

## An Evaluation of the Materials Deployed in English Language Proficiency Courses for Postgraduate Applicants: A Content- Based Study

**Bekhal Latif Muhedeen**

Department of English, College of Languages, University of Sulaimani, Sulaimani, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

### Abstract:

There is broad recognition that a textbook, among other components, plays an important role in many English language classrooms today. As a result, its evaluation is a significant issue to guarantee its contribution to the success of the teaching-learning process. Evaluating textbooks and other instructional materials used in the teaching- learning contexts is one of the responsibilities of teachers. The textbooks adopted in Kurdistan university language centers are no exception. Hence, the present paper is an attempt to conduct a post-use

evaluation for the content of one of the textbooks (Interchange 3) used at the intermediate level in Kurdistan university English language proficiency courses. It aims to determine the areas of strengths and weaknesses of the textbook content and to see to what extent it was appropriate in helping the learners improve their level of English from the teachers' perspectives. The textbook is analyzed using a descriptive content analysis method. For this purpose, 23 teachers who taught this textbook in six different language centers were asked to participate and the data were obtained through a 24-item questionnaire suggested by Demir and Ertaş (2014). The results of the content analysis indicated that the teachers are highly satisfied with the textbook under evaluation regardless of some deficiencies in certain aspects of the textbook - and that the textbook suited the teaching/ learning context as it could provide sufficient meaningful opportunities for the learners to communicate with the target language.

**Keywords:** Material Evaluation, Interchange 3, Content analysis, Teachers' Perceptions.

### Article Info:

DOI: [10.26750/Vol\(9\).No\(4\).Paper14](https://doi.org/10.26750/Vol(9).No(4).Paper14)

Received: 25- November -2021

Accepted: 30-January-2022

Published: 29-September-2022

Corresponding Author E-mail:

[bekhal.muheden@univsul.edu.iq](mailto:bekhal.muheden@univsul.edu.iq)

This work is licensed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0

Copyright©2022 Journal of University of Raparin.



## 1. Introduction:

Instructional materials (IMs) are the tools which provide core contents for their users. They take two main forms: printed materials, such as textbooks, handouts, and manuals; and non-print materials, such as audio/video tapes, CDs, and DVDs. Despite the recent technological advancements available in the process of language teaching and learning, textbooks are still regarded as a basic foundational component (after the teacher) in language classrooms all over the world.

Textbooks offer considerable advantages and materials for both teachers and students but this does not mean that they do not have disadvantages. In the literature, several experts and even key writers (e.g., O'Neill, 1982; Hutchinson and Torres, 1994; Sheldon, 1988 and Nguyen *et al.* 2018), write about the benefits that textbooks bring for both learners and teachers; while others (e.g, Graves, 2000; Ur, 1991; and Allwright, 1981), as textbook opponents, describe their disadvantages. In all cases, learners' success partly depends on the quality of the textbooks through which they are taught.

Nowadays, ELT world is full of commercially produced materials which are written without keeping particular users' backgrounds and needs in mind. Textbook evaluation has thus become a necessity and an essential part of our teaching practice as English language teachers. It is also essential for the curriculum planners and classroom teachers to regularly evaluate the suitability of the textbooks to the targeted users and contexts. For this reason, this study set out to examine the content of the intermediate level textbook, Interchange 3, which together with its supplementary resources was in use at our university language centers in the Kurdistan region.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Defining Material & Its Evaluation

Materials refer to “anything which is used by teachers or learners to facilitate the learning of a language,” Tomlinson, (1998:2). As key driving forces of language learning, they take various forms and they can be informative, instructional, experiential, eliciting, or exploratory in nature, Tomlinson (2012) and Azarnoosh *et al.* (2018). Hence, it is the teachers' duty to create a compatible combination of the strengths of these forms. Whatever forms they take, they have multiple roles in every course of instruction all over the world.

Textbooks are one of the universal instructional materials serving as a primary source for much of the language input to which learners are exposed and the language practice performed in the classroom, Richards (2001). It is an important and inseparable part of every instructional program in a way that “no teaching- learning situation, it seems, is complete until it has its relevant textbook.” Hutchinson and Torres (1994: 315).

