

# A Comparative Evaluation and Analysis of Two General English Textbooks: Four Corners 1 vs. Top Notch Fundamentals A

Hadi Hamidi

Department of English Language, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

Morteza Montazeri

Department of English Language, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

Khadijeh Alizadeh

Department of English Language, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

Jamaloddin Rezaie

Department of English Language, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

**Abstract**—Evaluation is regarded as the systematic collection of information contributing to decision-making. It encompasses processes for gathering an enough deal of information about a program or curriculum aimed at being conducive to improvement. Evaluation is taken into technical account as formal interpretation and examination of the components of a workplace development initiative so as to find out how well it is meeting its goals, thereby allowing an organization to improve the current initiatives and enabling decisions about support. In English language teaching, textbook evaluation helps curriculum developers and syllabus designers choose the best possible materials for a course of study. Considering the importance of textbook evaluation in language teaching and language syllabus design, the researchers aimed at qualitatively analyzing the two general English textbooks; Four Corners 1 and Topnotch Fundamentals A. The evaluation was based on the checklist of Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979). Three expert EFL teachers who had taught the mentioned books for about three years qualitatively analyzed the two textbooks. The analysis concluded that the two books almost did not differ based on the checklist, though they both had some strengths and weaknesses. Curriculum developers, syllabus designers, and EFL teachers may find the findings useful in their language teaching practice.

**Index Terms**—Four Corners 1, general English textbook, textbook evaluation, Top Notch Fundamentals A

## I. INTRODUCTION

Evaluation exists in different forms and is considered the principle of learning (Bentley, Sandy, & Lowry, 2002). According to Belfiore (1996), evaluation is formal interpretation and examination of the elements of a workplace development initiative in order to determine how well it is meeting its goals. Ongoing evaluation, as argued by Belfiore (1996), allows an organization to improve the current initiative and to plan further initiatives, and it enables decisions about support.

In general, evaluation is the systematic gathering of information for decision making. According to Richards and Schmidt (1985), evaluation may apply quantitative methods, such as tests, qualitative methods, such as observations, and value judgment. In language planning, evaluation frequently involves gathering information on patterns of language use, language ability, and attitude towards the foreign language (Richards & Schmidt, 1985). Richards and Schmidt (1985) further contend that in language program evaluation, evaluation pertains to decision making about the quality of program itself and about individuals in the program.

Nunan (2004, p.214) defines evaluation as “processes and procedures for gathering information about a program or curriculum for purposes of improvement”. According to Richards and Schmidt (1985), the evaluation of programs may involve the study of curriculum, objectives, materials and tests or grading systems, and the evaluation of individuals involves decision about entrance to programs, placement, progress, and achievement. Considering the importance of textbook evaluation in language teaching and language syllabus design, the researchers aimed at qualitatively analyzing the two general English textbooks; Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A. The evaluation was based on the checklist of Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979).

## II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

### A. Course Book Evaluation

The process of language education involves many elements, often learners considered as the center. However, this common belief is rejected when textbooks, as sources of providing input, are seen to control the instruction to a large extent (Sarem, Hamidi, & Mahmoudie, 2013). A systematic approach to course book evaluation can, as Nation and Macalister (2010) assert, be based on the parts of the curriculum design process:

- 1- Does the course book suit the environment where it will be used?
- 2- Does the course book meet the needs of learners?
- 3- Does the course book adhere to principles of learning and teaching?
- 4- Do the goals of the course book match the goals of the course?
- 5- Does the content of the course book match the proficiency level of the learners and show sensible selection and sequencing principle?
- 6- Is the course book interesting and does it apply effective techniques?
- 7- Does the course book include tests and ways of the process of monitoring?

Nation and Macalister (2010) further contend that very early in the evaluation procedure, the teacher needs to decide on the features that are essential for the course book. Any course book without these features would not be worth considering further. They mention the following possible essential features:

- 1- The book should be at right vocabulary and grammar level for the learners.
- 2- The book should focus on the language and the skills that are the goal of the course.
- 3- The book should be of a reasonable price.
- 4- The book should be easily available.
- 5- The size and number of lessons in the book should suit the length of the course.
- 6- The book should not include topics and behavior that offend religious and cultural sensitivities of the learners and their parents.

Once a textbook is chosen, it should be evaluated by standard or reliable checklists based on acceptable criteria so that the strong and weak points of the textbook are determined (Hamidi & Montazeri, 2014). Cunningsworth (1995, cited in Richards, 2001) proposes the following four criteria for evaluation of course books:

- 1- They should correspond to learners' needs, and they should match the aims and objectives of the language learning program.
- 2- They should reflect their present and future uses for learners.
- 3- They should take students' needs as learners into account, and they should facilitate their learning process.
- 4- They should have a clear role as a support for learning. Like teachers, they are the mediators between the target language and the learner.

