Iranian Language Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on English Result Series at Intermediate Level

Mehdi Azadsarv[a*], Mohammad Taghvaee[b], Ali Zangoei[c], Emad Kishani Farahani[d]

[a,b,d] *English Department, Imam Khomeini University of Naval Sciences, Nowshahr, Iran*
[c] *University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran*
[a] *Email: arasazadsarv@gmail.com*
[b] *Email: taghvaee2010@gmail.com*
[c] *Email: zangoei.ali@gmail.com*
[d] *Email: kishani.emad65@gmail.com*

Abstract

As the means of transferring knowledge between teachers and students, coursebooks play a significant role in educational practices all over the world. Evaluation of coursebooks is also of great significance as it manages to a better understanding of the nature of a specific teaching/learning situation. The present study is an attempt to evaluate English Result coursebook from both Iranian EFL learners' and teachers' perspectives. Seventy three students and 16 teachers participated in this study. Forty six of the students and six of the teachers were male and 27 of the students and 10 of the teachers were female. The range of teachers' experience of teaching the coursebook was between 2-4 years and the range of students' experience of studying the coursebook was between 1-3 years. The data collection took place in three language institutes of Gilan and Mazandaran provinces. The coursebook, evaluated based on modified version of Cunningsworth's checklist [1], was the intermediate level of English Result. It was evaluated by both students and teachers based on administering written questionnaires.

----

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: arasazadsarv@gmail.com.

In order to triangulate the gathered data, 25 percent of the teachers and 10 percent of the students attended an interview session. Data analysis indicated that the strengths of English Result from teachers' perspective are methodology, visuals and culture and from students' view are grammar and visuals. Moreover, the coursebook's weaknesses from both teachers' and students' perspectives are vocabulary and phonology**.**

Keywords: coursebook; checklist; evaluation; English Result.

1. Introduction

In the process of language teaching and learning, several components are involved in such as the learners, the teachers, the environment in which the learning event is taking place, the purpose of learning, and more importantly the textbooks, since they undoubtedly specify the main part of the teaching in the classroom and out-of-class learning of the students. Hutchinson and Torres [2] state no teaching-learning situation is complete without adopting its appropriate textbook. Materials and textbooks serve as one of the main instruments for shaping knowledge, attitudes, and principles of the students [3].

Today, coursebooks are of vital significance to educational practices all over the world since they serve as the means of transferring knowledge between teachers and students. In addition, they are considered as the basis for much of the language input and the language practice which learners receive in the classroom. As Richards [4] states, for learners the textbook might provide the main source of contact they maintain with the language. Litz [5] asserts that whether one believes textbooks are too inflexible and biased to be used directly as instructional material, there can be no denying that they are still the most valuable element in educational systems. Garinger [6] believes that a textbook can serve different purposes for teachers: as a core resource, as a source of supplemental material, as an inspiration for classroom activities, and even as the curriculum itself.

As a relatively new trend in the field of English language teaching (ELT), coursebook evaluation has attracted many language scholars' and curriculum developers' attention. Coursebooks have to be evaluated, since they are the basic materials in the learning process. The aim of textbook evaluation was to develop checklists based on which a book could be analyzed in detail in order to assure its usefulness and practicality with such factors as proficiency level of students, learners' needs, course objectives, gender, and many other contextual factors. [7]

Tomlinson [8] proposes coursebook evaluation is an applied linguistic activity through which teachers, supervisors, administrators and materials developers can make judgments about the effect of the materials on the people using them. Kiely [9: 105] asserts that evaluation attempts to ensure "quality assurance and enhancement" and constructs "a dialogue within programs for ongoing improvement of learning opportunities". McGrath [10] holds that coursebook evaluation is also of a significant value for the development and administration of language learning programs. Therefore, evaluating coursebooks in order to see whether they are suitable is of crucial significance.

Sheldon [11] states coursebooks are the visible heart of any ELT program for both teachers and students; however, they are not free from shortcomings. Litz [5] asserts that having dissatisfied textbook is due to the fact that they are often considered as the tainted and product of an author's or a publisher's design for quick profit.

Coursebooks are considered as significant resources for teachers and instructors in helping learners learn every subject including English. Finding an English institute without a coursebook is something surprising in Iran. Even some people compare different institutes and different teachers based on the coursebook they use in their English classes. Iranian students depend heavily on coursebooks and learn materials in a way that are displayed in their coursebooks; therefore, the content of textbook outweighs anything else.

Textbooks do not only influence what and how students learn, but also what and how teachers teach. Few teachers teach without a textbook that offers content and activities that form much of what occurs in a class. Nowadays textbooks play a very vital role in the dominion of language teaching and learning. In addition, after teachers, textbooks are considered to be the next significant aspect in the foreign language classroom. As Hutchinson and Torres [2] believe, the textbook is an almost worldwide component of English language teaching. Millions of copies are sold yearly, and many aid plans have been set up to produce them in different countries.

McDonough and Shaw [12] believe that there are several circumstances that it is needed to evaluate textbooks. The first is when the teachers might be given the choice to adopt or develop their materials and the second is when they are just users of other people's products. In both of these circumstances, some degree of evaluation is necessary. In EFL settings it can be discussed that the teacher and the textbook are the two most significant and immediate cultural links between the student's innate culture and the target foreign culture. If the dominant roles of the teacher and the textbook are accepted, then the way the textbook portrays the role of several people in the target society and the way they use language to express their meanings directly affect EFL students' choices of language when communicating with native speakers. Therefore, the materials and textbooks of each era in the history of ELT reflect the ethics and philosophies of a teaching method which were trendy at that time.

According to Sheldon [11], we need to evaluate textbooks for two reasons; first, the evaluation will help the teacher or program developer in making decisions on selecting the appropriate textbook. Furthermore, evaluation of the merits and demerits of a textbook will familiarize the teacher with its probable weaknesses and strengths. This will enable teachers to make appropriate adaptations to the material in their future instruction. [11]

Therefore, the present study is an attempt to address the issues mentioned above by determining the overall pedagogical value and suitability of the English Result coursebook from both Iranian EFL learners' and teachers' perspectives.

This study seeks answer to the following questions:

1.   How is English Result series viewed from language teachers' and students' perspectives?
2.   What are the strengths and weaknesses of English Result series?

2. Review of literature

English language teaching consists of significant components among which coursebooks and instructional materials are of vital importance in EFL/ESL classes and courses and are often employed by language teachers. Coursebook is a universal constituent of English language teaching. In ELT, coursebooks have always been one of the most preferred instructional resources. They are best viewed as a material in achieving goals and aims that have already been set concerning learner needs [1]. In spite of the development of new technologies which makes high-quality teacher-generated materials possible, a need for coursebooks grows every day, and new series of coursebooks are published every year [13].

Ur [14] defined coursebook as a textbook of which the teacher and, usually, each student has a copy, and which is in principle to be followed systematically as the basis for a language course. It also provides a clear framework. She proposed that coursebooks clarify subsequent materials and learners know where they are going. Due to having ready-made texts and tasks, coursebooks save the time of the teacher. In addition, it guides the inexperienced teachers. Ur added that a textbook could provide the learner with some degree of autonomy. In other words, a learner without a textbook becomes more teacher-dependent. [14]

In addition, coursebooks have a significant role to play in language classes in all educational settings: public schools, universities, and language schools. Razmjoo [15] stated that working with a coursebook gives most students a sense of progress and achievement. Coursebooks are identified as an ineffective resource for self-directed learning and an effective resource for teacher-directed learning. Moreover, they are considered as a source of ideas and activities, a reference source for students, a syllabus that reflects predetermined learning objectives. They also serve as a support for the beginning teachers who have yet to gain in confidence [1].Therefore, it can be concluded that the basic role of coursebooks is to be at the service of teachers and learners but not their boss.