Obviously, all the textbooks available at present cannot suit all ESL/ EFL classrooms. Selecting a high- quality textbook has, therefore, become a daunting task for teachers and educational institutions. Even, when the textbook selection has been made, the process does not end. Constant evaluation ought to be carried out to recognize its strengths and weaknesses, and ensure that it matches the program to which it is selected.

Hence, evaluation is defined as an activity of collecting information in order to be used in making educational decisions, Genesee and Upshur (1996). Scriven, in his Evaluation Thesaurus considers evaluation as “the process of determining the merit, worth and value of things, or the products of that process” (1991:139).

### 2.2 Types of Materials Evaluation:

As Tomlinson (2003: 23) states, evaluation differs in: (1) purpose (What is the purpose behind the evaluation?), (2) personnel (Who is the evaluator?), (3) formality (What is the context of the evaluation?) and (4) timing. (When is the evaluation carried out?). These categories will indeed bring about different types of evaluation.

There is disagreement among experts and evaluation professionals over the types of material evaluation. Most of the classifications are a matter of terminology as well as of numbers, as illustrated below in table (1):

**Table 1: Types of Materials Evaluation**

<b>Ellis (1997)</b>	<b>Predictive evaluation</b>
	Retrospective evaluation
<b>McDonough and Shaw (1998)</b>	External evaluation
	Internal evaluation
	Overall evaluation
<b>McGrath (2002)</b>	First- glance evaluation
	In-depth evaluation
<b>Cunningsworth (1995) &amp; Tomlinson (2003)</b>	Pre- use
	Whilst- use
	Post- use

Cunningsworth's and Tomlinson's ternary divisions encapsulate all the other classifications. Pre-use evaluation, as its name suggests, is conducted for selecting contextually appropriate material by making predictions about the potential efficacy of the materials which are not actually yet being used. Whist- (or in-) use evaluation involves examining the value of the materials in use. Compared to pre-use evaluation, this type of evaluation is more reliable due to the fact that it does not depend on prediction but depends on investigating data regarding the effect of the content of the material and its value during its actual use. Post-use, which is applied in the present study, is designed to examine the impact of the materials after they have been used and to decide whether to use them again or not.

### 2.3 Rationale for Material Evaluation:

Textbooks should be evaluated during all stages of instruction in an effort to ensure their suitability, determine their weaknesses and proceed accordingly, Zohrabi (2011). In the literature of material evaluation, many diverse reasons are identified for textbook evaluation. Sheldon (1988), for example, identifies two main reasons for evaluation: (1) helping teachers and program developers to choose suitable materials for their language classes; (2) determining probable strengths and weaknesses of a given textbook in order to familiarize teachers with the contents and to improve them.

### 2.4 Related Studies:

To the knowledge of the researcher, there have been no studies so far evaluating this intermediate textbook, Interchange 3, in the intended language centers of Kurdistan; but there is at present a vast body of literature on the development and evaluation of this series in general and other ESL/ EFL textbooks in particular around the world. Here, some of these related literatures will be presented.

By adopting Lee's model and analyzing 225 papers (135 writing papers and 90 pre- and post- questionnaires) textually and statistically, Haji (2020) tries to find out the effect of the explicit teaching of coherence and multimedia- aided coherence elements in improving the quality of EFL learners' writing and increasing their motivation. The sample consists of 45 intermediate EFL learners who studied English for general purposes in three language centers in Sulaimani city: Language and Culture Centre of the University of Sulaimani, IDEL Institute for Educational and Training Services, and Rava Institute for Learning the English Language. The results of his study show that the explicit teaching of coherence and coherence integrated with videos

significantly improve the participants' writing performance, and that unlike the non- integrated approach, the video- integrated coherence approach increases their motivation towards writing.

Şendoğan (2019) evaluated interchange (5<sup>th</sup> edition) to find Turkish EFL learners' perspectives about the series and check whether it is suitable for its intended users. The sample of the study consisted of 47 first-year Turkish EFL university students at a university in Turkey. The instrument to collect data was a questionnaire originally developed by Litz (2000) containing 25 items on a five- point Likert scale. After analyzing the data, it was shown that despite its positive aspects (such as suitable and precise layout and design, a balanced presentation of the skills, good and clear introduction of grammar points and vocabulary items, etc.), the series suffers from a number of drawbacks such as its unreasonable price, etc.

