and contextual perceptions about the whole nature of textbook (Ellis, 1997).

English language teaching theoreticians and practitioners both commonly agree that textbooks play an essential role in language teaching and learning and consider them as “the next important element in the EFL/ESL classroom after the teacher” (Riazi, 2003, p. 21). They are psychologically necessary for both students and teachers as they make the basis upon which the progress and achievement measurement of the learners can be built (Haycroft, 1998). Richards (2007) maintains that the basic criterion for the evaluation of such a determining educational element should be appropriateness and ideal usability

of the textbook in specific situations with some specific learners. Furthermore, materials developers and teachers can “make judgments about the effect of the materials on the people using them” (Tomlinson, 2001, p. 15) through careful evaluation of the textbooks.

While even such a short and brief introduction to the significant role of the textbooks in educational programs and the grave importance of their evaluation reflects the necessity of continuous, organized, and multidimensional evaluation and adaptation of the textbooks especially when they are to be applied in high stake educational contexts like a nationwide mainstream educational program, it is quite evident that Prospect Series as the official English textbook developed by Iranian Ministry of General Education for the nationwide application in junior high schools across the country is yet to be evaluated from different perspectives and more importantly it needs to be put into the ongoing revision and adaptation process (McDonough & Shaw, 2003). It is further evidence that the revision and adaptation of this series are yet to claim due attention of the syllabus designers and materials developers of the Iranian Ministry of General Education, and such a revision gets instigated as a result of a meticulous evaluation of the text. Against such a rationale, this study aimed to evaluate one of the less frequently evaluated members of Prospect Series, i.e. Prospect 3, (Alavi Moghadam et al., 2015) which is considered as the main text for EFL courses of the ninth grade in Iranian general education system.

2. Review of the Related Literature

Educationalists consider the educational materials as a prominent factor in any educational curriculum and do attest to their significant role in the educational process (Mukundan, 2007; Nunan, 1999). This significant role is realized through the provision of “concrete models for desirable classroom

practices” and serving as the basis for teachers’ professional development (Nunan, 1999, p. 98). Moreover, every educational practice requires some sort of educational materials and textbooks as a basis for the learning process (Tomlinson, 2001, 2011). As Hutchinson and Torres (1994) maintain “the textbook is an almost universal element of [English language] teaching. ... no teaching-learning situation, it seems, is complete until it has its relevant textbook (p. 315)”. Besides, it is “the main component of any instructional program as it is difficult to imagine a class without it” (Nunan, 1999, p. 98). Based on what is reviewed in the introduction part above and the brief review of the scholars and practitioners’ perspectives on the importance of the textbooks in educational programs in the present part, it is quite evident that the evaluation of such a key component of education is of crucial significance in any educational context (McGrath, 2002).

Evaluation of educational materials and textbooks started in the 1970s and most of the primary materials evaluation projects and studies were to help teachers and materials developers to extend criteria for evaluating and selecting materials (Chang, 1996). Evaluation is generally defined as “the systematic attempt to gather information to make judgments or pass decisions” (Lynch, 1996, p. 2) and once applied to the realm of educational materials’ evaluation it largely concentrates on the needs of the materials’ users and makes subjective judgments about their influences on the same materials’ users (Tomlinson, 2003). Littlejohn (2011) claims that “materials analysis and evaluation enable us to look inside the materials and to take more control over their design and use” (p. 183). McDonough and Shaw (2003) maintain that materials need to be evaluated in two situations. First, the situation in which the teachers might be allowed to adapt or develop their own materials. Second, the situation in which teachers are determined as the consumers who use the others’ products.

The literature abounds with textbook evaluation studies, however, only few recent exemplar works are reviewed here due to space and word number limit that is even intensified as a result of rather lengthy results and discussion sections. Jahangard (2007) conducted a study to evaluate EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. To this end, four EFL textbooks used in the Iranian high schools were studied using an evaluation checklist. The results of the study showed that the content of the books was attractive for students and encouraged them to learn the English language but the speaking skill was ignored. The researchers concluded that the textbooks were in need of much revision in this regard.

Similarly, Bemani and Jahangard (2014) evaluated “The English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Textbook, Prospect 1” which is developed for the first grade of junior high schools in Iran. This study explored the perspectives of 102 EFL teachers through Litz (2005) evaluation checklist. The results revealed that the teachers were partially satisfied with Prospect 1. They concluded that the presentation of skills and cultural norms in the textbook needs to be revised.

Ahmadi Safa et al. (2017) evaluated second grade English textbook of Iranian junior high schools called “Prospect 2”. Participants of this study were 236 EFL school teachers from seven cities of Iran. A 65-item researcher-made Likert scale questionnaire was used to collect the required data. In addition, 38 teachers participated in a semi-structured interview. The findings indicated that the EFL teachers held positive attitudes and perceptions towards linguistic aspects of the book. However, the EFL teachers had a negative attitude towards authentic contextualization of the language, cultural points, and the physical aspects of the text.

A critical evaluation of Iranian junior high school textbooks (Prospect 1, 2, 3) from teachers’ point of view was conducted by Tavakoli Gheinani et al.

(2017). In this questionnaire-based study, the English teachers' attitudes on the prospect series (1, 2, and 3) and any probable differences among their attitudes were explored. The results revealed that the participants had positive attitudes toward these textbooks. However, a significant difference between the attitudes of the teachers towards Prospect 2 and 3 was reported.

Finally, Ahmadi Safa et al. (2018) evaluated "Prospect I". To this end, a researcher-made questionnaire was administered to 188 high school English teachers conveniently chosen from seven provinces of Iran. Moreover, 146 teachers sat for a semi-structured interview. The analyses revealed that the participating teachers were not satisfied with several aspects of the text including layout and design, the exercises and activities, the integration of the four skills, teachers' book, grammar, vocabulary, language functions, and the proposed teaching methodology of the text.

Against the backdrop of the reviewed theoretical underpinnings and the empirical studies, it is apparent that the third member of the Prospect Series had comparatively received lesser attention and deserved further evaluative studies. Hence, as a partial attempt to address the need, the present study focused on EFL teachers' and learners' perspectives on "Prospect 3" which is the main text for the EFL course of the third-grade junior high school in the Iranian general education system. The study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the attitudes of Iranian EFL teachers towards different aspects of the third-grade junior high school English textbook "Prospect 3"?
2. What are the attitudes of Iranian students towards different aspects of the third-grade junior high school English textbook "Prospect 3"?
3. Is there any discrepancy between Iranian teachers' and learners' beliefs on the English textbook for the third-grade junior high school?

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

A sample of 218 Iranian EFL learners and 105 EFL teachers were conveniently chosen from high schools of Khuzestan, Golestan, Hamedan, and Qom provinces of Iran. They were both male (88 students, 39 teachers) and female (130 students, 66 teachers) with an average age of 36 and 15 for the teachers and students respectively. Learners were in the third year of junior high school level and teachers were experienced English teachers. The average years of teaching experience of the teachers was 12.