According to Daoud and Celce-Murcia [16], it is useful to know some information on coursebook selection as sometimes it is teachers' duty to choose a coursebook which is going to be taught in a class. This selection should not be arbitrary; rather, it has to be careful and systematic. They also stated that even in places where teachers are not directly involved in coursebook selection, they might be asked to give reports on the effectiveness of the coursebooks they are already taking advantage of. Several criteria for selecting an appropriate coursebook have been offered although carrying out a sound selection of appropriate coursebooks is not a fully objective process. In spite of various guidelines which are offered, teachers' subjective judgments are central to coursebook selection. In materials selection, the materials have to be matched with goals and objectives of the program, and it is important to make certain that they are in line with one's beliefs about the nature of language and learning, as well as with one's learners' attitudes, beliefs, and preferences. [16]

Coursebook evaluation is an approximately new phenomenon in language teaching field. If coursebooks' values are accepted in English language teaching, it has to be with the qualification that they have acceptable level of quality, usefulness, and appropriateness for the context and people with whom they are being used. Coursebook evaluation and material selection is not an easy job. Effective evaluation of teaching materials is a very significant professional activity for all EFL/ESL teachers. Low [17: 153] stated that "designing appropriate

material is not a science; it is a strange mixture of imagination, insight and analytical reasoning, and this fact must be recognized when materials are assessed."

Several scholars proposed various definitions and interpretations for coursebook evaluation. Coursebook evaluation typically functions as a sort of educational judgment. Richards, Platt, and Weber [18: 98] defined evaluation as "the systematic gathering of information for purposes of making decisions." Hutchinson and Waters [19: 41] considered evaluation as "a matter of judging the fitness of something for a particular purpose". From Tomlinson's [20] point of view, evaluation is the systematic judgment of the value of materials in relation to the purposes of the materials and the learners who are using them.

Coursebook evaluation is of great significance as it manages to a better understanding of the nature of a specific teaching/learning situation. In addition, it is of vital importance in education and for teachers as it gives them precious information for the future going of classroom practice, for the course planning, and for the management of learning tasks and students. Finally, evaluation is necessary for the use of instructional materials such as textbooks.

The most common method of conducting a coursebook evaluation is making use of an appropriate checklist that is developed by well-known scholars. While the subject of coursebook evaluation has not been extensively investigated, several authors have offered methods of assisting teachers to be more accurate in their evaluation by demonstrating evaluation checklists based on criteria which can be used by teachers and learners in various situations. Soori, Kafipour, and Soury [21] defined checklist as an instrument which provides the evaluator with a list of features of successful teaching/learning materials.

Several scholars have conducted a detailed investigation of a textbook's language content that has managed to the production of large amounts of evaluation checklists. One of these checklists is Cunningsworth's [22] checklist in which he touches upon the significance of relating coursebooks to course goals and the learners' needs and processes. Another one is Sheldon's [11] checklist which includes a large variety of components and tries to evaluate all aspects of content such as graphics and physical characteristics to authenticity and flexibility.

In spite of Sheldon's [11] suggestion that no list of criteria can really be used in all ESL/EFL settings without modification, most of these checklists include similar parts which can be applied as useful starting points for ELT teachers in various situations. Several scholars in the field of coursebook design like Sheldon [11], Brown [23], and Cunningsworth [1] all assented that evaluation checklists ought to have some criteria related to the physical features of coursebook like layout, organizational, and logistical features as well. Other significant criteria which should be included are the criteria to evaluate a coursebook's methodology, objectives, approaches and the extent to which particular materials are not only teachable, but also are appropriate for both teacher's approach and organization's curriculum. In addition, criteria have to analyze the particular language functions, grammar, and skills which are covered by a specific coursebook and the relevance of linguistic elements to the socio-cultural context. Finally, coursebook evaluations have to contain criteria which are related to presentation of culture and gender as well as the degree to which the linguistic items, subjects, content, and

topics fit the learner's personalities, backgrounds, needs, and interests as well as those of the teacher and/or institution.

A review of the literature indicates that most evaluation checklists have common characteristics. For example, Skierso's [24] checklist contains features pertaining to bibliographical data, aims and goals, subject matter, vocabulary and structures, exercises and activities, and layout and physical makeup. These characteristics are mostly consistent with those in Cunningsworth's [1] checklist which considers aims and approaches, design and organization, language content, skills, topic, methodology, and practical considerations. Even though the topic of the parts in the two checklists seem different, an investigation of the items will display that they are approximately similar. For instance, Skierso [24] considers the cost-effectiveness of the coursebook in the section named 'bibliographical data', while Cunningsworth [1] refers to it in the 'practical consideration' section. Daoud and Celce-Murcia [16] proposed a checklist for coursebook evaluation which includes five main parts: subject matter, vocabulary and structures, exercises, illustrations, and physical make-up. Every part consists of detailed strategies that can be used in assessing and analyzing every coursebook.

The checklist used in the present study was a coursebook evaluation checklist which was primarily designed by Cunningsworth [1] and specifically modified for this study. Cunningsworth [1: 2] stated that since "different criteria will apply in different circumstances", teachers and researchers ought to identify their own priorities and develop their own checklists. The checklist used in this study consists of fifty three criteria in fourteen sections; content, grammar, vocabulary, phonology, language skills, methodology, study skills, visuals, practice and testing, supplementary material, objectives, content selection, gradation, and culture. Moreover, the checklist has a four-point multiple-choice Likert scale format.

3. Method

3.1. Participants

The participants of this study were selected from various language institutes of Gilan and Mazandaran provinces in which English Result coursebook was taught. Three institutes were selected randomly. Seventy three students and 16 teachers participated in this study. Forty six of the students and six of the teachers were male and 27 of the students and 10 of the teachers were female. The range of teachers' experience of teaching the coursebook was between 2-4 years and the range of students' experience of studying the coursebook was between 1-3 years.

3.2. Instruments

The instruments employed in this study are students' and teachers' checklists modified from Cunningsworth [1].

3.2.1. Checklist

The checklist employed in the present study was developed mainly from Cunningsworth's [1] checklist after tailoring it to meet the objectives of this study. Some of the items of the questionnaire were modified and some were removed from the questionnaire since they did not suit Iran's context. These modifications were made

based on the interviews that the researcher had with four TEFL experts. Cunningsworth [1: 2] proposed that as "different criteria will apply in different circumstances", teachers or researchers ought to specify their own priorities and prepare their own checklists. Sheldon [11: 242] states "any culturally restricted, global list of criteria can never really apply in most local environments, without considerable modification." Therefore, the items of the cultural section of the questionnaire were taken from Shatery and Azargoon's nativized checklist [25].

The checklist used in the study includes 53 criteria in 14 categories: content, grammar, vocabulary, phonology, language skills, methodology, study skills, visuals, practice and testing, supplementary material, objectives, content selection, gradation, and culture. It was used to indicate participants' opinions regarding the four coursebooks used in the study. A four-point multiple-choice Likert scale format, ranging 1-4, was used to show participants' level of agreement with a list of statements. Each statement was weighted equally (1 point for each strongly disagree, 2 points for each disagree, 3 points for each agree, and 4 points for each strongly agree). All scores were converted to percentile rankings (0-100%).

Students and teachers completed the same version of checklist, to allow for comparison across groups, although the teachers' version included some additional items. One of the benefits of employing a single questionnaire was avoiding linguistic and cultural biases, and also achieving results which were as precise as possible. While both questionnaires included nine common categories (statements 1-30) - content, grammar, vocabulary, phonology, language skills, methodology, study skills, visuals, and practice and testing- the teachers' questionnaire had five additional categories: supplementary material, objectives, content selection, gradation, and culture (statements 31-53). Both questionnaires had an open-ended section where participants were given the opportunity to write their own comments or suggestions regarding the coursebook. Finally, the researcher reviewed the coursebook thoroughly to provide a descriptive analysis of the 14 categories.