In Iran, Sahragard *et al.*, in their 2009 article, investigated the Interchange (3<sup>rd</sup> edition) textbook by employing Littlejohn's detailed framework (1998) without considering how it is used in the classroom. Their study sought to determine to what extent the communicative and task- based approaches are portrayed in the series. The participants completing the evaluative checklists were four ELT expert raters who had taught the series for at least one year each. The results show that, although it suffers from certain drawbacks, the textbook has several pedagogical values. However, the communicative principles and task- based approaches are not emphasized adequately, with the focus more on grammatical points than communicative issues.

Another study is from University of Birmingham where Dominguez (2003) explored how New Interchange Intro portrays men and women in the dialogues, examples and texts found in the book. The scrutiny of the gender analysis involved four related categories: (1) Male and Female characters, (2) occupational roles, (3) amount of male/ female talk, (4) male and female in illustrations. Findings show that the series does not seem to have any hidden biases. It is, therefore, regarded as an exemplary textbook which keeps balance in representing the two genders throughout the book.

In addition to these, numerous comparative studies have been conducted to compare the series with other ESL/ EFL textbooks. Tayyebi *et al.*'s study (2014), for instance, compares Interchange and Top-Notch series in order to uncover their similarities and differences in terms of "general appearance, design and illustration, accompanying materials, objectives, topic contents, language contents, social and cultural contexts, language skills, teachability, flexibility, teaching methods, practice and testing". For this purpose, 58 EFL teachers in five different cities, Firozabad, Kazerun, Borazjan, Qaemiye and Noor Abad were asked to fill in the questionnaire. The questionnaire employed was primarily developed by Alamri (2008) consisting of 12 categories and 63 subcategories. The results of the analysis of the data gathered through the 4- point Likert scale questionnaire indicates that there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the participants regarding the two said textbooks; and that the Iranian EFL teachers had a better perception about Interchange series compared to the other textbook.

Similarly, Zohrabi *et al.* (2014) comparatively examined two English textbooks, namely Interchange 1 and English Book 1 of Iranian high schools to show their probable similarities and differences in terms of their content, vocabulary, grammar, reading exercises and activities, pronunciation practice, physical makeup, and language functions. It is concluded that each of these textbooks has its strengths and weaknesses and that Iranian students are not satisfied with English Book 1, as compared to Interchange 1. Due to the fact that it is more grammar- and accuracy- based, English Book 1 does not encourage sufficient communicative and meaningful practice to its users.

Unlike the aforementioned studies, the current study is a post- use content evaluation study attempting to examine Interchange (3<sup>rd</sup> edition) series from the teachers' perspective and to determine its merits and faults which have not yet been analyzed in Kurdish EFL contexts.

### 3. Aims

This paper aims to conduct a thorough descriptive content analysis to evaluate an intermediate level English language textbook, Interchange 3, to explore the opinions of teachers about various aspects of the textbook and find out its areas of strengths and weaknesses.

### 4. Research Questions

The present paper addresses the following questions:

1. How do Kurdish EFL teachers evaluate the content of the intended textbook?
2. Is there any statistically significant difference in the opinions of the teachers at the selected language centers?
3. Do the teachers' years of teaching the textbook affect their opinions in evaluating it in terms of subjects & contents, skills & sub-skills and practical considerations?

### 5. Scope of the Study

This study involves exploring the opinions of twenty- three teachers regarding the content of one of the textbooks, Interchange 3, employed in all intermediate levels of our university language centers in the Kurdistan region. Its findings are, hence, limited to that textbook and the sample of this study. They cannot be generalized to other textbooks and levels, but it can be a useful starting point and a basic foundation for the evaluation of the other textbooks in the other levels.

### 6. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study can be summarized as follows:

1. This study is significant for the MOHE's curriculum designers and developers as its results contribute to determine the advantages and disadvantages of the textbook under analysis. This can be a good source for ascertaining its suitability for the intended courses and deciding on future continued use.
2. The findings of this study will further be applicable to the educational officials and administrators in the language centers of Kurdistan universities to see how closely they matched with what they envision for their language centers.
3. It is also important for those teachers who teach in the language centers because it will help them use their textbook effectively and learn how to enrich their materials wherever and whenever needed.
4. The language learners themselves can benefit from the results of this study in that they pave the way for more understanding the various dimensions of the textbooks they are being taught. This consequently ensures that the knowledge given in these centers is useful for their future careers.
5. The present study is also beneficial for researchers as it forms a basic foundation for the evaluation of the other series in the course and the other aspects of the current textbooks.