3.2. Instrumentation

EFL Textbook Evaluation Questionnaire developed by Ahmadi Safa et al. (2018) was used as the main data collection instrument in this study. It consists of 60 five-point Likert scale items addressing 7 aspects of the textbook: 1) layout and formatting 2) activities and exercises 3) content and language skills 4) supplementary materials and teacher's guide 5) language types 6) methodology and 7) vocabulary and grammar. The construct validity of the questionnaire was assured in the original study through expert judgment and exploratory factor analyses, meanwhile, Cronbach Alpha analysis was applied as a measure on the internal consistency of the scale, and the estimated reliability index of the questionnaire was found to be ($\alpha=0.90$).

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

The data was collected from EFL teachers and students of public junior high schools in four provinces of Khuzestan, Golestan, Hamedan, and Qom. To

gather data, EFL Textbook Evaluation Questionnaire developed by Ahmadi Safa et al. (2018) was administered to the EFL teachers and students in hard copy in face to face contacts or virtually through email correspondence and Telegram messaging application.

3.4. Data Analysis

To answer the first two research questions concerning the attitudes of EFL teachers and students towards Prospect 3, descriptive statistics including percentage, mean, and the standard deviation was used. To determine whether there was a discrepancy between Iranian EFL teachers and students in terms of their overall beliefs (i.e., the third research question), independent samples t-tests were run.

4. Results

In the following parts, the descriptive statistic information concerning the teachers' and students' attitudes towards different aspects of the textbook is tabulated. Table 1 depicts the descriptive statistic data on the layout and physical appearance of the text.

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics for (a) Layout and Physical Appearance*

| Item | Likert Scale Percentage % | | | | | | N | Participants |
|---|---------------------------|----------------|-------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|-----|--------------|
| | Mean | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | | |
| 1. The book has a good layout and physical appearance | 2.99 | 8.6 | 39 | 9.5 | 28.6 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.82 | 11.5 | 26.6 | 14.2 | 28.0 | 19.7 | 218 | Students |
| 2. The book is well organized | 3.31 | 15.2 | 38.1 | 16.2 | 23.8 | 6.7 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.96 | 13.3 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 15.1 | 218 | Students |
| 3. Hard cover of the book is attractive enough. | 3.02 | 14.3 | 29.5 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 13.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.20 | 5 | 11.5 | 13.8 | 38.5 | 31.2 | 218 | Students |
| 4. Images and figures are clear, simple with no confusing details. | 3.06 | 11 | 34.3 | 19 | 20 | 15.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.64 | 8.3 | 21.1 | 19.7 | 28.9 | 22.0 | 218 | Students |
| 5. Images in the book are attractive and of high quality. | 3.11 | 18.1 | 26.7 | 19 | 21 | 15.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.44 | 8.7 | 15.1 | 17.9 | 28.9 | 29.4 | 218 | Students |
| 6. Images, tables, charts, and shapes available are relevant and effective. | 2.96 | 9.5 | 26.7 | 27.6 | 22.9 | 13.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.41 | 9.2 | 12.8 | 19.3 | 28.0 | 30.7 | 218 | Students |
| 7. The table of contents is comprehensive and quite useful. | 3.15 | 16.2 | 33.3 | 13.3 | 23.8 | 13.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.68 | 12.4 | 18.8 | 17.0 | 28.9 | 22.9 | 218 | Students |
| 8. Preface of the text briefly explains objectives and fundamental learning theories based on which the text is designed. | 3.20 | 13.3 | 30.5 | 29.5 | 17.1 | 9.5 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.67 | 6.4 | 19.7 | 28.0 | 27.1 | 18.8 | 218 | Students |
| 9. A useful list of references is included at the end of the textbook. | 3.09 | 16.2 | 26.7 | 22.9 | 19 | 15.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.83 | 17.0 | 18.8 | 19.3 | 21.1 | 23.9 | 218 | Students |
| 10. Useful index/s is/are included and is/are quite helpful. | 3.19 | 10.5 | 39 | 19 | 21.9 | 9.5 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.67 | 8.7 | 18.8 | 26.6 | 23.4 | 22.5 | 218 | Students |
| 11. List of words at the end of the book is useful and effective. | 3.16 | 17.1 | 28.6 | 19 | 23.8 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.81 | 18.3 | 15.6 | 21.1 | 19.3 | 25.7 | 218 | Students |
| Criteria | | | | Mean | | Std. Deviation | | |
| Layout and Physical Appearance | | | | 3.11 | | 1.25 | 105 | Teachers |
| | | | | 2.64 | | 1.29 | 218 | Students |

As is shown in Table 1, the mean score and standard deviation for the teachers' evaluation of layout and physical appearance are 3.11 and 1.25 respectively. It shows that most EFL teachers were partially satisfied with the layout and physical appearance of Prospect 3. Around half of the teachers (about 39% agree and 8% strongly agree) believed that the design and layout of the textbook are appropriate. Around 49 percent of the teachers agreed that the book provides adequate guidelines about how to use the book. Additionally, 53.3 percent of the teachers agreed that the book is organized appropriately and 45.3 percent of the teachers agreed that pictures in the book are clear. On the other hand, as is indicated in Table 1, the mean score and standard deviation for the students' evaluation of this aspect were 2.64 and 1.29 respectively. It is evident that most EFL students were less satisfied with the layout and physical appearance of Prospect 3 than the teachers.

The mean scores of the individual items of the questionnaire ranged from 2.20 to 2.96. Around 70 percent of the students (38.5% disagree and 31.2% strongly disagree) believed that the book does not have an attractive layout, 59 percent believed that the images and tables of the book are not relevant, around 60 percent thought that the images of the book are not attractive, 51 percent did not accept that the table of the contents is comprehensive and appropriate, and 51 percent did not accept the images of the book as clear. Concerning the second evaluated aspect of the textbook i.e. activities and exercises, descriptive statistics results are summarized in Table 2 below. This aspect was measured through seven items (12-18) in the questionnaire.