In addition to English statements, students' checklist was accompanied by Persian translation of the statements in order to remove any ambiguities for students in understanding the statements of the questionnaire. In order to ensure the validity of the checklist's translation, the researcher asked a translation expert to translate the questionnaire into Persian. The Persian translations were translated into English by three experts. The comparison of these three translated checklists with the original one showed no considerable difference; therefore, it was concluded that the Persian translation of the checklist was valid.

Pilot study

In order to estimate how reliable the use of the checklist is, the researcher administered the checklist to the pilot group of 30 students and 30 teachers. Cronbach`s Alpha was used for the computation of the internal consistency of the checklist. The reliability index for the present study's checklist was found to be 0.94, for students' questionnaire and 0.86 for teachers' questionnaire, both are considered high reliabilities. To ensure the content and face validity of the checklist, the comments of five experts were sought. Each strongly confirmed the appropriateness of the checklist in regard to the general objective of evaluating coursebooks.

It is worth mentioning that the researcher took advantage of the students' and the teachers' comments and suggestions about the questionnaire and applied some slight modifications in the final version.

3.3. Procedure

This study aimed at evaluating one of the most frequently used foreign coursebook in Iran, namely English Result. The data collection took place in three institutes of Gilan and Mazandaran provinces. The coursebook, evaluated based on the evaluation checklist, was the intermediate level of English Result. The textbook was evaluated by both students and teachers based on administering written questionnaires. The researcher requested institutes' supervisors for permission to administer the research instruments in the selected classes in collaboration with class teachers. The questionnaires were administered and collected in one session. The researcher himself attended administration sessions in order to clarify any probable ambiguities for students and teachers. Before administering the questionnaire, the project was explained to the participants in the study in order to guarantee their cooperation. All the participants were given an oral description of objectives and procedures of the questionnaire. They were also assured that the results would be kept confidential. They had ample amount of time to go over the questionnaire items and answer them.

In order to empower the gathered data, 25 percent of the teachers and 10 percent of the students attended to an interview session. The researchers' final insights and overall evaluation of the coursebooks were made in section four after analyzing the gathered data. In this section, the weakness and strengths of the coursebook were discussed. Once the data were collected, appropriate statistical tests were used to find out the significance of the results.

3.4. Data Analysis

In order to analyze the collected data from the questionnaires, first of all descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations were computed to summarize the students' responses to the checklists. In addition, chi squares were run to see whether the differences in each item were meaningful or not. Moreover, the interviews that included open-ended items were analyzed qualitatively. It must be noted that all the statistical analyses were conducted by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 17.0) program. Hypotheses were tested on alpha .05. Finally, the results were interpreted and discussed thoroughly.

4. Results

In this section, all the administered questionnaires from both teachers' and students' perspectives were analyzed and their reports were presented.

4.1. Analysis of the Questionnaires

As it is indicated in table 1, in item1, 100% of the teachers *agreed* that the selected topics are familiar to the students (M = 3.00, SD=.00).

In the second item, 87.5% of the teachers *agreed* and 12.5% of them *disagreed* that the selected topics enhance learners' motivation (M = 2.87, SD=.34). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 9.00, p < .05.

Table 1. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to content

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
1. The selected topics are familiar to the students.	16	3.00	.00	0	100	0	0	---	0	---
2. The selected topics enhance learners' motivation.	16	2.87	.34	0	87.5	12.5	0	9.00	1	.00
3. The CB contains adequate self-check progress report.	16	2.62	.72	6.3	56.3	31.1	6.3	11.00	3	.01
4. Texts and dialogues include new vocabulary and grammatical structures.	16	2.87	.81	18.8	56.3	18.6	6.3	9.00	3	.03
5. Language items (e.g. vocabulary, etc) are presented *in context* to make meaning clear.	16	2.94	.25	0	93.8	6.2	0	12.25	1	.00
6. Pedagogic texts and dialogues include a variety of interesting subjects.	16	2.57	.63	6.2	44.8	49	0	5.37	2	.07

Note. S. Agr. = Strongly Agree; Agr. = Agree; D. Agr. = Disagree; S. D. Agr. = Strongly

The next item considers whether English Result coursebook contains adequate self-check progress report or not. The results show that 6.3% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.3% of them *agreed* that the coursebook contains adequate self-check progress report. In addition, 31.1% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.3% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.62, SD=.72; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 62.6%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed, disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 11.00, p < .05.

The findings in item 4 display that 18.8% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.3% of them *agreed* that texts and dialogues include new vocabulary and grammatical structures. In addition, 18.6% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.3% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.87, SD=.81; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75.1%).

Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed, disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 9.00, p < .05.

The fifth item considers if language items (e.g. vocabulary, etc) are presented *in context* to make meaning clear. The results show that 93.8% of the teachers *agreed* and 6.2% of them *disagreed* that the language items (e.g. vocabulary, etc) are presented *in context* to make meaning clear (M = 2.94, SD=.25). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 12.25, p < .05.

In the last item of this category, 6.2% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 44.8% of them *agreed* that pedagogic texts and dialogues include a variety of interesting subjects. In addition, 49% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.57, SD=.63; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 51%). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 5.37, p > .05.

As it is indicated in table 2, in the first item, 17.8% of the students *strongly agreed* and 71.2% of them *agreed* that the selected topics are familiar to the students. Moreover, 11% of the students had the opposite idea and *disagreed* with the item (M = 3.07, SD =.54; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 89%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 73) = 47.69, p < .05.

In the second item, 13.7% of the students *strongly agreed* and 64.4% of them *agreed* that the selected topics enhance learners' motivation. Moreover, 17.8% of the students *disagreed* and 4.1% of them *strongly disagreed* with the item (M = 2.86, SD=.69; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. =78.1%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 63.27, p < .05.

The next item considers whether English Result coursebook contains adequate self-check progress report or not. The results show that 11% of the students *strongly agreed* and 54.8% of them *agreed* that the coursebook contains adequate self-check progress report. In addition, 31.5% of the students *disagreed* and 2.7% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.74, SD=.69; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. =65.8%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed, disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 47.38, p < .05.

The findings in item 4 display that 19.2% of the students *strongly agreed* and 65.8% of them *agreed* that texts and dialogues include new vocabulary and grammatical structures. In addition, 13.7% of the students *disagreed* and 1.4% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 3.03, SD= .62; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 85%). However, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed, disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 69.52, p < .05.

The fifth item considers if language items (e.g. vocabulary, etc) are presented in context to make meaning clear. The results show that 20.5% of the students **strongly agreed** and 60.3% of them **agreed** that the language items (e.g. vocabulary, etc) are presented *in context* to make meaning clear. In addition, 16.4% of the students **disagreed** and 2.7% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.98, SD=.69; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 80.8%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **disagreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 53.52, p < .05.

Table 2. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to content

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr	Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
1. The selected topics are familiar to the students.	73	3.07	.54	17.8	71.2	11.00		47.69	2	.00
2. The selected topics enhance learners' motivation.	73	2.88	.69	13.7	64.4	17.8	4.1	63.27	3	.00
3. The CB contains adequate self-check progress report.	73	2.74	.69	11	54.8	31.5	2.7	47.38	3	.00
4. Texts and dialogues include new vocabulary and grammatical structures.	73	3.03	.62	19.2	65.8	13.7	1.4	69.52	3	.00
5. Language items (e.g. vocabulary, etc) are presented *in context* to make meaning clear.	73	2.9863	.69708	20.5	60.3	16.4	2.7	53.52	3	.00
6. Pedagogic texts and dialogues include a variety of interesting subjects.	73	2.7123	.75424	11.0	56.2	26.0	6.8	43.76	3	.00

In the last item of this category, 11% of the students **strongly agreed** and 56.2% of them **agreed** that the pedagogic texts and dialogues include a variety of interesting subjects. In addition, 26% of the students **disagreed** and 6.8% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.71, SD=.75; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 66.2%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed, disagreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 43.76, p < .05.