### 7. Methodology

#### 7.1 Sample of the Study

Twenty- three Kurdish EFL teachers (2 females and 21 males) who have at least one year's experience in teaching this textbook in their university language centers were asked to complete the questionnaire. The table below illustrates the participants' demographic information.



**Table 2: The Demographic Distribution of the Sample**

Demographic Categories		Language Centers						
		Sulaimani	Salahaddin	Duhok	Soran	Raparin	Charmo	Garmian
No. of Teachers		6	6	2	3	2	1	3
Gender	Male	5	6	1	3	2	1	3
	Female	1		1				
Academic Title	Assistant lecturer	6	3	1	1	1	1	2
	Lecturer		3	1	2	1		1
Experience in teaching	1 year	2	1					2
	2 years	3	4		1			
Interchange 3	3 years				2	1	1	
	4 years	1	1	2		1		1

## 7.2 Data Collection Instrument

By taking the aims of the study into consideration and reviewing a number of the checklists and questionnaires available, an eclectic checklist questionnaire was chosen as the data collection instrument to assess the content of the textbook from the teachers’ perspectives. It is a 24-item checklist questionnaire suggested by Demir and Ertaş (2014) to be used by English language teachers, syllabus planners, material developers and researchers to systematically evaluate any given EFL/ ESL textbook.

The questionnaire consists of two main parts: (1) Information on the Research Participants; and (2) An Evaluation Checklist Questionnaire. The first part gathers a set of demographic information about the participants (such as gender, university, academic degree, and years of teaching the textbook) while the second part which is the core of the content evaluation of the selected textbook contains twenty- four items distributed among three main categories as follows: ‘Subjects & Contents (3 items)’, ‘Skills & Sub- Skills: Reading (3 items), Listening(3 items), Speaking (3 items), Writing (3 items), Vocabulary (3 items), and Grammar (3 items)’ and finally Practical Considerations (3 items),’. It is worth mentioning that the second part of the questionnaire has a three- option rating scale style which requires teachers to indicate their responses among three options: ‘Yes’, ‘Maybe’ and ‘No’. For the sake of data analysis, the ‘Yes’ answers are coded as (3), while the ‘Maybe’ and ‘No’ answers are coded as (2) and (1) respectively.

## 7.3 Procedure

After collecting the study’s categorical data, they are entered into the SPSS software for analysis. Statistical measurements such as standard deviations, percentages and ranges are used to answer the first research question summarizing the teachers’ perceptions towards the textbook under evaluation. For answering the second and the third research questions, one- way ANOVA test is used to see if any significant differences occur in two areas: firstly, in the perceptions of the teachers at the different language centers towards the textbook; and secondly, to determine the rate of variance that the differing number of years teaching the textbook has as to the effect on their opinions in evaluating the textbook in terms of the items of the questionnaire.

## 7.4 The Targeted Textbook

The textbook selected for evaluation is “Interchange 3/ Fifth Edition” which was approved by MOHE to be exploited in the Intermediate levels of all university language centers in Kurdistan since 2019. It was written

by Jack C. Richards, Jonathan Hull and Susan Proctor and published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press in 2017.

Kurdistan university language centers are mainly textbook- based; the chosen textbook with its supplementary materials (a student’s book (SB), a workbook (WB) and an audio CD) was their core source of target language input from 1/1/2019 to 15/7/2021. It is doubtless that an internationally reputable company like Cambridge University Press does not produce this material specifically for the Kurdish EFL learners of these language centers. The present content evaluation paper, therefore, is of great importance especially at this time as there have been no official evaluations about their effectiveness and appropriateness to their intended teaching-learning contexts. It will be a great opportunity to enable the language centers’ officials and textbook teachers to know their merits and drawbacks and their suitability to the context of use.