Table 2*Descriptive Statistics for (b) Activities and Exercises*

| Item | Likert Scale Percentage % | | | | | | N | Participants |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|-------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|-----|--------------|
| | Mean | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | | |
| 12. The book includes a balanced range of exercises | 2.99 | 10.5 | 27.6 | 23.8 | 26.7 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.88 | 12.8 | 22.5 | 21.1 | 27.1 | 16.5 | 218 | Students |
| 13. A good range of individual, pair, and group works is included in the text. | 3.36 | 13.3 | 42.9 | 20 | 14.3 | 9.5 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.94 | 15.6 | 20.6 | 23.4 | 23.9 | 16.5 | 218 | Students |
| 14. Activities are designed in such a way that lead students to meaningful communications | 3.24 | 14.3 | 37.1 | 19 | 18.1 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.00 | 17.4 | 21.1 | 22 | 23.4 | 16.1 | 218 | Students |
| 15. Activities of the book encourage students to respond creatively, innovatively, and independently | 2.97 | 10.5 | 31.4 | 17.1 | 26.7 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.55 | 9.2 | 17 | 22 | 24.3 | 27.5 | 218 | Students |
| 16. Activities of the book are enough to support and inspire students in meaningful and communicative practices. | 2.99 | 9.5 | 29.5 | 23.8 | 24.8 | 12.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.65 | 12.8 | 14.2 | 21.1 | 29.4 | 22.5 | 218 | Students |
| 17. Activities helps students learn grammar by creating real and actual situations. | 3.00 | 10.5 | 31.4 | 21 | 21.9 | 15.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.80 | 11.9 | 18.3 | 29.3 | 19.3 | 21.1 | 218 | Students |
| 18. Course content throughout the book is properly recycled and learning new things is evaluated through different tasks and activities. | 3.12 | 11.4 | 36.2 | 17.1 | 23.8 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.98 | 14.2 | 22 | 26.6 | 22 | 15.1 | 218 | Students |
| Criteria | | | | Mean | | Std. Deviation | | |
| Activities and Exercises | | | | 3.10 | | 1.22 | 105 | Teachers |
| | | | | 2.82 | | 1.25 | 218 | Students |

Table 2 indicates that the teachers' mean score for the acceptability of the activities and exercises was 3.10 and its standard deviation was 1.22 showing that EFL teachers were moderately pleased with the activities and exercises of *Prospect 3*. However, the mean score for the activities and exercises' acceptability from the students' point of view was 2.82 and the standard deviation was 1.25, which shows that the students were less satisfied with the activities and exercises than the teachers. As Table 2 reveals, while 27.6 percent of the teachers believed that Prospect 3 partially provides a balanced variety of exercises and activities (item 12), almost 37 percent of the teachers believed that the exercises and activities included in Prospect 3 inspire inadequate meaningful and communicative practices (item 16).

More than half of the teachers (42.9% and 13.3% respectively agreed and strongly agreed) believed that the activities of the book provided a good range of individual activities, pair works, and group activities (item 13). They also believed that activities are designed in such a way that lead students to create meaningful communications (37.1% agree and 14.3% strongly agree) (item 14). Almost 48 percent of the teachers agreed the textbook content is reviewed and recycled throughout the book and the learners learning of new content is evaluated through different tasks and activities (item 18). While 42 percent of the teachers agreed that activities of the book, encourage students to respond creatively, innovatively, and independently, 41 percent disagreed (item 15). Most EFL teachers were pleased with introducing vocabulary and grammar points in realistic and motivating contexts. According to Table 2, the mean score for the students' evaluation of this aspect was 2.82 and the standard deviation was 1.22, showing that EFL students were only moderately pleased with the activities and exercises of Prospect 3. As indicated in Table 2, the mean for all seven

subcategories of activities and exercises was above 2.5 showing that the textbook's activities and exercises were seen as relatively satisfactory.

Also, Table 2 shows that 38.4 percent of the students agreed that Prospect 3 activities are designed in such a way that they lead students to create meaningful communications (item 14). More than half of the students (27.5% disagreed and 24.3 strongly disagreed) believed that the textbook's activities encourage students to respond creatively, innovatively, and independently (item 15), and 22.5 percent disagreed and 29.4 percent strongly disagreed that the exercises and activities inspire adequate meaningful and communicative practices (item 16). Concerning the content and language skills aspect of the textbook, descriptive statistics obtained from 21 items (19-39) of the questionnaire are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for (c) Content and Language Skills

| Items | Mean | Likert Scale Percentage % | | | | | N | Participants |
|---|------|---------------------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|-----|--------------|
| | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | | |
| 19. The content of the different parts of the book is like a window that opens into the culture of a second language (English). | 3.29 | 14.3 | 38.1 | 21.9 | 14.3 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.02 | 16.9 | 19.7 | 26.6 | 22.0 | 14.6 | 218 | Students |
| 20. Considering the range of the students' age, cultural information is appropriate to arise the interest of the students. | 2.92 | 9.5 | 28.6 | 21 | 26.7 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.71 | 11.9 | 17.8 | 24.3 | 25.2 | 16.5 | 218 | Students |
| 21. Activities and special exercises such as games, music, and songs are included in the book as much as possible. | 2.47 | 4.8 | 14.3 | 29.5 | 26.7 | 24.8 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.99 | 17.43 | 16.0 | 24.7 | 27.0 | 19.2 | 218 | Students |
| 22. Wide and diverse range of countries are represented and named in the book. | 2.19 | 2.9 | 14.3 | 15.2 | 34.3 | 33.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.72 | 11.0 | 16.9 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 20.6 | 218 | Students |
| 23. Opportunities provided for students are similar to the actual conditions of language use. | 2.12 | 4.8 | 9.5 | 14.3 | 36.2 | 35.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.40 | 6.4 | 11.0 | 25.2 | 31.1 | 26.1 | 218 | Students |
| 24. Students are asked to compare their culture with the second culture (English) and explore similarities and differences between models and concepts of the two cultures. | 2.20 | 3.8 | 10.5 | 19 | 35.2 | 31.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.52 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 22.9 | 26.1 | 27.9 | 218 | Students |