Table 3. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to grammar

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
7. The paradigm used to introduce grammatical rules is clear and simple.	16	2.69	.60	6.3	56.2	37.5	0	6.12	2	.04
8. Grammar items suit students' language needs.	16	2.62	.62	0	68.8	25.0	6.2	9.87	2	.01
9. There is a balance between form and use.	16	2.87	.50	6.2	75.0	18.8	0	12.87	2	.00
10. Sentences and examples contain words that are known by learners.	16	2.94	.44	6.2	81.3	12.5	0	16.62	2	.00

As displayed in table 3, in item 7, 6.3% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.2% of them *agreed* that the paradigm used to introduce grammatical rules is clear and simple. In addition, 37.5% of the teachers *disagreed* with the item (M = 2.69, SD=.60; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 62.5%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 6.12, p < .05.

The eighth item considers whether grammar items suit students' language needs. The results show that 68.8% of the teachers *agreed* that grammar items suit students' language needs. Moreover, 25% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.2% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.62, SD=.62; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 68.8%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 9.87, p < .05.

In item 9, 6.2% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 75% of them *agreed* that there is a balance between form and use. In addition, 18.8% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.87, SD=.50; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 81.2%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 12.87, p < .05.

Item 10 considers if sentences and examples contain words that are known by learners. The findings display that 6.2% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 81.3% of them *agreed* that sentences and examples contain words that are known by learners. In addition, 12.5% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.94, SD=.44; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 87.5%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 16.62, p < .05.

Table 4. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to grammar

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
7. The paradigm used to introduce grammatical rules is clear and simple.	73	3.12	.72	31.5	50.7	16.4	1.4	38.94	3	.00
8. Grammar items suit students' language needs.	73	2.88	.64	12.3	65.8	19.2	2.7	68.64	3	.00
9. There is a balance between form and use.	73	2.85	.66	13.7	58.9	26.0	1.4	53.63	3	.00
10. Sentences and examples contain words that are known by learners.	73	3.05	.70	24.7	58.9	13.7	2.7	51.76	3	.00

As indicated in table 4, in item 7, 31.5% of the students *strongly agreed* and 50.7% of them *agreed* that the paradigm used to introduce grammatical rules is clear and simple. In addition, 16.4% of the students *disagreed* and 1.4% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 3.12, SD=.72; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 82.2%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 38.94, p < .05.

Item 8 considers if grammar items suit students' language needs. The results show that 12.3% of the students *strongly agreed* and 65.8% of them *agreed* that grammar items suit students' language needs. In addition, 19.2% of the students *disagreed* and 2.7% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.88, SD=.64; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 78%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 68.64, p < .05.

In the ninth item, 13.7% of the students *strongly agreed* and 58.9% of them *agreed* that there is a balance between form and use. In addition, 26% of the students *disagreed* and 1.4% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.85, SD=.66; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 72.6%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 53.63, p < .05.

Item 10 considers whether sentences and examples contain words that are known by learners or not. The findings indicate that 24.7% of the students *strongly agreed* and 58.9% of them *agreed* that sentences and examples contain words that are known by learners. In addition, 13.7% of the students *disagreed* and 2.7% of

them ***strongly disagreed*** with this item (M = 3.05, SD=.70; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 83.6%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who ***agreed*** and the ones who ***strongly agreed***, ***disagreed*** and ***strongly disagreed*** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 51.76, p < .05.

Table 5. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' *responses related to vocabulary*

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
11. New lexical items appear in the following units.	16	2.69	.79	12.5	50	31.3	6.2	7.50	3	.06
12. The exercises for vocabulary are rich and adequate.	16	2.37	.50	0	37.5	62.5	0	1.00	1	.32

Table 5 shows that in item 11, 12.5% of the teachers ***strongly agreed*** and 50% of them ***agreed*** that new lexical items appear in the following units. In addition, 31.3% of the teachers ***disagreed*** and 6.2% of them ***strongly disagreed*** with the item (M = 2.69, SD=.79; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 62.5%). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who ***agreed*** and the ones who ***strongly agreed***, ***disagreed,*** and ***strongly disagreed*** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 7.50, p > .05.

Table 6. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to vocabulary

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
11. New lexical items appear in the following units.	73	2.30	.76	4.1	35.6	46.6	13.7	33.35	3	.00
12. The exercises for vocabulary are rich and adequate.	73	2.26	.80	5.5	31.5	46.6	16.4	28.09	3	.00

Twelfth item considers the exercises for vocabulary are rich and adequate or not. The results display that 37.5% of the teachers ***agreed*** and 62.5% of them ***disagreed*** that the exercises for vocabulary are rich and adequate (M = 2.37, SD=.50). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who ***agreed*** and the ones who ***disagreed*** with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 1.00, p > .05.

Table 6 demonstrates that in item 11, 4.1% of the students **strongly agreed** and 35.6% of them **agreed** that new lexical items appear in the following units. In addition, 46.6% of the students **disagreed** and 13.7% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.30, SD=.76; SUM. of S. D. Agr. & S. D. Agr. = 60.3%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who **disagreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **agreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 33.35, p < .05.

In item 12, 5.5% of the students **strongly agreed** and 31.5% of them **agreed** that the exercises for vocabulary are rich and adequate. In addition, 46.6% of the students **disagreed** and 16.4% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.26, SD=.80; SUM. of S. D. Agr. & S. D. Agr= 63%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who **disagreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **agreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 28.09, p < .05.

Table 7. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to phonology

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr	Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
13. Pronunciation is built through different types of activities, such as listening, dialogue practice etc.	16	2.75	.58	6.2	62.5	31.3	0	7.62	2	.02
14. There is an adequate amount of pronunciation practice.	16	2.31	.48	0	31.3	68.7	0	2.25	1	.13

As shown in table 7, in item 13, 6.2% of the teachers **strongly agreed** and 62.5% of them **agreed** that pronunciation is built through different types of activities, such as listening, dialogue practice etc. Moreover, 31.3% of the teachers **disagreed** with this item (M = 2.75, SD=.58; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 68.7%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed** and **disagreed** with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 7.62, p < .05.

Item 14 considers if there is an adequate amount of pronunciation practice. The findings show that 31.3% of the teachers **agreed** and 68.7% of them **disagreed** that there is an adequate amount of pronunciation practice (M = 2.31, SD=.48). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who **agreed** and the ones who **disagreed** with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 2.25, p > .05.

As it is shown in table 8, in item 13, 16.5% of the students **strongly agreed** and 58.9% of them **agreed** that pronunciation is built through different types of activities, such as listening, dialogue practice etc. Moreover, 17.8% of the students **disagreed** and16.4% of them **strongly disagreed** with the item (M = 2.85, SD =.78; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75.4%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of students who

agreed and the ones who ***strongly agreed***, ***disagreed*** and ***strongly disagreed*** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 46.83, p < .05.

Table 8. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to phonology

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
13. Pronunciation is built through different types of activities, such as listening, dialogue practice etc.	73	2.85	.78	16.5	58.9	17.8	6.8	46.83	3	.00
14. There is an adequate amount of pronunciation practice.	73	2.40	.81	19.2	54.8	20.5	5.5	26.01	3	.00

In item 14, 19.2% of the students ***strongly agreed*** and 54.8% of them ***agreed*** that there is an adequate amount of pronunciation practice. Moreover, 20.5% of the students ***disagreed*** and 5.5% of them ***strongly disagreed*** with the item (M = 2.88, SD=.78; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. =74%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of students who ***agreed*** and the ones who ***strongly agreed***, ***disagreed*** and ***strongly disagreed*** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 38.61, p < .05.