The SB composed of 150 pages distributed into sixteen units. The topics of each unit are categorized in terms of ‘Speaking’, ‘Grammar’, ‘Pronunciation/ Listening’, ‘Writing/ Reading’ and ‘Interchange Activity’. The units have similar structure and include ‘Snapshot,’ ‘Conversation,’ ‘Grammar Focus,’ ‘Word Power,’ ‘Listening,’ ‘Discussion,’ ‘Writing,’ ‘Perspectives,’ ‘Pronunciation,’ ‘Interchange Activity,’ and ‘Reading.’ They together allow the learners practice in the four main language skills, grammar points, and pronunciation as well as opportunity to enrich their vocabularies. Seemingly, these support the statement which is made in the blurb that this material adopts a communicative approach and helps “students become confident speakers of English right from the beginning” (Interchange, 2017: back cover)

The WB with an audio CD accompanying the selected series are regarded as supplementary materials containing an array of additional activities, oral and written exercises and conversations to practice the information and contents taught in the corresponding SB and consequently allow their users to make frequent progress checks as they proceed.

Since its prescription, no study has been conducted to investigate its pedagogical suitability to the context of use. This, together with the importance and criticality of the intermediate level constitutes the main reasons behind the evaluation of the textbook. It is the level which with appropriate content can prepare learners to use their English communicatively outside their classroom walls. Continuous content analysis is one of the primary points to guarantee this matter.

To this end, content analysis (CA) is viewed nowadays as a “powerful and unobtrusive” research method which had been introduced into psychological and social sciences in the 1980s; but at that time, it was mainly used in journalism and communication research, Krippendorff, (2004).

The current study characterizes CA as the data collection method and tool to explore the suitability of the content of the selected textbook because like all the other textbooks, this selected textbook has components of content, such as written, spoken, and/ or visual, which are the subject of this content evaluation.

## 8. Results and Discussions

In this section, the questionnaire items are analyzed and their results are presented in order to answer the research questions and elucidate the teachers’ perceptions about the selected textbook.

Regarding the first question of the study, ‘How do Kurdish EFL teachers evaluate the content of the intended textbook?’, the teachers’ responses are displayed by calculating the standard deviations, percentages and ranges for all the items of the questionnaire as outlined in Table (3):

**Table 3: Standard Deviations, Percentages and Ranges for the First Research Question**

	Items	Yes	Maybe	No	Total	Standard Deviation	Percentage	Range	
Subjects & Contents	1. Is the content of the textbook challenging enough to foster new learning?	12	8	3	23	2.39	80%	12	
	2. Are the subject and content of the textbook motivating?	13	8	2	23	2.48	83%	10	
	3. Is there a relationship between the content of the textbook and real-life situations (society)?	7	5	11	23	1.83	61%	16	
Skills & Sub- Skills	Reading	1. Are there adequate and appropriate exercises and tasks for improving reading comprehension?	14	6	3	23	2.48	83%	10
		2. Is there a wide range of different reading texts with different subject content?	15	5	3	23	2.52	84%	9
		3. Are the reading selections authentic pieces of language?	16	7	0	23	2.70	90%	5
	Listening	1. Does the textbook have appropriate listening tasks with well- defined goals?	20	3	0	23	2.87	96%	2
		2. Is the listening material well recorded, as authentic as possible?	22	1	0	23	2.96	99%	1
		3. Is the listening material accompanied by background information, questions and activities which help comprehension?	15	8	0	23	2.65	88%	6
	Speaking	1. Does the textbook include speech situations relevant to students' background?	4	10	9	23	1.78	59%	17
		2. Are the activities developed to initiate meaningful communication?	15	4	4	23	2.48	83%	10
		3. Does the textbook include adequate individual and group speaking activities?	16	4	3	23	2.57	86%	8
	Writing	1. Are models provided for different genres?	3	10	10	23	1.70	57%	18
		2. Do the tasks have achievable goals and take into consideration learner capabilities?	5	12	6	23	0.96	65%	14
		3. Is enough practice provided in controlled and guided composition in the early stages?	7	13	3	23	2.17	72%	13
Vocabulary	1. Does the vocabulary load (i.e. the number of new words introduced every lesson) seem to be reasonable for the students of that level?	18	5	0	23	2.78	93%	3	