| Likert Scale Percentage % | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|-----|--------------|
| Items | Mean | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | N | Participants |
| 25. The content of the book presents real-life issues and encourages critical thinking. | 2.54 | 8.6 | 15.2 | 23.8 | 26.7 | 25.7 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.50 | 6.8 | 15.1 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 26.6 | 218 | Students |
| 26. Topics and content of the book are consistent with the needs, interests, and age of the students. | 3.26 | 11.4 | 41 | 21.9 | 14.3 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.83 | 13.3 | 21.1 | 26.1 | 19.7 | 15.1 | 218 | Students |
| 27. There is enough variety in subjects in the content of the book. | 2.66 | 9.5 | 19 | 20 | 31.4 | 20 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.57 | 9.6 | 13.7 | 24.7 | 28.8 | 23.3 | 218 | Students |
| 28. Examples and explanations of the book are understandable for students. | 3.37 | 13.3 | 43.8 | 19 | 14.3 | 9.5 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.14 | 14.6 | 31.1 | 22.9 | 16.0 | 15.1 | 218 | Students |
| 29. Conversations, tasks, and activities are attractive to students and as close as possible to real-life tasks. | 3.08 | 15.2 | 29.5 | 17.1 | 24.8 | 13.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.55 | 8.2 | 18.8 | 20.6 | 24.7 | 27.5 | 218 | Students |
| 30. Instructions to various sections are clear enough for learners. | 3.30 | 18.1 | 32.4 | 21 | 19 | 9.5 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.93 | 15.1 | 29.3 | 16.9 | 15.1 | 18.8 | 218 | Students |
| 31. Content and images are generally attractive to students. | 3.18 | 4.8 | 46.7 | 21.9 | 15.2 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.16 | 12.8 | 25.2 | 34.4 | 16.5 | 14.6 | 218 | Students |
| 32. Gradation of the content (including grammar, vocabulary, etc.) in terms of the level of difficulty is appropriate. | 3.28 | 14.3 | 36.2 | 22.9 | 17.1 | 9.5 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.51 | 6.8 | 15.1 | 23.8 | 31.1 | 22.9 | 218 | Students |
| 33. This book covers all four language skills in an appropriate way. | 2.95 | 11.4 | 30.5 | 17.1 | 23.8 | 17.1 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.88 | 14.2 | 19.7 | 27.9 | 16.0 | 22.0 | 218 | Students |
| 34. This book contains and focuses on the content and skills that students need to practice. | 3.20 | 14.3 | 34.3 | 20 | 21 | 10.6 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.67 | 8.2 | 23.3 | 20.1 | 24.3 | 23.8 | 218 | Students |
| 35. The texts included are useful in terms of theme, content, and exercises. | 3.12 | 11.4 | 36.2 | 20 | 18.1 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.85 | 9.1 | 19.2 | 35.7 | 19.2 | 16.5 | 218 | Students |
| 36. Activities that are used before, during, and after addressing the four language skills and sub-skills are engaging and helpful. | 2.99 | 14.3 | 20 | 29.5 | 22.9 | 13.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.26 | 5.5 | 14.6 | 20.1 | 28.8 | 21.5 | 218 | Students |
| 37. The conversations have been well designed to enable students to use them for real purposes outside the classroom. | 3.21 | 12.4 | 37.1 | 21.9 | 17.1 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.18 | 16.9 | 35.7 | 10.5 | 22.0 | 14.6 | 218 | Students |
| 38. Grammar rules are provided reasonably and graded based on the task difficulty. | 3.10 | 15.2 | 26.7 | 25.7 | 18.1 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.79 | 10.0 | 23.8 | 23.3 | 20.6 | 22.4 | 218 | Students |
| 39. Listening and reading assignments with audio files are various and present different dialects of English to students. | 2.68 | 6.7 | 24.8 | 19 | 29.5 | 20 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.70 | 11.9 | 16.5 | 24.7 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 218 | Students |
| Criteria | Mean | Std. Deviation | | | | | | |
| Content and Language Skills | 2.91 | 1.27 | | | | | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.75 | 1.20 | | | | | 218 | Students |

As is displayed in Table 3, the mean score for the teachers' evaluation of content and language skills is 2.91 and the standard deviation is 1.27, indicating that EFL teachers were moderately pleased with the representation of the content and the four language skills in *Prospect 3*. The mean scores of the items ranged from 2.12 to 3.37. Item 23 with the mean of 2.12 had the lowest value indicating that the teachers had a rather negative attitude towards opportunities which were provided for EFL students' language use, whereas item 28 with the mean of 3.37 had the highest value indicating that the teachers had a comparatively more positive perspective about the examples and explanations.

The most advantageous aspects of the content and language skills section from the teacher's point of view were apparently related to the comprehensibility of examples (item 28, $M=3.37$), clarity of instructions (item 30, $M=3.30$), the cultural content of the different parts (item 19, $M=3.29$), content gradation (item 32, $M=3.28$), consistency of the topics and content of the book with the needs, interests, and age of the students (item 26, $M=3.26$), well-designed conversations (item 37, $M=3.21$), the focus of the book on the content and skills that students need to practice (item 34, $M=3.20$), attractive content and images (item 31, $M=3.18$), the usefulness of the texts (item 35, $M=3.12$), provision and gradation of grammar rules (item 38, $M=3.10$), and attractive conversations, tasks, and activities for students (item 29, $M=3.08$).

The least item mean scores were for items 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 in which more than half of the high school teachers were not satisfied with the resemblance between the opportunities provided in the text and the actual conditions of language use (item=23, $M=2.12$), the range of countries represented in the book (item 22, $M=2.19$), the representation of the concepts of the two cultures (item 24, $M=2.20$), and the lack of activities that encourage critical thinking (item 25, $M=2.54$). On the other hand, the mean score for the

students' evaluation of the content and skills was 2.75 and the standard deviation was 1.20, showing that EFL students were even less positive with the demonstration of skills and the content of *Prospect 3*.

As Table 3 indicates, the mean scores for the students' evaluation of this aspect ranged from 2.26 to 3.18. Item 36 with the mean score of 2.26 had the lowest value, whereas item 37 with the mean of 3.18 had the highest value. From the students' perspective, the conversations were viewed as well designed (item 37, $M=3.18$), while the activities addressing the four language skills were not viewed as highly engaging and helpful (item 36, $M=2.26$). In addition to the conversations (item 37, $M=3.18$) other advantageous aspects of content and language skill from the students' point of view were the attractive images (item 31, $M=3.16$), clear examples and explanations (item 28, $M=3.14$), and the English culture representation (item 19, $M=3.02$).

On the other hand, the other most disadvantageous aspects of the content and skills part of the text from the students' perspective were related to items 23, 25, and 36 in which the high school students were not satisfied with the opportunities provided (item 23, $M=2.40$), the authenticity of the tasks and activities (item 25, $M=2.50$) and, activities that are used before, during, and after addressing the four language skills and sub-skills. The supplementary materials and teacher's guide aspect of the text were addressed through five items (40-44) of the questionnaire. Table 4 summarizes the descriptive statistics obtained in this regard.