Table 9. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to language skills

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
15. All four language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are practiced in each unit.	16	2.87	.62	12.5	62.5	25	0	6.50	2	.04
16. The CB uses authentic material at an appropriate level.	16	2.62	.72	6.3	56.3	31.3	6.1	11.00	3	.01
17. The CB uses authentic listening material at an appropriate level.	15	2.67	.62	6.7	53.3	40.0	0	5.20	2	.07

As it is indicated in table 9, in the fifteenth item, 12.5% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 62.5% of them *agreed* that all four language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are practiced in each unit. Moreover, 25% of the teachers had the opposite idea and *disagreed* with the item (M = 2.87, SD=.62; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 6.50, p < .05.

In item 16, 6.3% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.3% of them *agreed* that English Result coursebook uses authentic material at an appropriate level. Moreover, 31.3% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.1% of them *strongly disagreed* with the item (M = 2.62, SD=.72; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 62.6%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 11.00, p < .05.

Item 17 considers if the English Result coursebook uses authentic listening material at an appropriate level. Data analysis shows that 6.7% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 53.3% of them *agreed* that the coursebook uses authentic listening material at an appropriate level. Moreover, 40% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.67, SD=.62; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 60%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 15) = 5.20, p > .05.

Table 10 shows that in item 15, 15.1% of the students *strongly agreed* and 46.6% of them *agreed* that all four language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are practiced in each unit. In addition, 27.4% of the students *disagreed* and 11% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.65, SD=.87; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 61.7%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 22.39, p < .05.

Table 10. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to language skills

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
15. All four language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are practiced in each unit.	73	2.6575	.87	15.1	46.6	27.4	11.0	22.39	3	.00
16. The CB uses authentic material at an appropriate level.	73	2.6027	.76	8.2	52.1	31.5	8.2	39.05	3	.00
17. The CB uses authentic listening material at an appropriate level.	73	2.6027	.80	8.2	54.8	26.0	11.0	39.93	3	.00

Item 16 considers whether English Result coursebook uses authentic material at an appropriate level or not. The findings indicate that 8.2% of the students *strongly agreed* and 52.1% of them *agreed* that the coursebook uses authentic material at an appropriate level. In addition, 31.5% of the students *disagreed* and 8.2% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.60, SD=.76; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 60.3%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 39.05, p < .05.

In item 17, 8.2% of the students *strongly agreed* and 54.8% of them *agreed* that English Result coursebook uses authentic listening material at an appropriate level. In addition, 26% of the students *disagreed* and 11% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.60, SD=.80; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 63%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 39.93, p < .05.

As shown in table 11, in item 18, 6.1% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 68.8% of them *agreed* that English Result coursebook units are related to student needs. Moreover, 18.8% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.3% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.75, SD=.68; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 74.9%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed, disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 17.00, p < .05.

Table 11. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to methodology

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr	Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
18. The CB units are related to student needs.	16	2.75	.68	6.1	68.8	18.8	6.3	17.00	3	.00
19. The CB encourages inductive approach to learning.	16	3.12	.34	12.5	87.5	0	0	9.00	1	.00
20. Accuracy is balanced with fluency.	16	2.87	.62	12.5	62.5	25	0	6.50	2	.04

Item 19 considers whether English Result coursebook encourages inductive approach to learning or not. The results indicate that 12.5% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 87.5% of them *agreed* that the coursebook encourages inductive approach to learning (M = 3.12, SD=.34; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 100%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 9.00, p < .05.

In the last item of this category, 12.5% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 62.5% of them *agreed* that accuracy is balanced with fluency. In addition, 25% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.87, SD=.62; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 6.50, p < .05.

As indicated in table 12, in item 18, 12.3% of the students *strongly agreed* and 57.5% of them *agreed* that the coursebook units are related to student needs. In addition, 26% of the students *disagreed* and 4.2% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.78, SD=.71; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 69.8%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 48.37, p < .05.

Item 19 considers if English Result coursebook encourages inductive approach to learning. The findings indicate that 9.6% of the students *strongly agreed* and 53.4% of them *agreed* that the coursebook encourages inductive approach to learning. In addition, 27.4% of the students *disagreed* and 9.6% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.63 SD=.79; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 63%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 37.63, p < .05.

In item 20, 8.2% of the students *strongly agreed* and 54.8% of them *agreed* that accuracy is balanced with fluency. In addition, 31.5% of the students *disagreed* and 5.5% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.66, SD=.71; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 63%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 46.50, p < .05.

Table 12. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to methodology

| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
					S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
18.	The CB units are related to student needs.	73	2.78	.71	12.3	57.5	26.0	4.2	48.37	3	.00
19.	The CB encourages inductive approach to learning.	73	2.63	.79	9.6	53.4	27.4	9.6	37.63	3	.00
20.	Accuracy is balanced with fluency.	73	2.66	.71	8.2	54.8	31.5	5.5	46.50	3	.00

Table 13 indicates that in item 21, 18.8% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.2% of them *agreed* that English Result coursebook includes lessons that reflect on study techniques such as vocabulary learning techniques. Moreover, 25% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.93, SD=.68; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 3.87, p > .05.

Item 22 considers if English Result coursebook contains advice on study skills development. Data analysis shows that 62.5% of the teachers *agreed* and 37.5% of them *disagreed* that the coursebook contains advice on study skills development (M = 2.62, SD=.50). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 1.00, p > .05.

In item 23, 12.5% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 43.8% of them *agreed* that students are encouraged to take some degree of responsibility for their learning. Moreover, 43.7% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.69, SD=.70; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 56.3%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 3.12, p > .05.

In item 24, 66.7% of the teachers *agreed* and 33.3% of them *disagreed* that there are some materials for independent work in each unit (M = 2.67, SD=.49). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 15) = 1.66, p > .05.

Table 13. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to study skills

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr	Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
21. The CB includes lessons that reflect on study techniques such as vocabulary learning techniques	16	2.93	.68	18.8	56.2	25	0	3.87	2	.14
22. The CB contains advice on study skills development.	16	2.62	.50	0	62.5	37.5	0	1.00	1	.32
23. Students are encouraged to take some degree of responsibility for their learning.	16	2.69	.70	12.5	43.8	43.7	0	3.12	2	.21
24. There are some materials for independent work in each unit.	15	2. 67	.49	0	66.7	33.3	0	1.66	1	.20

Table 14 displays that in item 21, 6.8% of the students **strongly agreed** and 45.2% of them **agreed** that English Result coursebook includes lessons that reflect on study techniques such as vocabulary learning techniques. In addition, 41.1% of the students **disagreed** and 6.8% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.52, SD=.73; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 62%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **disagreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 38.72, p < .05.

Item 22 considers if English Result coursebook contains advice on study skills development. The findings indicate that 12.3% of the students **strongly agreed** and 65.8% of them **agreed** that the coursebook contains advice on study skills development. In addition, 19.2% of the students **disagreed** and 2.7% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.88, SD=.64; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 78.1%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **disagreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 68.64, p < .05.

In item 23, 17.8% of the students **strongly agreed** and 39.7% of them **agreed** that students are encouraged to take some degree of responsibility for their learning. In addition, 35.6% of the students **disagreed** and 6.8% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.68, SD=.85; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 57.5%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **disagreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 20.75, p < .05.

Table 14. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to study skills

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr	Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				Percentage						
21. The CB includes lessons that reflect on study techniques such as vocabulary learning techniques	73	2.52	.73	6.8	45.2	41.1	6.8	38.72	3	.00
22. The CB contains advice on study skills development.	73	2.88	.64	12.3	65.8	19.2	2.7	68.64	3	.00
23. Students are encouraged to take some degree of responsibility for their learning.	73	2.68	.85	17.8	39.7	35.6	6.8	20.75	3	.00
24. There are some materials for independent work in each unit.	73	2.88	.74	16.4	60.3	17.8	5.5	51.11	3	.00

Item 24 considers whether there are some materials for independent work in each unit or not. The findings show that 16.4% of the students *strongly agreed* and 60.3% of them *agreed* that there are some materials for independent work in each unit. In addition, 17.8% of the students *disagreed* and 5.5% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.88, SD=.74; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 76.7%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 51.11, p < .05.

