

## Evaluation of an ESP Textbook for the Students of Preschool and Primary Education

Malek, Panahi<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

---

No one can deny the paramount importance of textbooks in teaching English especially for specific purposes. McGrath (2006) argues that "course books tend to dictate what is taught, in what order and, to what extent, how and what learners learn" (p.171). He thinks of a textbook as an essential component of the classroom and evaluating the textbooks is believed to have a vital role in improving and increasing their fitness to the needs of the learners. This study focuses on evaluating the textbook *English for the students of preschool and primary education*. The aim of this study is to evaluate whether the ESP textbook taught at university level in Iran for B.A students of Preschool and Primary Education is satisfying students' objectives, needs, and wants. For this purpose, a questionnaire was used. Participants included 20 ESP teachers and 50 students of *preschool and primary education* taking an ESP course at Allameh tabatabai and Bentolhoda Campuses in Ardabil Farhangian University. The results of the analysis indicated that there is a significant difference between the students' and teachers' views regarding practical concern, subject matter, activities, and content of the book. Their overall view is that the textbook, in spite of having merits, mostly focused on reading skills and overlooked other skills and sub skills.

---

**Keywords:** ESP, ESP textbook, materials evaluation, language teaching

### 1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to evaluate a sample of ESP textbooks published by the Organization for Researching and Composing University Textbooks in the Humanities (SAMT in Persian) to be used at university level as ESP textbook for the students of preschool and primary Education. This book is used in universities as a textbook. The research was conducted on the basis of some teachers' views and a number of students' viewpoints. It was carried out for two purposes: first, to investigate the extent to which the textbook addresses the students' specific needs and also the teacher's expectations. Second, to delve into the strengths and weaknesses of the text book and offer some suggestions for improvement. To gather data, textbook evaluation survey questionnaires were used. The questionnaire consists of 20 items including practical concerns, objectives' compatibility language issues, subject matter issues, skills and strategies, exercises, lay out and content

### 2. The Importance of Textbook Evaluation

One of the important factors that is of prime importance in language teaching, especially in ESP, is to determine whether the textbooks and materials are useful and suitable for the purpose of the course or not. The determination of their usefulness and suitability is generally done via the process of textbook evaluation which is the aim of the present study.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ardabil Farhangian University.

O'Neill (1982) mentions four reasons for the use of course books. First, most parts of course book materials are appropriate for students' needs, even if they are not specially designed for them. Second, they make it possible for students to plan for future learning and also review the previous materials or lessons. Third, course books provide students with high quality materials at a reasonable price. Finally, suitable course books allow teachers to adapt and modify them to meet the learners' needs and also allow for natural interaction to happen.

Dudley-Evans and St John (1998) contend that textbooks and materials play a significant role in every learning situation including exposing learners to the language especially in EFL situation and assisting teachers with their responsibilities. If materials involve learners in thinking about language and using it, and if they stimulate and motivate learners, they will accelerate learning. They give four reasons for using textbooks and materials:

1) as a source of language 2) as a learning support, 3) for motivation and stimulation and 4) for reference.

Otlowski (2003), concerning the importance of a textbook, claims: "The textbook is one of the main learning and reference tools for language students, and especially EFL students who may have limited or no contact with native speakers. Most of the language that students will acquire during their schooling in English will be from either their teacher and/or their textbook" (p.2).

With respect to ESP, Barnard and Zemach (2003) argue that the ESP has been characterized by five main currents in material preparation: Register analysis, Discourse and rhetorical analysis, Need analysis, Skill-centered approach, Learning centered approach.

The second factor which is very important in language teaching is evaluation.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) define evaluation as "a matter of judging the fitness of something for particular purposes" (p.96). Evaluation is a process of matching needs to available solutions. They divide the evaluation process into 4 stages: a) defining criteria, b) subjective analysis, c) objective analysis, and d) matching, how far does the material match the learners' needs? They add that, to make the best choice, different parties involved in the course have to be considered: teachers, students, and sponsors.