Table 4*Descriptive Statistics for (d) Supplementary Materials and Teacher's Guide*

| Item | Likert Scale Percentage % | | | | | | N | Participants |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----|--------------|
| | Mean | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | | |
| 40. There is also a Teacher's Guide containing useful guidelines for the novice as well as experienced teachers. | 3.20 | 18.1 | 30.5 | 17.1 | 22.9 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.48 | 8.7 | 9.6 | 26.6 | 31.1 | 23.8 | 218 | Students |
| 41. Recommended practices in the Teacher's Guide are based on the latest research findings in the field of language teaching and learning. | 3.02 | 14.3 | 23.8 | 26.7 | 21 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.90 | 15.5 | 16.5 | 26.6 | 25.2 | 16.0 | 218 | Students |
| 42. In the Teacher's Guide, appropriate techniques are provided to enable students to activate their background knowledge about reading comprehension texts. | 3.17 | 14.3 | 29.5 | 26.7 | 18.1 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.07 | 16.0 | 27.0 | 20.1 | 21.5 | 15.1 | 218 | Students |
| 43. Concerning different parts and activities of the book, a useful and usable teacher's guide is presented in the book itself. | 2.93 | 9.5 | 30.5 | 20 | 23.8 | 16.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.98 | 24.6 | 24.7 | 24.3 | 21.1 | 10.5 | 218 | Students |
| 44. useful tasks and exercises are provided in the workbook | 3.00 | 14.3 | 29.5 | 15.2 | 23.8 | 17.1 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.62 | 12.8 | 18.8 | 22.4 | 19.2 | 17.4 | 218 | Students |
| 45. In addition to the original book, effective complementary materials such as CD, video, cards are also provided for the students. | 2.97 | 16.2 | 21 | 22.9 | 23.8 | 16.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.22 | 8.2 | 10.0 | 13.7 | 35.7 | 27.5 | 218 | Students |
| Criteria | | | Mean | | Std. Deviation | | | |
| Supplementary materials and teacher's guide | | | 3.04 | | 1.28 | | 105 | Teachers |
| | | | 2.71 | | 1.08 | | 218 | Students |

As indicated in Table 4, the teachers' mean score for acceptability of supplementary materials and teacher's guide is 3.04 and the standard deviation is 1.28, showing that EFL teachers were fairly satisfied with the supplementary materials and teacher's guide.

The teachers' mean scores for the items of this factor ranged from 2.93 to 3.20. Item 43 enjoyed the lowest value ($M=2.93$) which addressed the usefulness

and usability of the teachers' guide for each part and item 40 enjoyed the highest value ($M= 3.20$) that addressed the inclusion of useful guidelines for novices as well as experienced teachers in the teachers' guide. On the other hand, the mean score for the students' evaluation of the supplementary materials is 2.71 and the standard deviation is 1.08. As indicated in Table 4, the range of mean scores was from 2.22 to 3.07. From the student's perspective, the supplementary material including CD and pictorial cards received the lowest rating (item 45, $M=2.22$). The language type aspect of the textbook was evaluated through four items (46-49) of the questionnaire. The obtained descriptive statistic data of the analyses are presented in Table 5.

Table 5*Descriptive Statistics for (e) Language Types*

| Item | Likert Scale Percentage % | | | | | | N | Participants |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|-------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|-----|--------------|
| | Mean | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | | |
| 46. The language functions contain language applications that the learners will use in their daily interactions. | 2.80 | 8.6 | 28.6 | 16.2 | 27.6 | 19 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.65 | 6.4 | 21.1 | 26.1 | 23.8 | 22.4 | 218 | Students |
| 47. Language used in the book is real, expresses the language that is used in everyday life. | 2.94 | 14.3 | 22.9 | 20 | 28.6 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.23 | 16.9 | 31.1 | 22.4 | 17.4 | 11.9 | 218 | Students |
| 48. The language used in the book is in accordance with the language proficiency level of the learners. | 3.10 | 14.3 | 30.5 | 21.9 | 18.1 | 15.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.51 | 25.2 | 33.0 | 18.8 | 14.2 | 8.7 | 218 | Students |
| 49. The language used in the book, covers a variety of dialects and vocabulary types. | 2.25 | 4.8 | 9.5 | 19 | 40 | 26.7 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.48 | 8.2 | 13.7 | 18.3 | 33.0 | 31.1 | 218 | Students |
| Criteria | | Mean | | Std. Deviation | | | | |
| Language types | | 2.77 | | 1.28 | | | 105 | Teachers |
| | | 2.96 | | 1.20 | | | 218 | Students |

As displayed in Table 5, the mean score for the teachers' evaluation of language types is 2.77 and the standard deviation is 1.28, which shows EFL teachers had a rather neutral perspective about the language type component of the text. As indicated in Table 5, the mean score for the teachers' evaluation of the items ranged from 2.25 to 3.10. Item 49 has the lowest value showing that language used in the book, encompasses a variety of dialects and vocabulary types ($M=2.25$). In other words, 26.7 percent of the teachers strongly disagreed and 40 percent of them disagreed with this item. While item 48 i.e., Language used is in accordance with the language proficiency level of the addresses, enjoyed the highest value ($M=3.10$), as 44.8 percent of the respondents had a positive view about the correspondence and 33.3 percent had a negative idea in this regard. On the other hand, the mean score for the students' evaluation of language types is 2.96 and its standard deviation is 1.20, showing that EFL students had a more positive perspective about the language types aspect of the text than that of their teachers.

As the results revealed (Table 5), the mean scores for the students' evaluation of the items ranged from 2.48 to 3.51. Item 49 indicating that the language of the text presents a variety of dialects had the lowest value ($M=2.48$), as 31.1 percent of the students strongly disagreed and 30 percent of them disagreed. While item 48 that addressed the accordance of the language with the language proficiency of the addresses received the highest value ($M=3.51$), as 33 percent of the respondents agreed and 25.2 percent of the students strongly agreed. It can be concluded that most students seemed pleased with the textbook's language types. The methodology aspect of the textbook was measured through five items (i.e., 50-53) of the questionnaire, and the obtained descriptive data are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6*Descriptive Statistics for (f) Methodology*

| Item | Likert Scale Percentage % | | | | | | N | Participants |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----|--------------|
| | Mean | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | | |
| 50. Student book content seems applicable to different methods of language teaching English. | 3.10 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 21.9 | 23.8 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.68 | 13.7 | 20.6 | 33.0 | 22.0 | 10.5 | 218 | Students |
| 51. Activities of the book are design based on the communicative language teaching approach. | 3.03 | 11.4 | 31.4 | 21 | 21.9 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.95 | 16.0 | 24.3 | 19.2 | 19.7 | 20.6 | 218 | Students |
| 52. Different learning styles and strategies of the learners are considered in this book. | 3.06 | 14.3 | 27.6 | 22.9 | 21 | 14.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.20 | 16.0 | 27.0 | 24.7 | 18.8 | 13.3 | 218 | Students |
| 53. Activities are so designed to let the students take responsibility for their own learning. | 3.12 | 18.1 | 27.6 | 18.1 | 21 | 15.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.11 | 16.5 | 23.7 | 22.4 | 18.3 | 16.5 | 218 | Students |
| Criteria | | | Mean | | Std. Deviation | | | |
| Methodology | | | 3.07 | | 1.11 | | 105 | Teachers |
| | | | 2.98 | | 1.15 | | 218 | Students |

According to Table 6, the mean score and standard deviation for the teachers' evaluation of methodology are 3.07 and 1.11, respectively, indicating EFL teachers had partially a positive view about the methodology endorsed in the textbook. As shown in Table 6, the range of mean scores for the teachers' evaluation of this aspect was from 3.03 to 3.12. Item 51 with the mean of 3.03 enjoyed the lowest value, while Item 53 with the mean of 3.12 enjoyed the highest value. That is, nearly 46 percent of them agreed that activities of the book are designed in such a way that enables learners to take responsibility for their learning, and nearly 36 percent of the teachers disagreed that activities of the book are designed based on communicational language teaching approach. On the other hand, the mean score and standard deviation of the students'

evaluation of methodology are 2.98 and 1.15, respectively, showing EFL students had a neutral perspective on the textbook's methodology.