As demonstrated in table 15, in item 25, 12.5% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 62.5% of them *agreed* that the textbook has attractive layout. In addition, 6.2% of the teachers *disagreed* and 18.8% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.67, SD=.95; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed,* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 12.50, p < .05.

In item 26, 26.7% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 60% of them *agreed* that the font size and type used in the book are appropriate. Moreover, 13.3% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 3.13, SD=.63; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 86.7%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 15) = 5.20, p > .05.

Table 15. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to visuals

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
25. The textbook has attractive layout.	16	2.67	.95	12.5	62.5	6.2	18.8	12.50	3	.01
26. The font size and type used in the book are appropriate.	15	3.13	.63	26.7	60	13.3	0	5.20	2	.07
27. The visuals are reasonably well produced and attractive.	16	2.75	.77	18.8	37.5	43.7	0	1.62	2	.44

The 27th item considers if the visuals are reasonably well produced and attractive. The results indicate that 18.8% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 37.5% of them *agreed* that the visuals are reasonably well produced and attractive. Moreover, 43.7% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.75, SD=.77; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 56.3%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 1.62, p > .05.

Table 16. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to visuals

| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
					S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
25.	The textbook has attractive layout.	73	3.08	.81	31.5	50.7	12.3	5.5	36.31	3	.00
26.	The font size and type used in the book are appropriate.	73	3.19	.84	41.1	42.5	11.0	5.5	33.35	3	.00
27.	The visuals are reasonably well produced and attractive.	73	2.88	.78	19.2	54.8	20.5	5.5	38.61	3	.00

As it is displayed in table 16, in item 25, 31.5% of the students *strongly agreed* and 50.7% of them *agreed* that the textbook has attractive layout. In addition, 12.3% of the students *disagreed* and 5.5% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 3.08, SD=.81; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 82.2%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 36.31, p < .05.

Item 26 considers whether the font size and type used in the book are appropriate or not. The findings show that 41.1% of the students *strongly agreed* and 42.5% of them *agreed* that the font size and type used in the book are appropriate. In addition, 11% of the students *disagreed* and 5.5% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 3.19, SD=.84; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 83.6%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 33.35, p < .05.

In item 27, 19.2% of the students *strongly agreed* and 54.8% of them *agreed* that the visuals are reasonably well produced and attractive. In addition, 20.5% of the students *disagreed* and 5.5% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.88, SD=.78; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 74%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 38.61, p < .05.

As shown in table 17, in item 28, 12.5% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 62.5% of them *agreed* that English Result coursebook provides communicative exercises that enable learners to carry out their communicative tasks in real-life situations. Moreover, 18.8% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.2% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.81, SD=.75; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 12.50, p < .05.

Table 17. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to practice and testing

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
28. The CB provides communicative exercises that enable learners to carry out their communicative tasks in real-life situations.	16	2.81	.75	12.5	62.5	18.8	6.2	12.50	3	.01
29. There are directions to explain how every exercise can be done.	16	2.87	.34	0	87.5	12.5	0	9.00	1	.00
30. The number of exercises is suitable.	16	2.50	.52	0	50	50	0	.00	1	1.00
31. The textbook provides appropriate periodical tests for diagnostic purposes.	16	2.68	.60	6.2	56.3	37.5	0	6.12	2	.05

In item 29, 87.5% of the teachers *agreed* and 12.5% of them *disagreed* that there are directions to explain how every exercise can be done (M = 2.87, SD=.34). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 9.00, p < .05.

In item 30, 50% of the teachers *agreed* and 50% of them *disagreed* that the number of exercises is suitable (M = 2.50, SD=.52). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = .00, p > .05.

In item 31, 6.2% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.3% of them *agreed* that the textbook provides appropriate periodical tests for diagnostic purposes. Moreover, 37.5% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item. The amount of mean (M = 2.68, SD=.60; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 62.5%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 6.12, p = .05.

Table 18 indicates that in item 28, 16.4% of the students *strongly agreed* and 56.2% of them *agreed* that English Result coursebook provides communicative exercises that enable learners to carry out their communicative tasks in real-life situations. In addition, 19.2% of the students *disagreed* and 8.2% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.81, SD=.81; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 72.6%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 39.71, p < .05.

Table 18. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the students' responses related to practice and testing

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
28. The CB provides communicative exercises that enable learners to carry out their communicative tasks in real-life situations.	73	2.81	.81	16.4	56.2	19.2	8.2	39.71	3	.00
29. There are directions to explain how every exercise can be done.	73	2.81	.77	13.7	61.6	16.4	8.2	53.30	3	.00
30. The number of exercises is suitable.	73	2.88	.64	13.7	61.6	23.3	1.4	59.32	3	.00

Item 29 considers if there are directions to explain how every exercise can be done. The results show that 13.7% of the students *strongly agreed* and 61.6% of them *agreed* that there are directions to explain how every exercise can be done. In addition, 16.4% of the students *disagreed* and 8.2% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.81, SD=.77; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75.3%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 53.30, p < .05.

In the last item, 13.7% of the students *strongly agreed* and 61.6% of them *agreed* that the number of exercises is suitable. In addition, 23.3% of the students *disagreed* and 1.4% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.88, SD=.64; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75.3%). Moreover, there is a significant difference between the number of students who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed*, *disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 73) = 59.32, p < .05.

As displayed in table 19, in item 32, 43.8% of the teachers *agreed* and 56.2% of them *disagreed* that the supplementary material such as posters and flash cards, etc. accompanying the book is attractive and suitable (M = 2.43, SD=.51). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *disagreed* and the ones who *agreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) =.25, p > .05.

In item 33, 6.3% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 68.8% of them *agreed* that there is an appropriate teacher's guide to aid the teacher. Moreover, 18.8% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.1% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.75, SD=.68; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75.1%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed, disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) =17.00, p < .05.

Table 19. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to supplementary material

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
32. The supplementary material such as posters and flash cards, etc. accompanying the book is attractive and suitable.	16	2.43	.51	0	43.8	56.2	0	.25	1	.62
33. There is an appropriate teacher's guide to aid the teacher.	16	2.75	.68	6.3	68.8	18.8	6.1	17.00	3	.00

Table 20. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to objectives

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
34. The terminal goals are specified in the Teacher's Manual or the student's Book.	16	2.75	.57	6.3	62.5	31.2	0	7.62	2	.02
35. The developmental objectives are specified at the beginning of each lesson.	16	2.87	.34	0	87.5	12.5	0	9.00	1	.00
36. Developmental objectives meet the needs of learners.	16	3.06	.25	6.2	93.8	0	0	12.25	1	.00
37. Developmental objectives suit the level of the learners.	16	2.75	.68	6.3	68.8	18.8	6.1	17.00	3	.00

Table 20 shows that in item 34, 6.3% of the teachers ***strongly agreed*** and 62.5% of them ***agreed*** that the terminal goals are specified in the Teacher's Manual or the student's Book. Moreover, 31.2% of the teachers ***disagreed*** with this item (M = 2.75, SD=.57; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 68.8%). In addition, there is a

significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 7.62, p < .05.

Item 35 considers if the developmental objectives are specified at the beginning of each lesson. The results indicate that 87.5% of the teachers *agreed* and 12.5% of them *disagreed* that the developmental objectives are specified at the beginning of each lesson (M = 2.87, SD=.34). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 9.00, p < .05.

In item 36, 6.2% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 93.8% of them *agreed* that developmental objectives meet the needs of learners (M = 3.06, SD=.25; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 100%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 12.25, p < .05.