Robinson (1991) defines evaluation as the discovery of the value for some purposes. Other clearer definition is proposed by Murphy (1985) who states that evaluation is concerned with describing what is there and placing some value on what is found. Evaluation is beneficial for the selection of textbooks, which is the most important decision to make in the process of teaching ESP. Sheldon (1988), relating the textbook evaluation to selection of materials, says: "The selection of a particular core volume signals an executive educational decision in which there is considerable professional, financial, and even political investment. This high profile means that the definition and application of systematic criteria for assessing course books are vital" (p.238). Furthermore, textbook evaluation can be regarded as an academic judgment.

Application of systematic criteria for evaluating textbooks is necessary since the prospective careers of some learners of ESP rely on this course. McGrath (2002) believes that evaluation process should be carefully performed to assure optimal results. Different models are proposed for evaluating a textbook. The most appropriate, time-saving, economical and applicable method of textbook evaluation is the McDonough and Shaw's model which has two stages: External and internal evaluation. In the first stage, a teacher scans the book to get a general view concerning the materials and decide whether they meet his/her expectations or not. If it does, he moves to the second stage which consists of an in-depth analysis of the materials, that is, the external evaluation which refers to a brief scan to determine whether the blurbs, and claims of the authors match the content of the books.

Robinson (1991) distinguishes between three types of materials evaluation: a) preliminary (before an ESP course begins), b) summative (takes place at the end of the course), and c) formative (conducted while the course is ongoing). She states that evaluation can be carried out by both outsiders and insiders. A further distinction made by Robinson (1991) is between process and product evaluation.

The former addresses teaching and learning processes, strategies, administrative and decision-making processes, while the latter is concerned with the students' product such as examination results, essays, etc. By insiders she means teachers, students, and course designers. Besides formative and summative evaluation, Richards (2001) suggests another kind of evaluation, namely illuminative. He describes this kind of evaluation as follows:

"This refers to evaluation that seeks to find out how different aspects of the program work or are being implemented. It seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the processes of teaching and learning that occur in the program, without necessarily seeking to change the course in any way as a result." (p.289)

Sanders (1992), Weir, and Roberts (1994) state that evaluation may concentrate on different aspects of a language program. They mention these aspects as curriculum design, the syllabus and program content, classroom processes, materials of instruction, the teachers, teacher training, the students, monitoring of pupil progress, learner motivation, the institution, learning environment, staff development, and decision making (cited in Richards, 2001, pp.286-287).

Finally, Ellis (1997) believes that there are mainly three kinds of textbooks evaluation. The most popular one is "predictive" or "pre-use", which is useful to predict the actual success of a textbook before using. The second one is "in-use" which is used for examining the performance of a textbook that is recently used. The last type of textbook evaluation is "retrospective" (reflective) or "post-use"; it is used for evaluation in any specific educational situations. The present study is a reflective or "post-use" evaluation for examining the performance of ESP textbooks which are used currently.

### 3. Statement of research question

The purpose of this study is to evaluate whether ESP textbook taught at university level in Iran for B.A students of Preschool and Primary Education is satisfying students' objectives, needs, and wants. To achieve this goal, the researcher formulated two research questions: "What are the students' and the teachers' opinion about the textbook?" and "Is there any significant difference between opinion of the students and that of the teachers' about the textbook?"

## 4. Methods

### 4.1 Respondents

The participants in this study were 20 teachers teaching in different universities and 50 BA preschool and primary students taking an ESP course. The respondents were both male and female. All respondents were young whose age varied from 20 to 23. They studied at Allameh tabatabai and Bentolhoda Campuses in Ardabil Farhangian University. The instrument that was used for collecting data was a questionnaire based on Sheldon's (1988) model of evaluation and modified by Karimi (2006) (see Appendix).

### 4.2 Instrument

Robinson (1991) lists a number of tools used to carry out evaluation: questionnaires, checklists, rating scales, interviews, observation, and records. Since questionnaires are generally more wide-ranging than other means of evaluation (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998), the questionnaire was used in the current study.