As shown in Table 6, the range of mean scores for the students' evaluation of this aspect was from 2.68 to 3.20. Item 50 with the mean of 2.68 enjoyed the lowest value, while item 52 with the mean of 3.12 enjoyed the highest value. That is, nearly 35 percent of the high school students disagreed that activities of the book are completely practicable using different ways of teaching English, and nearly 42 percent of them agreed that this book is matched with various language learning styles and strategies. The vocabulary and grammar component of the text was measured through seven items (i.e., 54-60) of the questionnaire. The results of the analyses are summarized in Table 7 below.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for (g) Vocabulary and Grammar

| Item | Mean | Likert Scale Percentage % | | | | | N | Participants |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|-----|--------------|
| | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | | |
| 54. The number of new vocabulary the book introduces is appropriate at this level of proficiency. | 3.24 | 19 | 29.5 | 20 | 20 | 11.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.15 | 15.3 | 27.0 | 22.0 | 20.1 | 13.3 | 218 | Students |
| 55. Recycling vocabulary throughout the book has been done effectively. | 3.23 | 17.1 | 31.4 | 21.9 | 17.1 | 12.4 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.02 | 13.3 | 22.0 | 35.3 | 12.8 | 16.5 | 218 | Students |
| 56. Distribution of the words (from easy to difficult) in each chapter has been properly done. | 3.07 | 11.4 | 36.2 | 14.3 | 24.8 | 13.3 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.24 | 18.8 | 26.6 | 26.6 | 16.5 | 11.4 | 218 | Students |
| 57. Grammar is presented and explained clearly and implicitly practiced throughout the book. | 3.00 | 15.2 | 28.6 | 15.2 | 23.8 | 17.1 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.43 | 25.6 | 25.4 | 21.1 | 11.4 | 12.8 | 218 | Students |
| 58. Grammar rules are chosen based on their frequency of usage in daily conversations | 3.35 | 14.3 | 38.1 | 25.74 | 12.4 | 9.5 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.18 | 16.0 | 33.4 | 16.9 | 19.7 | 13.7 | 218 | Students |
| 59. Considering the students' needs, the grammar rules are appropriate to their language proficiency level. | 3.36 | 17.1 | 36.2 | 21.9 | 15.2 | 9.5 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 3.14 | 17.4 | 26.6 | 26.1 | 12.8 | 16.9 | 218 | Students |
| 60. The grammar points are presented in authentic sentences or short paragraphs. | 2.88 | 9.5 | 26.7 | 21.9 | 26.7 | 15.2 | 105 | Teachers |
| | 2.78 | 10.5 | 17.4 | 28.8 | 26.6 | 16.5 | 218 | Students |
| Criteria | Mean | Std. Deviation | | | | | | |
| Vocabulary and grammar items | 3.16 | 1.26 | | | 105 | Teachers | | |
| | 3.13 | 1.18 | | | 218 | Students | | |

According to Table 7, the mean score and standard deviation for the teachers' evaluation of vocabulary and grammar items are 3.16 and 1.26, respectively, showing partial agreement of EFL teachers on vocabulary and grammar section of Prospect 3. As shown in Table 7, the mean scores for the teachers' evaluation of the vocabulary and grammar items ranged from 2.88 to 3.36. Item 59 with the mean of 3.36 enjoyed the highest value, while item 60 with the mean of 2.88 received the lowest value. That is, 3.63 percent of the high school teachers agreed that considering the students' needs, the grammar rules of the textbook are appropriate to their language proficiency level, on the other hand, 2.88 percent of them agreed that the grammatical points are presented in authentic sentences or short paragraphs. On the other hand, the mean and standard deviation for the students' evaluation of the vocabulary and grammar items are 3.13 and 1.18 respectively, indicating partial satisfaction of EFL students on vocabulary and grammar section of Prospect 3.

Table 7 further indicates that the mean scores for the students' evaluation of the vocabulary and grammar items ranged from 2.78 to 3.43. Item 60 with the mean of 3.43 enjoyed the highest value, while item 57 with the mean of 2.78 enjoyed the lowest value. That is, 51 percent of the high school students agreed that grammar was explained clearly and 43 percent of them disagreed that grammar is provided in the context of authentic and interesting language.

Table 8 shows descriptive statistics for all subcategories of Prospect 3.

Table 8*Descriptive Statistics for all Subcategories*

| Item | Participants | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|--------------|------|----------------|
| (1) Layout and Physical Appearance | Teachers | 3.11 | 1.25 |
| | Students | 2.64 | 1.29 |
| (2) Activities and Exercises | Teachers | 3.10 | 1.22 |
| | Students | 2.82 | 1.22 |
| (3) Content and Language Skills | Teachers | 2.91 | 1.27 |
| | Students | 2.75 | 1.20 |
| (4) Supplementary Materials and Teacher's Guide | Teachers | 3.04 | 1.28 |
| | Students | 2.71 | 1.08 |
| (5) Language Types | Teachers | 2.77 | 1.28 |
| | Students | 2.96 | 1.20 |
| (6) Methodology | Teachers | 3.07 | 1.11 |
| | Students | 2.98 | 1.15 |
| (7) Vocabulary and Grammar Items | Teachers | 3.16 | 1.26 |
| | Students | 3.13 | 1.18 |
| Total | Teachers | 3.02 | 1.23 |
| | Students | 2.85 | 1.18 |

As Table 8 indicated, the mean scores for the teachers' evaluation of all subcategories ranged from 2.77 to 3.16. Vocabulary and grammar items with a mean of 3.16 enjoyed the highest value, while language types with a mean of 2.77 had the lowest value. Also, the mean scores for two subcategories, i.e. (1) layout and physical appearance and (5) Activities and Exercises was fairly the same ($M=3.11$, $M=3.10$). Finally, the mean score for all subcategories (all items) was 3.02 which is almost a high value. That is, Iranian EFL junior high school teachers were partially satisfied with *Prospect 3*.