In the last item of this category, 6.3% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 68.8% of them *agreed* that developmental objectives suit the level of the learners. Moreover, 18.8% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.1% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.75, SD=.68; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75.1%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed, disagreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 17.00, p < .05.

Table 21. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to content selection

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
38. Content selection reflects the objectives of the course.	16	3.00	.36	6.3	87.5	6.2 0		21.12	2	.00
39. Content selection suits the level of the course.	16	3.00	.52	12.5	75	12.5 0		12.50	2	.00
40. Content selection suits the time limit allowed for the course.	16	2.56	.51		56.2 0	43.8	0	.25	1	.62

As indicated in table 21, in item 38, 6.3% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 87.5% of them *agreed* that content selection reflects the objectives of the course. Moreover, 6.2% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 3.00, SD=.36; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 93.8%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the

number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 21.12, p < .05.

Item 39 considers whether content selection suits the level of the course or not. Data analysis shows that 12.5% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 75% of them *agreed* that content selection suits the level of the course. Moreover, 12.5% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 3.00, SD=.52; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 87.5%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 12.50, p < .05.

In item 40, 56.2% of the teachers *agreed* and 43.8% of them *disagreed* that content selection suits the time limit allowed for the course (M = 2.56, SD=.51). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) =.25, p > .05.

Table 22. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to gradation

| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Percentage | | | | Chi-square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
					S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
41.	The grading of items is suitable for the learners.	16	2.68	.60	6.3	56.2	37.50		6.12	2	.05

As demonstrated in table 22, in item 41, 6.3% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.2% of them *agreed* that the grading of items is suitable for the learners. Moreover, 37.5% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.68, SD=.60; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 62.5%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 6.12, p = .05.

As can be seen in table 23, in item 42, 37.5% of the teachers *agreed* and 62.5% of them *disagreed* that English Result coursebook aims to alienate students from their own culture (M = 2.37, SD=.50). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *disagreed* and the ones who *agreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 1.00, p > .05.

Item 43 considers if English Result coursebook is a vehicle to advertise the Anglo-American culture. The results show that 62.5% of the teachers *agreed* and 37.5% of them *disagreed* that the coursebook is a vehicle to advertise the Anglo-American culture (M = 2.62, SD=.50). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) = 1.00, p > .05.

In item 44, 6.3% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 50% of them *agreed* that the illustrations are culturally appropriate to the students. Moreover, 37.5% of the teachers *disagreed* and 6.2% of them *strongly disagreed* with this item (M = 2.56, SD=.72; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 56.3%). In addition, there is a significant

difference between the number of teachers who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **disagreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 9.50, p < .05.

Table 23. Result of the descriptive statistics, percentage and Chi-square of the teachers' responses related to culture

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Percentage				Chi-square	df	Asymp. Sig.
				S. Agr.	Agr.	D.A gr	S. D. Agr			
42. The coursebook aims to alienate students from their own culture.	16	2.37	.50	0	37.5	62.5	0	1.00	1	.32
43. The coursebook is a vehicle to advertise the Anglo-American culture.	16	2.62	.50	0	62.5	37.5	0	1.00	1	.32
44. The illustrations are culturally appropriate to the students.	16	2.56	.72	6.3	50	37.5	6.2	9.50	3	.02
45. It is possible to involve the local culture and language in the textbook.	16	2.81	.54	6.2	68.8	25.0	0	9.87	2	.01
46. The coursebook is in line with promoting the concept of World Englishes (WE).	16	2.68	.70	6.3	62.5	25.0	6.2	13.50	3	.00
47. Cultural sensitivities have been considered.	16	2.37	.72	6.3	31.1	56.3	6.3	11.00	3	.01
48. It takes religious considerations into account.	16	2.12	.62	6.3	6.3	81.3	6.1	27.00	3	.00
49. It is free from ideological tendencies.	16	2.75	.45	0	75	25	0	4.00	1	.05
50. It raises awareness by avoiding or realizing cultural stereotypes	16	2.93	.57	6.3	87.5	0	6.2	21.12	2	.00
51. It prepares students to interact with people from other cultures.	16	2.93	.44	6.2	81.3	12.5	0	16.62	2	.00

52.	It aims at international culture	16	3.06	.68	25	56.2 18.8 0	3.87	2	.14
53.	The social and cultural contexts in the coursebook are comprehensible to the learners.	16	2.81	.65	12.5	56.3 31.2 0	4.62	2	.10

Item 45 considers whether it is possible to involve the local culture and language in the textbook or not. Data analysis indicates that 6.2% of the teachers **strongly agreed** and 68.8% of them **agreed** that it is possible to involve the local culture and language in the textbook. Moreover, 25% of the teachers **disagreed** with this item (M = 2.81, SD=.54; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 75%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed** and **disagreed** with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 9.87, p < .05.

In item 46, 6.3% of the teachers **strongly agreed** and 62.5% of them **agreed** that English Result coursebook is in line with promoting the concept of World Englishes (WE). Moreover, 25% of the teachers **disagreed** and 6.2% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.68, SD=.70; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 68.8%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who **agreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **disagreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 13.50, p < .05.

Item 47 indicates that 6.3% of the teachers **strongly agreed** and 31.1% of them **agreed** that cultural sensitivities have been considered. Moreover, 56.3% of the teachers **disagreed** and 6.3% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.37, SD=.72; SUM. of D. Agr. & S. D. Agr. = 62.6%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who **disagreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **agreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 11.00, p < .05.

In item 48, 6.3% of the teachers **strongly agreed** and 6.3% of them **agreed** that English Result coursebook takes religious considerations into account. Moreover, 81.3% of the teachers **disagreed** and 6.1% of them **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.12, SD=.62; SUM. of D. Agr. & S. D. Agr. = 87.4%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who **disagreed** and the ones who **strongly agreed**, **agreed** and **strongly disagreed** with this item, c^2 (3, N = 16) = 27.00, p < .05.

Item 49 considers if the coursebook is free from ideological tendencies. The results show that 75% of the teachers **agreed** and 25% of them **disagreed** that English Result coursebook is free from ideological tendencies (M = 2.75, SD=.45). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who **agreed** and the ones who **disagreed** with this item, c^2 (1, N = 16) =4.00, p = .05.

In item 50, 6.3% of the teachers **strongly agreed** and 87.5% of them **agreed** that the coursebook raises awareness by avoiding or realizing cultural stereotypes. Moreover, 6.2% of the teachers **strongly disagreed** with this item (M = 2.93, SD=.57; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 93.8%). In addition, there is a significant difference

between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *strongly disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 21.12, p < .05.

Item 51 considers if the coursebook prepares students to interact with people from other cultures. Data analysis shows that 6.2% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 81.3% of them *agreed* that English Result coursebook prepares students to interact with people from other cultures. Moreover, 12.5% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.93, SD=.44; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 87.5%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 16.62, p < .05.

In item 52, 25% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.2% of them *agreed* that English Result coursebook aims at international culture. Moreover, 18.8% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 3.06, SD=.68; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 81.2%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 3.87, p > .05.

The last item of the category, item 53, indicates that 12.5% of the teachers *strongly agreed* and 56.3% of them *agreed* that the social and cultural contexts in the coursebook are comprehensible to the learners. Moreover, 31.2% of the teachers *disagreed* with this item (M = 2.81, SD=.65; SUM. of S. Agr. & Agr. = 68.8%). In addition, there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who *agreed* and the ones who *strongly agreed* and *disagreed* with this item, c^2 (2, N = 16) = 4.62, p > .05.

4.2. Analysis of the Interviews

In order to empower the gathered data, the researcher interviewed 25 percent of the teachers and 10 percent of the students who have participated in this study. The findings of these interviews were employed in extracting strengths and weaknesses of the coursebooks in section 5.2. Moreover, a brief report of the interviewees' comments is presented below.