The questionnaire consists of 20 items based on a five-point Likert scale ranging from excellent to very weak. The questionnaire examines different parts including practical concerns, objectives' compatibility language issues, subject matter issues, skills and strategies, exercises, lay out and content. ***The Cronbach alpha reliability index turned out to be 0.74.***

To answer the research questions, a series of statistical analysis was done. First, 20 questionnaires were randomly selected and the reliability of the instrument was ensured using Chronbach's alpha (Table 1).

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.742	.737	20

To answer the first research question, "what are the student and teachers' opinion about the book?" the frequencies of the students' and teachers' answers to each item of the questionnaire were sought.

## 5. Results

The first part under investigation was practical concerns: The first question was: to what extent is the book available? 6% of the students chose excellent, 26% chose good, 40% chose average, 24% chose weak and 4% chose very weak alternatives. While 15% of the teachers chose good and 85% chose Average. The second question was: to what extent can the accompanying materials be obtained in a timely manner? 38% of the students chose excellent, 46% chose good, 14% chose average and 2% chose weak alternatives. While 65% of the teachers chose excellent and 35% chose good alternatives. The third question was: is the text book cost-effective? 2% of the students chose excellent, 6% chose good, 10% chose average, 5% chose weak and 32% chose very weak alternatives. While 50% of the teachers chose average and 50% chose weak alternatives.

The second part of the research dealt with the objectives' compatibility: the first question in this regard was: to what extent do the objectives of the textbook match the objectives of the course? 6% of the students chose excellent, 26% chose good, 28% chose average, 18% chose weak, and 22% chose very weak alternatives. While 30% of the teachers chose good and 70% chose average alternatives. The second question was: to what extent does the textbook seem to be in tune with broader educational concern? 5% of the students chose excellent, 30% chose good, 38% chose average, 12% chose weak, and 10% chose very weak alternatives. While 65% of the teachers chose excellent and 35% chose good alternatives. The third question was: to what extent is the textbook appropriate for the audience? 22% chose good, 24% chose average, 42% chose weak and 12% very weak alternatives. While 50% of the teachers chose weak and 50% chose very weak alternatives.

The third area was related to language issues: the first question was: to what extent does the textbook contain basic grammatical patterns and vocabulary? 8% of the students chose excellent, 38% chose good, 38% chose average, 12% chose weak and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 35% of teachers chose good, 15% chose average and 50% chose weak alternatives. The second question was: to what extent does the presentation of structures and vocabularies move gradually from simple to more complex? 10% of the students chose excellent, 32% chose good, 28% chose average, 24% chose weak, and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 35% of the teachers chose excellent, 35% chose good, 15% chose average, 15% chose weak alternatives. The third question was: to what extent are new vocabularies and structures recycled in subsequent units for reinforcement? 12% of the students chose excellent, 44% chose good, 34% chose average, 8% chose weak, and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 50% of the teachers chose good, and the rest did average alternatives.

The fourth area under investigation was related to the subject matter issue: the first question was: to what extent does the subject matter motivate and interest you? 18% of the students chose excellent, 28% chose good, 45% chose average, 6% chose weak, and the rest chose 2%. While 50% of teachers chose good, and 50% chose average. The second question was: to what extent has the ordering of the material by topics been arranged in a logical fashion? 18% of the students chose excellent, 24% chose well, 40% chose average, 12% chose weak, and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 80% of the teachers chose good, and 20% chose average. The third question was: to what extent has the content been graded according to the need and background knowledge of the students? 2% of the students chose excellent, 18% chose well, 22% chose average, 34% chose weak, and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 50% of the teachers chose well, 15% chose average, and the rest chose weak alternatives.

The next area was related to the skill and strategies: The first question was: to what extent does the textbook teach the reading skills? 6% of the students chose excellent, 20% chose good, 42% chose average, 26% chose weak, and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 15% of the teachers chose good, 35% chose average, and the rest chose weak alternatives. The second question was: to what extent does the textbook teach reading strategies? 6% of the students chose excellent, 22% chose good, 42% chose average, 24% chose weak, and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 15% of the teachers chose good, 35% chose average, and 50% chose weak alternatives. The third question was: to what extent does the textbook teach speaking skills? : 16% of the students chose excellent, 44% chose good, 34% chose average, and 6% chose weak. While 85% of the teachers chose good, and 15% chose average alternatives.