As results in Table 8 indicated, the mean scores for the students' evaluation of all subcategories ranged from 2.64 to 3.13. Vocabulary and grammar items enjoyed the highest value ($M=3.13$), while the layout and

physical appearance had the lowest value ($M=2.64$). Also, the mean scores for three subcategories, i.e. (4) language types and (5) methodology was fairly the same ($M=2.96$, $M=2.98$) indicating that most of the students' answers ranged between "disagree" and "neutral". Finally, the mean score for all subcategories (or all items) was 2.89 which is an almost low value showing that Iranian EFL junior high school students were not satisfied with Prospect3. To address the third research question, an independent samples t-test was run the results of which are shown in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9

Group Statistics for the Difference between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs

| | Group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--|----------|-----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Layout and format | Students | 218 | 31.82 | 4.75 | .32 |
| | Teachers | 105 | 47.88 | 3.85 | .37 |
| Activities and Exercise | Students | 218 | 26.85 | 3.82 | .25 |
| | Teachers | 105 | 28.91 | 2.77 | .27 |
| Content and Language Skills | Students | 218 | 72.41 | 7.29 | .49 |
| | Teachers | 105 | 71.40 | 5.34 | .52 |
| Supplementary Materials and Teacher's Guide | Students | 218 | 19.64 | 2.72 | .18 |
| | Teachers | 105 | 21.03 | 2.21 | .21 |
| Language Types | Students | 218 | 13.83 | 1.39 | .09 |
| | Teachers | 105 | 12.42 | 1.39 | .13 |
| Teaching Method | Students | 218 | 16.27 | 1.39 | .09 |
| | Teachers | 105 | 18.52 | 1.08 | .10 |
| Vocabulary And Grammar Items | Students | 218 | 21.83 | 2.38 | .16 |
| | Teachers | 105 | 18.26 | 1.91 | .18 |

Table 9 shows the means and standard deviation for the teachers' and students' evaluation of layout and format of the textbook were, respectively, $M=47.88$ and $SD=3.85$, $M=31.82$ and $M=4.75$, while the same measures for textbook activities and exercises were, accordingly, $M=28.91$ and $SD=2.77$,

$M=26.85$ and $SD=3.82$. Moreover, the same measure for content and language skills, educational aid materials and guidance teacher textbook, and language types from teachers' point of view were found to be, in order, $M=71.40$ and $SD=5.34$, $M=21.03$ and $SD=2.21$, $M=12.42$ and $SD=1.39$, however, the results from students' viewpoint were $M=72.41$ and $SD=7.29$, $M=19.64$ and $SD=2.72$, $M=13.83$ and $SD=1.39$ respectively. As for the two factors of teaching method and vocabulary and grammar items, the means and SDs for the teachers' evaluation of these aspects were $M=18.52$ and $SD=1.08$, $M=18.26$ and $SD=1.91$, and the mean score and SD for the students' evaluation of teaching method were $M=16.27$ and $SD=1.39$, and for vocabulary and grammar items $M=21.83$ and $SD=2.38$ were obtained.

As is indicated above, to compare the teachers' and student's beliefs on the different aspects of the textbook, independent samples t-tests were run. The results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Independent Samples t-test for the Difference between Teachers' and Students' Beliefs

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Layout and format | Equal variances assumed | 7.25 | .007 | -30.16 | 321 | .000 | -16.06 | .53 | -17.11 | -15.01 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -32.43 | 248.27 | .000 | -16.06 | .49 | -17.04 | -15.08 |
| Activities and Exercise | Equal variances assumed | 21.98 | .000 | -4.93 | 321 | .000 | -2.06 | .41 | -2.88 | -1.23 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -5.49 | 271.89 | .000 | -2.06 | .37 | -2.79 | -1.32 |
| Content and Language Skills | Equal variances assumed | 6.27 | .013 | 1.25 | 321 | .210 | 1.00 | .79 | -.56 | 2.57 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.39 | 270.05 | .164 | 1.00 | .71 | -.41 | 2.41 |
| Supplementary Materials and Teacher's Guide | Equal variances assumed | 8.11 | .005 | -4.55 | 321 | .000 | -1.39 | .30 | -1.99 | -.79 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -4.89 | 247.47 | .000 | -1.39 | .28 | -1.95 | -.83 |
| Language Types | Equal variances assumed | .43 | .511 | 8.46 | 321 | .000 | 1.40 | .16 | 1.07 | 1.72 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 8.44 | 204.52 | .000 | 1.40 | .16 | 1.07 | 1.72 |
| Teaching Method | Equal variances assumed | 11.28 | .001 | -14.57 | 321 | .000 | -2.24 | .15 | -2.55 | -1.94 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -15.87 | 256.84 | .000 | -2.24 | .14 | -2.52 | -1.96 |
| Vocabulary and grammar items | Equal variances assumed | 4.80 | .029 | 13.38 | 321 | .000 | 3.57 | .26 | 3.04 | 4.09 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 14.43 | 250.56 | .000 | 3.57 | .24 | 3.08 | 4.06 |

As shown in Table 10, there was a significant difference between the teachers' and students' evaluation of layout and format, $t(248.27) = -32.43$, $p = .00 < .05$. Concerning the textbook activities and exercises, a significant discrepancy was also found between teachers' and students' attitudes, i.e. $t(271.89) = -5.49$, $p = .00 < .05$. However, no significant difference was found between teachers' and students' evaluation of the textbook's content and language skills, $t(270.05) = 1.39$, $p = .16 > .05$. Concerning supplementary materials and teacher's guide, $t(247.47) = -4.89$, $p = .00 < .05$, that is to say, there was a statistically significant difference between teachers' and students' beliefs. As for the language types $t(321) = -8.46$, $p = .00 < .05$, a statistically significant variation was found between teachers and students on their beliefs concerning language types of the textbook. With respect to the textbook's teaching method, a significant difference was also found between both groups, $t(256.48) = -15.87$, $p = .00 < .05$. Moreover, concerning vocabulary and grammar items, a statistically significant discrepancy was found between the teachers' and students' beliefs, i.e. $t(250.56) = 14.43$, $p = .00 < .05$.

5. Discussion

This study aimed to investigate EFL teachers' and students' perspectives on a recently developed Iranian EFL junior high school textbook entitled "Prospect 3" from seven aspects including layout and formatting, activities and exercises, content and language skills, supplementary materials, and teacher's guide, language types, methodology and, vocabulary and grammar items.

Based on the result of the study, the most meritorious aspect of the textbook from the teachers' and students' point of view was the vocabulary and grammar aspect. The teachers believed that the grammar points were appropriately chosen based on the students' level of proficiency and their needs

and language applications in everyday conversations. They also believed that the vocabulary size of the text was appropriate considering the students' level of proficiency, and repetition and recycling of the new words were effectively done throughout the book. Moreover, the students believed that grammar points were presented and explained clearly and the distribution of the words from easy to difficult was properly done.