Generally, the teachers were content with the clarity of grammatical points and encouragement of the inductive approach in English Result coursebook. They also believed that the coursebook is not culturally biased and the font size and type used in the book are appropriate. However, they were unanimous about the inadequacy of the number of exercises for vocabulary and pronunciation. They also stated that the coursebook does not include conversation in its units and has plenty of reading passages which make the book boring for students.

On the other hand, the students believed that the paradigms used to introduce grammatical rules are clear and simple and examples contain words that are known by learners. They also believed that English Result contain very attractive pictures which make the coursebook interesting for them. However, many of the students complain about the large number of reading passages in the book.

5. Discussion of the Findings

In the following, each research question is presented and discussed thoroughly.

5.1. Research Question 1

How is English Result series viewed from language teachers' and students' perspectives?

In the case of all categories, teachers as well as students had approximately similar ideas. However, some differences could be identified.

In terms of *content*, teachers and students were content with English Result in regard to familiarity of topics to the students, topic selection, and contextualizing language items. Regarding *grammar*, teachers and students believed that in the coursebook, sentences and examples contain words that are known by learners. Teachers also believed that there is a balance between form and use in English Result. Both teachers and students showed their disagreement with the appearance of new lexical items in the following units and richness and adequacy of exercises for vocabulary. Teachers and students believed that English Result coursebook has an adequate amount of pronunciation practice. Considering *methodology*, teachers were unanimous that the coursebook encourages inductive approach to learning. In the case of *visuals*, teachers agreed that English Result has attractive layout. In regard to *practice and testing*, contrary to the students' ideas, teachers believed that English Result provided good explanations regarding how every exercise can be done. In terms of *objectives*, teachers were unanimous that developmental objectives of English Result met the needs of learners. In regard to *culture*, teachers agreed that English Result is free from ideological tendencies. They also believed that the coursebook did well in preparing students to interact with people from other cultures.

As far as the researcher knows, since no studies regarding the evaluation of English Result coursebook have been carried out, the findings of the present study could not be compared with the relevant previous studies.

5.2. Research Question 2

In the following section, the researcher extracted the strengths and weaknesses of the coursebook from both teachers and students point of view based on the amount of mean. The items with the mean more than 3.1 were considered as strength and the items with the mean below 2.4 as weakness. It is worth noting that the items 42, 43 and 48, due to their negative concept, are scored reversely.

5.2.1. Strengths of English Result from Students' Perspective

1. The paradigm used to introduce grammatical rules is clear and simple.

2. The font size and type used in the book are appropriate.

No one can deny the role of grammar in the usefulness of a coursebook. Clarity and simplicity of the introduction of grammatical rules are great assets in a textbook and tremendous help for students. From teachers' perspective, English Result has such strengths.

5.2.2. Weaknesses of English Result from Students' Perspective

1. New lexical items do not appear in the following units.

2. The exercises for vocabulary are not rich and adequate.

3. There is not an adequate amount of pronunciation practice.

Although some teachers believe that pronunciation is not as important as lexicon and grammar in ESL/EFL learning, none of them deny its significant role. Students stated that English Result is the coursebooks which do not pay due attention to pronunciation, i.e., the coursebook does not have adequate amount of pronunciation practice.

5.2.3. Strengths of English Result from Teachers' Perspective

1. The CB encourages inductive approach to learning.

2. The font size and type used in the book are appropriate.

3. The coursebook does not aim to alienate students from their own culture.

4. It does not take religious considerations into account.

Al-Kharrat [26] contended that an inductive method involves students more in an analytical study of the language than the deductive method does. In addition, this method sounds to be highly motivating and extremely beneficial for the students' understanding of the materials presented to them. The teachers believed that this approach is encouraged in English Result.

5.2.4. Weaknesses of English Result from Teachers' Perspective

1. The exercises for vocabulary are not rich and adequate.

2. There is not an adequate amount of pronunciation practice.

3. Cultural sensitivities have not been considered.

Cultural issues have always been controversial in language learning. It is widely believed that lack of coursebooks' consideration to cultural sensitivities might have negative effects on learners. Teachers believed that English Result suffer from such a weakness.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the researcher does not propose that one coursebook should replace another but that teachers should be well aware of strengths and weaknesses of the coursebook they teach. In other words, it is important to consider which coursebook may best support language learners in diverse instructional contexts.

References

[1] A. Cunningsworth. *Choosing your coursebook*. UK: Heinemann English Language Teaching, 1995.

[2] T. Hutchinson and E. Torres. "The Textbook as Agent of Change." *ELT Journal,* vol. 48(4), pp. 315-328, 1994.

[3] N. Nooreen and A. A. Arshad (2010). "Examining the importance of EST and ESL textbooks and materials: objectives, content and form." [Online] Available: http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_9/textbooks.htm (January 23, 2011)

[4] J. C. Richards. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[5] D. R. A. Litz (2005). "Textbook evaluation and ELT management: a South Korean 46 Iranian EFL Journal case study." *Asian EFL Journal*. Retrieved from: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Litz_thesis.pdf

[6] D. Garinger. *Textbook Selection for the EFL Classroom.* Washington DC: ERIC Digest (Dec.), 2002.

[7] S. Najafi Sarem, H. Hamidi and R. Mahmoudie. "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 Sciences,* vol. 4 (2), pp. 372-380, 2013.

[8] B. Tomlinson. "Materials development." In R. Carter and D. Nunan (Ed.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[9] R. Kiely. "Small answers to the big question: Learning from language program evaluation." *Language Teaching Research,* vol. 13(1), pp. 99-116, 2009.

[10] I. McGrath. *Materials Evaluation and Design for Language Teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.

[11] L. Sheldon. "Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials." *English Language Teaching Journal,* vol. 42(4), pp. 237-246, 1988.

[12] J. McDonough and C. Shaw. *Materials and methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

[13] J. M. Lamie (1999). "Making the textbook more communicative." *The Internal TESL Journal*, vol. 5(1). Retrieved September 27, 2012, from www.iteslj.org.

[14] P. Ur. *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

[15] S. A. Razmjoo. "High schools or private institutes textbooks? Which fulfill communicative language teaching principles in the Iranian context?" *Asian EFL Journal*, vol. 9(4), pp. 126-140, 2007.

[16] A. Daud and M. Celce-Murcia. "Selecting and evaluating textbooks." In M. Celce- Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign Language.* New York, NY: Newbury House, 1979.

[17] G. Low. Appropriate design: the internal design of course units. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

[18] J. C. Richards, J. Platt and H. Weber. *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman, 1985.

[19] T. Hutchinson and A. Waters. *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

[20] B. Tomlinson. "Glossary of basic terms for materials development in language teaching and introduction." In B. Tomlinson (ed.), *Materials development in language teaching.* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[21] A. Soori, R. Kafipour and M. Soury. "EFL textbook evaluation and graphic representation." *European Journal of Social Sciences,* vol. 26(3), pp. 481-493, 2011.

[22] A. Cunningsworth. *Evaluating and selecting ELT materials.* London: Heinemann, 1984.

[23] J. Brown. *The Elements of Language Curriculum.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 1995.

[24] A. Skierso. "Textbook selection and evaluation." In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign Language.* Boston : Heinle and Heinle Publishers, 1991.

[25] H. Shatery and M. Azargoon. "Designing and Developing a Native Checklist to Evaluate General English Course Books in Iran and Comparing It with Other Existing Checklists in the World," presented at the First Conference on Language Learning and Teaching: An Interdisciplinary Approach, October, 30 and 31, 2012.

[26] M. Y. Al-Kharrat, (2000). "Deductive & Inductive Lessons for Saudi EFL Freshmen Students." *The Internet TESL Journal,* vol. 6(10). Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Al-Kharrat-Deductive/