The sixth area under investigation dealt with the exercises and activities. The question was: Are the exercises and activities varied enough to challenge the students? 26% of the students chose excellent, 48% chose good, 24% chose average, and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 30% of the teachers chose good, and 70% average alternatives.

The next part of the questionnaire was related to the layout of the book. The first question was: to what extent does the textbook appear attractive? 38% of the students chose excellent, 40% chose good, 18% chose average and the rest chose weak alternatives. While 85% of the teachers chose good and the rest chose average alternatives. The second question was: to what extent do photographs and illustrations in the book motivate you to talk about the subject? 18% of the students chose excellent, 54% chose good, 24% chose average, 2% chose weak, and 2% chose very weak alternatives. While 65% of the teachers chose excellent, 35% chose good alternatives.

The last part under investigation dealt with the content of the book. The first question was: to what extent are the materials related to your major? 2% of the students chose excellent, 16% chose good, 28% chose average, 20% chose weak and the rest chose very weak alternatives. While 35% of the teachers chose good, 65% chose average alternatives. The second question was: to what extent has the content been graded according to the proficiency level of the students? 48% of the students chose excellent, 34% chose good, 10% chose average, 6% chose weak, and 2% chose very weak alternatives. While 70% of the teachers chose excellent and 30% chose good alternatives. Table 2 summarizes the findings of the research.

**Table 2: Frequency of the Answers by Students and Teachers**

Category	Group																				
	Students					Teachers															
	Item	N	N %	Excellent	Good	Average	Weak	Very Weak	Excellent	Good	Average	Weak	Very Weak								
<b>practical concerns</b>	Q1	3	6.0%	13	26.0%	20	40.0%	12	24.0%	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	17	85.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Q2	19	38.0%	23	46.0%	7	14.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	13	65.0%	7	35.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Q3	1	2.0%	3	6.0%	5	10.0%	25	50.0%	16	32.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	10	50.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Objectives' compatibility</b>	Q4	3	6.0%	13	26.0%	14	28.0%	9	18.0%	11	22.0%	0	0.0%	6	30.0%	14	70.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Q5	5	10.0%	15	30.0%	19	38.0%	6	12.0%	5	10.0%	13	65.0%	7	35.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Q6	0	0.0%	11	22.0%	12	24.0%	21	42.0%	6	12.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	10	50.0%
<b>Language Issues</b>	Q7	4	8.0%	19	38.0%	19	38.0%	6	12.0%	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	7	35.0%	3	15.0%	10	50.0%	0	0.0%
	Q8	5	10.0%	16	32.0%	14	28.0%	12	24.0%	3	6.0%	7	35.0%	7	35.0%	3	15.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%
	Q9	6	12.0%	22	44.0%	17	34.0%	4	8.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	10	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Subject Matter Issues</b>	Q10	9	18.0%	14	28.0%	23	46.0%	3	6.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	10	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Q11	9	18.0%	12	24.0%	20	40.0%	6	12.0%	3	6.0%	0	0.0%	16	80.0%	4	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Q12	1	2.0%	9	18.0%	11	22.0%	17	34.0%	12	24.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	3	15.0%	7	35.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Skills and Strategies</b>	Q13	3	6.0%	10	20.0%	21	42.0%	13	26.0%	3	6.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	7	35.0%	10	50.0%	0	0.0%
	Q14	3	6.0%	11	22.0%	21	42.0%	12	24.0%	3	6.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	7	35.0%	10	50.0%	0	0.0%
	Q15	8	16.0%	22	44.0%	17	34.0%	3	6.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	85.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Exercises</b>	Q16	13	26.0%	24	48.0%	12	24.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	6	30.0%	14	70.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Layout</b>	Q17	19	38.0%	20	40.0%	9	18.0%	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	85.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Q18	9	18.0%	27	54.0%	12	24.0%	1	2.0%	1	2.0%	13	65.0%	7	35.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Content</b>	Q19	1	2.0%	8	16.0%	14	28.0%	10	20.0%	17	34.0%	0	0.0%	7	35.0%	13	65.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Q20	24	48.0%	17	34.0%	5	10.0%	3	6.0%	1	2.0%	14	70.0%	6	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Following is the result of the Chi-Square test of goodness of fit on each item both by students and teachers.