Both the teachers and students were satisfied with the activities and exercises of the textbook. They believed activities of the book led students to meaningful communications and encouraged students to cooperate which in turn resulted in learners' further motivation for learning the language. On the other hand, more than half of the students believed that the textbook's activities and exercises promote original, creative, and independent language productions. It seems that the reason for this positive perception of the students was that activities and exercises were clear and students could do them without any ambiguity. Similar to the findings of the present study in this regard, Bemani and Jahangard (2014) reported a positive outlook of the EFL learners towards different aspects of Prospect 1.

Contrary to Jahangard (2007) who reported that the content of Iranian high school English textbooks was attractive and encouraging for the learners. EFL teachers and students in this study were not satisfied with the "content and language skills" and "supplementary materials and teacher's guide". They believed that the content and language skills were not sensitive to the students' needs, interests, and age and the content did not provide a proper balance of the four language skills. For example, listening and speaking skills were almost totally neglected, because the students used the textbook without using CD, as a result, their listening and speaking activities were quite limited. On the other hand, from the participating teachers' perspective, the teacher's guide was not

useful enough and the instructions for different parts and activities of the main text could not provide the teachers with the required clues and hints and supplementary materials including CD and pictorial cards were not attractive and effective enough. This piece of finding supports those of Ahmadi Safa et al. (2018), Ahmadi Safa et al. (2017) which both reflected the teachers' negative attitudes towards Prospects 1 and 2 respectively. However, the findings are in contrast to Tavakili Gheinani et al. (2017) which generally reported a positive attitude of the teachers towards prospect 3.

The teachers were partially satisfied with the layout and physical appearance of the test book but students' perspectives were not positive with this aspect of the textbook. It seemed that the dissatisfaction of the students with the appearance of the book was due to the quality of the images. Moreover, the content of the images and the pictures seem to be another problematic aspect of the images. Dissatisfying layout and physical appearance aspect of the Prospect series was reported in earlier studies as well. For example, Ahmadi Safa, et al., (2017) showed that participants' attitude was quite negative towards authentic contextualization of the language and the physical aspects of the textbook. On the other hand, the students were satisfied with the language type used in the text while the teachers were not satisfied with this aspect of the textbook.

Finally, comparing the teachers' and students' beliefs on different aspects of the textbook, Prospect 3 was meritorious in some aspects and suffered from some others from the teachers' and student's perspectives. EFL teachers were partially satisfied with vocabulary and grammar, layout and physical appearance, activities, and exercises, and methodology. A similar result was reported in Tavakoli Ghenani et. al. (2017) in this regard. However, the teachers believed that the supplementary materials and teacher's guide, content and language skills, and language types were in need of revision. On the other hand, students

believed the most meritorious aspect of this textbook were vocabulary and grammar items, methodology, language types, and activities and exercises while, content and language skills, supplementary materials and teacher's guide, and layout and physical appearance were the least positive aspects of this textbook, respectively.

6. Conclusions

This study investigated EFL teachers' and students' perspectives on a recently developed Iranian EFL junior high school textbook entitled "Prospect 3" and for this purpose, a textbook evaluation questionnaire was employed for data collection. As a conclusive statement, the study revealed that EFL teachers were partially satisfied with Prospect 3, however, EFL learners adopted neutral perspectives on this textbook. From the teachers' and students' point of view, the presentation of vocabulary and grammar was the most meritorious aspects of the text as they believed that the selection, gradation, and sequencing of vocabulary and grammar points were tuned to the students' level of proficiency and needs. On the other hand, from the students' perspective, layout and physical appearance were viewed as the least satisfactory dimension of the text, while from the teachers' perspective language type was the least acceptable dimension. The findings of this study can potentially be helpful for curriculum designers and textbook writers in the Iranian Ministry of Education in particular and other educational organizations in general. Moreover, language teachers need to consider the reported merits and demerits of the textbook and address the pitfalls most appropriately in their own unique contexts. However, the study results need to be cautiously applied on the grounds several limitations might restrict the generalizability of the findings: First, the convenience sampling procedure applied in this study is a nonprobability sampling procedure, second,

the collected data of the study was limited to a quantitative questionnaire-based body of data. Further studies are suggested to evaluate the text using both qualitative and triangulated approaches of data collection.

References

- Ahmadi Safa, M., Donyae, S., Sohrabi, S., Farahani, M., Khassemy, D., & Saeedpanah, E. (2018). First grade high school English textbook evaluation: Prospect I. *Critical Studies in Texts & Programs of Human Sciences*, 8(18), 1-26.
- Ahmadi Safa, M., Ghonche Poor, A., Malek Mohammadi, R., Seifi, Z., & Zekrati, S. (2017). Prospect II: A textbook evaluation study based on EFL teachers' perspective. *Journal of Language Studies*, 9(24), 7-32.
- Alavi Moghadam, B., Kheir Abadi, R., Rahimi, M., & Alavi, M. (2015). *Prospect 3: English book for school*. Textbook Publishing Company.
- Bemani, M., & A. Jahangard (2014). Attitude analysis of teachers: The case of Iranian newly developed EFL textbook for junior high schools. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 7(1), 198-215
- Chang, D.Y. (1996). Applications of the extent analysis method on fuzzy AHP. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 95(3), 649-655.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 36-42.
- Haycroft, J. (1998). *An introduction to English language teaching*. Longman.
- Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal*, 48(4), 315-328.
- Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 130-150.
- Littlejohn, A. (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan Horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 179-211). Cambridge University Press.
- Litz, D. R. A. (2005). Textbook evaluation and ELT management: A South Korean case study. *Asian EFL Journal*. Retrieved May, 2014 from [http://www.asian-efljournal.com/Litz thesis](http://www.asian-efljournal.com/Litz%20thesis).

- Lynch, B. K. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. (2nd Ed). Blackwell.
- McGrath, I. (2001). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh University Press.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh University Press
- Mukundan, J. (2007). Evaluation of English language textbooks: Some important issue for consideration. *Journal of NELTA*, 1(2), 80-84.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Riazi, A. M. (2003). What textbook evaluation schemes tell us? A study of the textbook evaluation schemes of three decades. In W.A. Renanda (Ed.), *Methodology and materials design in language teaching* (pp. 52-68). SEAMEO Regional Center.
- Richards, G. (2007). *Cultural tourism: Global and local perspectives*. Haworth Press.
- Tavakoli Gheinani, M., Tabatabaei, O., & Chakhorzade, Sh. (2017). Critical evaluation of Iranian junior high school textbooks (Prospect 1, 2, 3): Teachers' view in focus. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research Volume*, 4(8), 241-255.
- Tomlinson, B. (2001). Materials development. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 66-71). Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Developing materials for language teaching*. Continuum.
- Tomlinson, B. (2008). *English language learning materials: A critical review*. Continuum.

- Tomlinson, B. (2001). Materials development. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 66–71). Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Material development in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 37(3), 251-255.