Grammar	2. Is there is a good distribution (simple to complex) of vocabulary load across chapters and the whole book?	17	4	2	23	2.65	88%	6
	3.Do the vocabulary exercises promote internalization of previously and newly introduced items?	11	11	1	23	2.43	81%	11
	1.Are the grammar points presented with brief and easy examples and explanations?	17	3	3	23	2.61	87%	7
	2.Do the structures gradually increase in complexity to suit the growing reading ability of students?	16	6	1	23	2.65	88%	6
	3.Are the grammar points recycled in the following units?	12	9	2	23	2.43	81%	11
	1.Does the book address different learning styles and strategies in all the skills?	8	5	10	23	1.91	64%	15
Practical Considerations	2.Does the textbook include self-assessment parts for the students?	18	4	1	23	2.74	91%	4
	3.Are the objectives specified explicitly in the textbook?	11	10	2	23	2.39	80%	12

As the statistical information in the above table demonstrates, the teachers as a whole evaluated the textbook positively. All the items of the questionnaire are strong except for item 3 in category ‘Subjects & Contents’, 1 in ‘Speaking’, 1 and 2 in ‘Writing’ and 1 in ‘Practical Considerations’. The standard deviations of the strong items are between (2.96- 2.17) with (99%- 72%) while that of the weak items are between (0.96- 1.70) with (65%- 57%) percentages as follows:

### • Subjects & Contents:

This category contains three items. The first two items are strong whose standard deviations are (2.39) and (2.38) with (80% & 83%) and (12 &10) percentages and ranges respectively. These demonstrate that the teachers evaluate the textbook in this domain as motivating and inspiring to foster new learning. While the third item is weak because its standard deviation is (1.83) with the percentage of (61%) and range of (16). This is an indication that the textbook could not create real- life contexts and link the content to its users’ real-life experiences. The lack of these connections, as Al Masri declares, is “likely to weaken the learners’ drive for learning English and slow their achievement” (1993:58).

### • Skills & Sub- Skills:

This category consists of six sub- categories: Reading, Listening, Speaking, Writing, Vocabulary and Grammar. Each of these sub- categories contains three items.

In regard to ‘Reading’, it has strong values on all its three items as their standard deviations are (2.48), (2.59) and (2.70) with (83%, 84% and 90%) and (10, 9 and 5) percentages and ranges respectively. The teachers’

positive responses to these items points out that the textbook includes sufficient authentic reading texts with various subject matters and adequate tasks to help its users improve their reading comprehension.

In regard to ‘Listening’, it has strong values on all its three items as their standard deviations are (2.87), (2.96) and (2.65) with (96%, 99% and 88%) and (2, 1 and 6) percentages and ranges respectively. The teachers’ positive responses to these items prove that the textbook includes appropriate and well- recorded materials which help comprehension.

In regard to ‘Speaking’, it has strong values on items 2 and 3 as their standard deviations are (2.48 and 2.57) with (83% and 86%) and (10 and 8) percentages and ranges respectively. The textbook is, therefore, regarded by the responding teachers as initiating adequate meaningful communication and of individual and group activities. In contrast, the first item, with standard deviation (1.78), percentage (59%) and range (17), is weak which meant that the textbook does not contain relevant speech situations.

As depicted in Table 3, the ‘Writing’ subcategory has weak values on items 1 and 2 since their standard deviations are (1.70 and 0.96) with (57% and 65%) and (18 and 14) percentages and ranges respectively. The textbook fails in providing elements of different genres and they are not applicable enough to the learners’ capabilities. In contrast, the third item, with standard deviation (2.17), percentage (72%) and range (13), is strong which meant that the textbook, to some extent, incorporates practice in the initial stages of controlled and guided composition.

In regard to ‘Vocabulary’, it has strong values on all its three items as their standard deviations are (2.78), (2.65) and (2.43) with (93%, 88% and 81%) and (3, 6 and 11) percentages and ranges respectively. So, the teachers’ favorable responses to these items display the textbook’s reasonable number, good distribution and opportunities for the internalization of vocabulary words across the chapters.

In regard to the ‘Grammar’ subcategory, the teachers responded positively to all the items as their standard deviations are (2.61), (2.65) and (2.43) with (87%, 88% and 81%) and (7, 6 & 11) percentages and ranges respectively. Hence, the textbook presented brief and handy examples and structures for explaining the grammar points gradually increasing in complexity to suit the learners’ grammatical competence.