**Table 3: Chi-Square Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>; Students**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
Chi-Square	22.6 <sup>b</sup>	25.2 <sup>c</sup>	41.6 <sup>b</sup>	7.6 <sup>b</sup>	17.2 <sup>b</sup>	9.36 <sup>c</sup>	27.8 <sup>b</sup>	13.0 <sup>b</sup>	32.6 <sup>b</sup>	31.6 <sup>b</sup>	17.0 <sup>b</sup>	13.6 <sup>b</sup>	22.8 <sup>b</sup>	22.4 <sup>b</sup>	17.68 <sup>c</sup>	21.2 <sup>c</sup>	17.68 <sup>c</sup>	45.6 <sup>b</sup>	15.0 <sup>b</sup>	40.0 <sup>b</sup>
Df	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.107	.002	.025	.000	.011	.000	.000	.002	.009	.000	.000	.001	.000	.001	.000	.005	.000

- a. Group = Students
- b. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 10.0.
- c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 12.5.

**Table 4: Chi-Square Test Statistics <sup>a</sup>; Teachers**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
Chi-Square	9.8 <sup>b</sup>	1.8 <sup>b</sup>	.00 <sup>b</sup>	3.2 <sup>b</sup>	1.8 <sup>b</sup>	.00 <sup>b</sup>	3.7 <sup>c</sup>	3.2 <sup>d</sup>	.00 <sup>b</sup>	.00 <sup>b</sup>	7.2 <sup>b</sup>	3.7 <sup>c</sup>	3.7 <sup>c</sup>	9.8 <sup>b</sup>	3.2 <sup>b</sup>	9.8 <sup>b</sup>	1.8 <sup>b</sup>	1.8 <sup>b</sup>	3.2 <sup>b</sup>	
Df	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Asymp. Sig.	.002	.180	1.00	.074	.180	1.00	.157	.362	1.00	1.00	.007	.157	.157	.157	.002	.074	.002	.180	.180	.074

- a. Group = Teachers
- b. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 10.0.
- c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 6.7.
- d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 5.0.

The result of the chi-square showed that there were significant differences between the students' responses to the items and the expected results in all cases. However, this was only the case in few numbers of items (items 1, 11, 15, and 17).

To answer the second research question, "is there any significant difference between the opinion of the students' and teachers' opinion about the book?" A Mann-Whitney U test was run on each category (Table 6). To do so, first the mean of the scores in each category were calculated (Table 5); then, the U test was run.

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Mean of each Category**

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Practical Concerns	Students	50	2.9267	.53997	.07636
	teachers	20	2.5667	.37619	.08412
Objectives Compatibility	Students	50	3.1667	.79753	.11279
	teachers	20	2.8500	.27519	.06153
Language Issues	Students	50	2.6467	.76609	.10834
	teachers	20	2.5833	.32218	.07204
Subject Matter Issues	Students	50	2.9000	.73231	.10356
	teachers	20	2.5167	.38198	.08541
Skills and Strategies	Students	50	2.7933	.59434	.08405
	teachers	20	2.9500	.52175	.11667
Activities	Students	50	2.0400	.83201	.11766
	teachers	20	2.7000	.47016	.10513
Layout	Students	50	2.0200	.68482	.09685
	teachers	20	1.7500	.38044	.08507
Content	Students	50	2.7400	.73707	.10424
	teachers	20	1.9750	.30240	.06762

Finally, in order to compare the opinions of teachers and students, a Mann-Whitney U test was run.