He presents a checklist organized under the following categories:

- 1- Aims
- 2- Design and organization
- 3- Language content
- 4- Skills
- 5- Topic
- 6- Methodology
- 7- Teacher's book
- 8- Practical consideration

Littlejohn (1998, cited in Taylor, et al., 2002) contends that there exists a certain dilemma facing the ones given the task of reviewing text books. The dilemma he refers to is the choice reviewers need to make between the various methods of evaluation. While, according to Taylor et al. (2002), the argument for a systematic and principled approach to evaluation of textbook materials is appealing, it can be encountered by the claim that course book evaluation is fundamentally subjective, which may raise the need for reviews to state at the outset which direction they are moving towards. However, the suggestion they provide to evaluate a course book is to investigate the extent to which it has been successful to reach its objectives.

Gearing (1999) argues that there have been a multitude of checklists used for evaluation course books, while only a few of them have focused on teacher guide evaluation. The main reasons for evaluating teacher guides are argued by Gearing (1999) to be as follows:

- 1- Helping teachers to decide on their selection of textbooks with teacher guides,
- 2- Making them more aware of the content of teacher guide they use, and
- 3- Helping them to make more effective use of it, apprising them of its deficiencies and advantages.

### B. Qualitative Evaluation vs. Quantitative Evaluation

According to Richards (2001), quantitative measurement refers to the measurement of something that can be numerically expressed. Many test, as he maintains, are designed to collect information that can be presented and counted in terms of frequencies, rankings, or percentages. Other sources of quantitative information are checklists, surveys, and self-ratings (Richards, 2001). Quantitative data, according to Richards (2001), aims to collect information

from a large number of people on particular topics and can generally be analyzed statistically so that certain patterns and tendencies emerge. The collected information can be analyzed simply because of the fact that subjective decisions are not usually involved. Richards (2001) contends that quantitative data are traditionally regarded as 'rigorous' or conforming to scientific principles of data collection, "though the limitations of quantitative information are also recognized, hence the need to complement such information with qualitative information" (p. 296).

Qualitative measurement refers to measurement of something that cannot be expressed numerically and that depends on subjective observation or judgment (Richards, 2001). Information obtained from classroom observation, interviews, logs, journals, and case studies is, according to Richards (2001), objective. Qualitative approaches are holistic and naturalistic and collect information in natural settings for language use and authentic tasks rather than in-test situation. The analysis of the information obtained through qualitative approach is argued by

### III. METHODOLOGY

Three expert EFL teachers who had taught the mentioned books for about three years qualitatively analyzed the two textbooks. The experience of the evaluators ranged from 4 to 10 years of teaching. The evaluation was based on the checklist of Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979). This checklist had 25 questions in 5 different sections; a. subject matter, b. vocabulary and structures, c. exercises, d. illustrations, and e. physical make-up. The evaluators joined together and evaluated the books in a joint meeting. The qualitative analysis of each section is presented in explanatory sentences.

### IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section describes the qualitative analysis of the two general English textbooks; Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A. The evaluation was based on the checklist of Daoud and Celce-Murcia (1979). Below are the results of the analysis.

#### A. Subject Matter

1) Does the subject matter cover a variety of topics appropriate to the interests of the learners for whom the textbook is intended (urban or rural environment; child or adult learners; male and/or female students)?

Different topics have been covered in Four Corners (1), such as new friends, daily life, work and play. A variety of different topics have been presented in Topnotch Fundamentals A too, including occupation, events and times, and families. Topics are interesting for both males and females or both children and adults.

2) Is the ordering of materials done by topics or themes that are arranged in a logical fashion?

The ordering of materials is arranged in a logical manner in both books. They are arranged from simple to more complicated ones. For instance, in Four Corners (1), materials are started by 'Introducing themselves and others; Saying hello and good-bye', 'New friends' and then 'people and places'. Or Topnotch Fundamentals A begins with 'Introduce yourself', 'Greet people' and then introducing people.

3) Is the content graded according to the needs of the students or the requirements of the existing syllabus (if there is one)?

In both books, the content is graded according to the needs of the students. It has been attempted to use topics that students encounter in their everyday life, such as 'New friends' and 'daily life' respectively in unit one and four of Four Corners (1) and 'Family' and 'Clothes' in unit four and six of Topnotch Fundamentals A that are among the most interesting topics for students.

4) Is the material accurate and up-to-date?

Both of the books, Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A, are acceptable in terms of being accurate and up-to-date. The pictures of the books are attractive, motivating and relevant for learners. However, in contrast to Four Corners, there is a second edition for Topnotch Fundamentals A.

#### B. Vocabulary and Structures

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?

Both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A are mostly written for English Language Institutes, therefore the vocabulary and grammatical structures must be suitable for these levels. Each unit of Four Corners (1) consists of four parts (A, B, C, D) in which vocabularies are presented in just parts A and C; but in Topnotch Fundamentals A, each unit has three lessons and there is a vocabulary section in all lessons of each unit and there is a vocabulary booster on page 126 too. So, while the number of new vocabularies is good in Four Corners (1), the number of new vocabularies is excellent in Topnotch Fundamentals A. For example, in unit one of Four Corners (1), students learn fourteen words in the vocabulary section, but in unit one of Topnotch Fundamentals A, they learn around twenty words. Of course, students may face with new vocabularies in other sections of both books.