● **Practical Considerations:**

Similar to the previous categories and sub- categories, this category consists of three items. The first item is weak because its standard deviation is (1.91) with the percentage of (64%) and range (15). This is an indication that the series could not address different learning styles in all the skills tackled, whereas the second and the third items are strong whose standard deviations are (2.74) and (2.39) with (91% and 80%) and (4 and 12) percentages and ranges respectively. These imply that the textbook contains tasks for self- assessment and it adequately specified the objectives set for the textbook.

Regarding the second question of the study, ‘Is there any statistically significant difference in the opinions of the teachers at the selected language centers?’ which seeks the significant difference, if any, that occurs in the opinions of participant teachers in the language centers selected, the results are illustrated in Table 4:

**Table 4: Statistical Results with Reference to the Participant Teachers’ Opinions**

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	27.37996219	22	1.244543736	2.413195601	0.00036965	1.56324388
Within Groups	260.9565217	506	0.515724351			
Total	288.3364839	528				

Based on the above one -way ANOVA test results, the P- value which is less than the standard value (0.05), (P- value (0.0003) < (0.05)) indicates that there are significant statistical differences in the opinions of the teachers at the various selected language centers in evaluating the content of the textbook in question.

Regarding the third question of the study, ‘Do the teachers’ years of teaching the textbook affect their opinions in evaluating it in terms of subjects & contents, skills & sub-skills and practical considerations?’, which attempts to ascertain whether the teachers’ experience in teaching the textbook can affect their opinions or not, the results are shown in Table (5):

**Table 5: Statistical Results with Reference to the Teachers’ Years of Experience in Teaching the Series**

ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	1560.25	1	1560.25	0.458055046	0.568318901	18.51282051
Within Groups	6812.5	2	3406.25			
Total	8372.75	3				

The one -way ANOVA test analysis shows that the P- value is greater than the standard value (0.05), (P- value (0.56) > (0.05)). This indicates that the teachers’ years of teaching the textbook do not affect their opinions when they evaluate the content of the textbook.

### Conclusions:

The following conclusions can be drawn:

- The results of the analysis show the teachers’ positive opinions about the targeted textbook which was an essential source for target language input and practice for the Kurdish EFL learners in the intended language centers.
- Despite the general satisfaction that the teachers have about the textbook, they have identified some deficiencies in certain aspects of the textbook. For example, the textbook fails to make a relationship between its contents and real- life situations and to include speaking situations relevant to the students’ background.
- The textbook analysis results display the capability of the textbook in presenting worthwhile benefits for both students and teachers in terms of teaching and learning the aforementioned domains.
- The participant teachers’ responses to the items of the questionnaire indicate that the textbook efficiently integrates different language skills such as reading, writing, speaking and listening as well as sub-skills such as grammar and vocabulary into its contents.

### Recommendations:

After a thorough analysis of the data and in the light of the study findings, the following recommendations are made:

- The materials under study should be revised by a special scientific committee to overcome the drawbacks they contain.
- The materials should be revised to achieve a balance in connecting their contents with the learners’ professional lives by using additional resources.
- The material should be taught in a way that they suit the learners with varying learning styles and educational backgrounds.

### Suggestions for Further Research:

The following are a number of topics suggested for further research:

- Similar studies can be conducted by evaluating the contents of the materials of the other levels.
- The same study can be conducted with a larger sample size by taking the teachers and learners’ perspectives regarding the contents of the materials under analysis.

## تقييم الكتب في دورات إتقان اللغة الإنجليزية للمتقدمين للدراسات العليا دراسة قائمة على المحتوى

بيخال لطيف محي الدين

قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية اللغات، جامعة السليمانية، السليمانية، اقليم كردستان، العراق.

ملخص:

هناك اعتقاد واسع بأن الكتب التدريسية من بين المكونات الأخرى ، يلعب دورًا مهمًا في العديد من دورات التعليم اللغة الإنجليزية اليوم. لذلك ، يعد تقييمها مسألة مهمة لضمان مساهمتها في نجاح عملية التعليم والتعلم. يعد تقييم الكتب التدريسية والمواد التعليمية الأخرى المستخدمة في دورات التدريس والتعلم إحدى مسؤوليات المعلمين. الكتب التدريس المعتمدة في مراكز اللغات بجامعة كردستان ليست استثناء، وبالتالي ، فإن هذه الدراسة هي محاولة لإجراء تقييم نهائي لمحتوى أحد الكتب التدريسية (انترجينج- ٣) المستخدم في المستوى المتوسط في دورات اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة كردستان. ويهدف إلى تحديد نكات القوة والضعف في محتوى الكتاب التدريسية ومعرفة إلى أي مدى كان مناسبًا في مساعدة المتعلمين على تحسين مستواهم في اللغة الإنجليزية من وجهة نظر المعلمين. يتم تحليل الكتاب التدريسية بطريقة تحليل المحتوى الوصفي. لهذا الغرض ، شاركوا (٢٣) مدرسًا من ستة مراكز لغوية مختلفة قاموا بتدريس هذا الكتاب التدريسية وتم الحصول على البيانات من خلال استبيان مكون من (٢٤) عنصرًا. أشارت نتائج تحليل المحتوى إلى أن المعلمين ، بغض النظر عن بعض أوجه القصور في جوانب معينة من الكتاب التدريسي ، راضون للغاية عن الكتاب قيد التقييم وأن الكتاب التدريسي يناسب سياق التعلم لأنه يمكن أن يوفر فرصًا ذات مغزى كافية للمتعلمين للتواصل مع اللغة الإنجليزية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تقييم الكتاب التدريسي، انترجينج-٣، تحليل المحتوى، آراء المدرسين.

## References:

- Allwright, R. L. (1981). 'What do we want teaching materials for?' *ELT Journal*.36 (1), 5-17.
- Al-Masri, N. (1993). *Developing learning materials for Palestinian learners of English in Gaza strip*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. UK: University of Manchester.
- Azarnoosh, M., Zeraatpishe M. & Khosrojerdi, M. (2018). Evaluation of ESP textbooks, In Azarnoosh, M., Zeraatpishe, M., Faravani, A., & Kargozari, H. R., (Eds.), *Issues in coursebook evaluation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Demir, Y. & Ertaş, A. (2014). 'A suggested eclectic checklist for ELT coursebook evaluation'. *The Reading Matrix*. 14 (2), 243- 252.
- Dominguez, L. M. (2003). *Gender textbook evaluation*. UK: Centre for English Language Studies.
- Ellis, R. (1997). 'The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials'. *ELT Journal*. 51, (1), 36-42.
- Genesee P. & Upshur, J. A. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Haji, L. S. (2020). *Investigating the impact of multimedia- aided coherence teaching on the quality of EFL writing in Sulaymaniyah city*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Sulaimani: University of Sulaimani.
- Hutchinson, T. & Torres, E. (1994). 'The textbook as agent of change'. *ELT Journal*, 48 (4), 315-328.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). California: Sage Publications.
- McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. (1998). *Evaluating ELT materials*. in Crystal, D. & Jonson, K. (eds.). *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nguyen, N., Tran, V. T., Bui, L. P. & Nguyen, H. A. (2018). 'Evaluating the benefits and values of textbooks: perceptions of Vietnamese business students'. *Springer*, 34 (1), 378- 384.
- O'Neill, R. (1982). 'Why use textbooks?' *ELT Journal*. 36 (2), 104-111.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C, Hull, J. & Proctor, S. (2017). *Interchange 3*, (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sahragard, R., Zaremoayeddi, I. & Rahimi, A. (2009). 'An in-depth evaluation of Interchange series'. *Porta Linguarum*, 12 (3), 37-54.
- Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Şendoğan, K. (2019). 'Turkish EFL learners' perspectives on Interchange series'. *Journal of Philology and Translation Studies*, 1 (1), 60-69.



- Sheldon, L. (1988). 'Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials'. *ELT Journal*, 42 (4), 237–246.
- Tayyebi, G., Farzanefer, H. & Ilun, M. (2014). 'Interchange vs. Top- Notch: A comparative study'. *International Journal of Modern Management & Foresight*, 1 (5), 156-164.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2012). *Materials development for language learning and teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum Press.
- Ur, P. (1991). *A course in language teaching: practice and theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zohrabi, M., Sabouri, H. & Kheradmand, M. (2014). 'A comparative study of Interchange 1 and English Book 1 of Iranian high schools', *International Journal of English and Education*, 3 (2), 95- 104.
- Zohrabi, M. (2011). 'Coursebook development and evaluation for English for general purposes course'. *English Language Teaching*, 4 (2), 213-222.
- Cunningsworth A. (1995). *Choosing Your Course book*. Oxford: Heinemann.