**Table 6: Mann-Whitney U Test; Difference in the Opinion of Students and Teachers**

	Practical. Concerns	Objectives Compatibility	Language Issues	Subject Matter Issues	Skills and Strategies	Activities	Layout	Content
Mann-Whitney U	296.500	361.500	484.500	310.000	429.500	248.000	388.500	183.000
Wilcoxon W	506.500	571.500	694.500	520.000	1704.500	1523.000	598.500	393.000
Z	-2.691	-1.825	-.205	-2.505	-.934	-3.525	-1.538	-4.258
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.068	.837	.012	.350	.000	.124	.000

a. Grouping Variable: Group

The results indicated that there were significant differences between the opinion of students and teachers regarding practical concerns ( $U=296.5$ ,  $p=.007<.01$ ), subject matter Issues ( $U=310$ ,  $p=.012<.05$ ), activities ( $U=248$ ,  $p=.000<.001$ ), and content ( $U=182$ ,  $p=.000<.001$ ).

## 6. Discussion and conclusion

ESP textbooks play an important role in the success of language teaching programs. Sheldon (1980) states that "textbooks represent the visible heart of any ELT program" (p.237). One of the ways to amend a curriculum is to improve the textbook and their contents. Systematic evaluations reveal strengths and weaknesses of the available textbooks and assist the authors and materials developer to revise the book and also help the teachers to choose the one which can meet student's needs and their expectations. It is crystal clear that every textbook has its own merits and demerits. No textbook is perfect (Cunningsworth, 1984). As mentioned earlier, the major areas of investigation in the present questionnaire were practical concerns, objectives compatibility, language issues, subject matter issues, skills and strategies, exercises, lay out and content. Two research questions were formulated. The first research question was: what are the students' and teachers' opinion about the book?

The findings of the chi square revealed that there were significant differences between the students' responses to the items and the expected results in a few numbers of items, (item, 1, 11, 15, 17).

To answer the second research question, a Mann-Whitney U test was run on each category (table 5), the results indicated that there were significant differences between the opinion of students and teachers regarding practical concerns ( $U=296.5$ ,  $p=.007<.01$ ), subject matter Issues ( $U=310$ ,  $p=.012,<.05$ ), exercises and activities ( $U=248$ ,  $p=.000<.001$ ), and content ( $U=182,p=.000<.001$ ).

Concerning the first part, practical concerns, it was revealed that the main problem was with the price of the book. It seems that the participants were not pleased with the price of the book. Participants, teachers and students, have positive attitudes toward the supplementary materials. The result showed that the currently used ESP textbook was easy to obtain. With respect to the second area of the questionnaire, it should be noted that there is no introduction section which clarifies the intended teaching objectives. The author of the book does not clearly specify the final objectives. An introduction section should be included at the beginning of the book to specify the objectives. The third section was related to the language issues. The author of the book mainly focused on vocabulary and deemphasized structure.

There is a concentration on reading comprehension and vocabulary, and various activities are employed to enable learners to comprehend the intended meanings. He made an attempt to consider logical order from simple to difficult. Nevertheless, the book suffers from poor recycling of structures and vocabulary. That is, they are not adequately repeated in subsequent lesson to reinforce their meanings and use. 50% of the teachers believed that the book lacks a section containing structures. The researcher, who has been teaching ESP more than 20 years, believes that the book may seem more valid if some grammatical items are included to empower students in comprehending and producing grammatical sentences both in isolation and in communication. With respect to subject matter, the results indicated that the subject matter is topically presented in logical manner.

The book starts with describing historical perspectives and continues with a variety of topics in the field. The researcher personally interviewed with five subject teachers, they had a consensus that the book developed some perspectives such as Piaget's, but somehow overlooked other influential perspectives such as Vygotsky's view including the concept of scaffolding. One of the interviewees put emphasis on the role of modern technologies on the child's language development which deserve attention. Participants both do not have positive attitude toward the subject matter of the book. That is, the content has not been graded as to the need and background knowledge of the students. Regarding the skills and strategies, it should be mentioned that more emphasis was put on reading skills, but other language skills and sub-skills are overlooked. In other words, the materials do not provide an appropriate balance of the four language skills. It seems that the book under study somehow ignores reading strategies, making prediction for example. The next part is related to the activities and exercises, with which participants are satisfied. There are different types of exercises ranging from simple to more challenging questions, which is in line with what Skierso (1991) suggests. He states that variety of activities and exercises of the textbooks seems beneficial. The last part of the questionnaires deals with the layout of the book. The layout of the book has a crucial role in drawing the students' attention and enhancing their motivation, this book, unfortunately, has no photographs which can be deterrent to the students.

## 7. Suggestions

Some practical suggestions are presented to tackle significant problems and drawbacks of the book under study.

The book, despite having merits, primarily focused on reading comprehension. Reconstructing the meanings intended by the writer of the materials requires activating students' background knowledge. To do so, pre-reading activity is needed. This book does not contain any activities which motivate the learners to read the reading materials meticulously. It would be better if the author adds some enabling activities. Textbook should provide an appropriate balance of four language skills. Covering all skills sufficiently meets the needs of the learners. Moreover, the book under study does not have reference to basic grammatical rules. The book may seem more valid if some grammar section is included to empower students in comprehending and producing grammatical sentences both in isolation and in communication. Finally, there is no introduction section which specifies the intended teaching objectives. It seems beneficial to have an introduction section at the beginning of a textbook.

## References

- Barnard, R., & Zemach, D. (2003). Materials for specific purposes. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teachers* (pp.306-325). London: Cromwell Press.
- Cunnings worth, A. (1984). Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching material. London: Heinemann.
- Evans,T.D, & StJohn. M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multidisciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials*. *ELT Journal*. 51(1), 50-75.
- Hutchinson. T, & Waters A. (1987). *ESP: A Learning centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karimi, S. (2006). ESP textbook evaluation: English for the students of computer. Unpublished master's thesis, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.
- Koosha, M. (2008). English for the students of Preschool and Primary Education. Tehran, SAMT Publication.
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. London:Blackwell.
- McGrath, I. (2002). Materials evaluation and design for language teaching. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2006) Teachers' and learner's Image of course books. *ELT journal*, 60,171-180.
- Murphy, D. (1985).Evaluation in language teaching: Assessment, accountability and awareness. In J. Alderson(Ed.)
- O'Neil, R.O. (1982).Why use textbooks? *ELT Journal* 36(2), 102-128.
- Otlowski, M. (2003). Ethnic diversity and gender bias in EFL textbooks. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5 (2), 232-250.
- Richards,J.C. (2001). Curriculum development in language education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P.C. (1991). ESP today: A practitioner's guide. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.
- Sheldon, L.E. (1988).Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 237-246.
- Skierso, A. (1991). Textbook selection and evaluation. In M. Celce-Murcia (9th Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 432-453). Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

## Appendix

### Dear participants

**The following questionnaire is intended for a research on textbook evaluation. Please read the questions carefully and express your idea by selecting one of the options.**

1. To what extent is the book available?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
2. To what extent can the accompanying materials be obtained in a timely manner?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
3. Is the text book cost-effective?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
4. To what extent do the objectives of the textbook match the objectives of the course?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
5. To what extent does the textbook seem to be in tune with broader educational concern?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
6. To what extent is the text book appropriate for the audience?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
7. To what extent does the textbook contain basic grammatical patterns and vocabulary?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
8. To what extent does the presence of structures and vocabularies move gradually from simple to more complex?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
9. To what extent are new vocabularies and structures recycled in subsequent units for reinforcement?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
10. To what extent does the subject matter motivate and interest you?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
11. To what extent has the ordering of the material by topics been arranged in a logical fashion?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
12. To what extent has the content been graded according to the need and background knowledge of the students?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
13. To what extent does the textbook teach the reading skill?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
14. To what extent does the textbook teach reading strategies?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
15. To what extent does the textbook teach the speaking skill?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
16. Are the exercises and activities varied enough to challenge the students?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
17. To what extent does the textbook appear attractive?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
18. To what extent do photographs and illustrations in the book motivate you to talk about the subject?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
19. To what extent are the materials related to your major?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak
20. To what extent has the content been graded according to the proficiency level of the students?  
a. excellent b. good c. average d. weak e. very weak.