2) Are the vocabulary items controlled to ensure systematic gradations from simple to complex items?

In both books, there is no phonetic transcription for the words. Enough number of exercises for practicing vocabularies is not seen in both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A. Activities such as vocabulary games and word puzzles are neglected in both books. However, students can handle vocabularies of these two books.

3) Is the new vocabulary repeated in subsequent lessons for reinforcement?

In order to reinforce new vocabularies, they should be repeated in subsequent lessons. But it seems that the frequencies of new vocabularies of both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A are not enough for the aim of reinforcement.

4) Does the sentence length seem reasonable for the students of that level?

The sentence length seems reasonable for the students of both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A. Of course, there are long sentences that can be surely learned by students if the teacher teaches them by short chunks.

5) Is the number of grammatical points as well as their sequence appropriate?

Today all EFL textbooks consider importance communication rather than grammar. However, each lesson of both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A provides different grammars including *possessive adjectives* in unit one and *adverbs of frequency* in unit five of Four Corners (1) and *questions with where* in unit three and *demonstratives* in unit six of Topnotch Fundamentals A. There are also many grammatical points that are similar in both books, such as simple present in unit six of Four Corners (1) and unit seven of Topnotch Fundamentals A. The number of grammatical points is appropriate in both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A. But in Topnotch Fundamentals A, there is a grammar booster in each unit which includes extra activities related to the grammar of each unit. So, Topnotch Fundamentals A is more powerful in this regard.

6) Do the structures gradually increase in complexity to suit the growing reading ability of students?

In contrast to the progression line of vocabularies that are not clear in both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A, the grammatical points as well as their sequence is appropriate and organized in order of difficulty. The structures are arranged according to the ability of the students. For example, in unit one of Four Corners (1), 'Yes/no questions' is explained and in unit two, 'questions with who and how old' is presented or unit one of Topnotch Fundamentals A deals with singular and plural nouns and unit four presents adverbs. There are more difficult structures in next units in both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A.

7) Does the writer use current everyday language, and sentence structures that follow normal word order?

The writer uses current everyday language and sentence structures in both of the books which the students may face in their real life. For example, in the first unit of Four Corners (1), 'New friends', learners come across with spelling names and talking about where people are from that is so useful to learn or in unit five of Topnotch Fundamentals A, 'Events and Times', students learn about times around the world.

8) Do the sentences and paragraphs follow one another in a logical sequence?

The sections and tasks given in each unit of both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A do not have a fixed order. For instance, in the first section (A) of unit one of Four Corners (1), at first it is seen language in context, then vocabulary, grammar, speaking and finally keep talking. While in the first section (A) of unit two, it is seen respectively vocabulary, language in context, grammar, pronunciation, speaking and keep talking and also in the first lesson of unit one of Topnotch Fundamentals A, we have vocabulary, pair work, grammar, grammar practice, pair work and integrated practice, but in lesson one of unit two, we have vocabulary, grammar, grammar practice, pair work, listening comprehension, grammar and grammar practice. Therefore, there is not a logical presentation of activities in units of both of the books.

9) Are linguistic items introduced in meaningful situations to facilitate understanding and ensure assimilation and consolidation?

Linguistic items are introduced in a good and meaningful situation in Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A to facilitate understanding and ensure assimilation and consolidation and there are different and colorful pictures throughout the whole book.

### C. Exercises

1) Do the exercises develop comprehension and test knowledge of main ideas, details, and sequence of ideas?

Four major skills, including listening, speaking, reading and writing, need to be appropriate to the learners and all units should cover these skills together. The exercises of Four Corners (1) include the major skills, speaking, reading and writing in each unit, but there is no listening activity. Speaking and writing skills are observed in each unit of Topnotch Fundamentals A, but reading activities are only seen in units one, four, and six. In addition, none of the units are covered by listening activity. In addition, the number of activities in Four Corners (1) is more than Topnotch Fundamentals A. For example, in section A of Four Corners (1), there is nine activities; while lesson one of Topnotch Fundamentals A consists of just three activities. This may due to the fact that in contrast to Topnotch Fundamentals A, the exercises of Four Corners (1) are existed in a separate book. Taking what mentioned above into consideration, Four Corners (1) is more comprehensive in terms of the exercises and regardless of listening activities, the exercises are adequate in Four Corners (1).

2) Do the exercises involve vocabulary and structures which build up the learner's repertoire?

Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A include some similar exercises in terms of vocabulary. In activities of Four Corners (1), vocabularies are seen by matching, completing the chart, using pictures, ordering, completing puzzles, and crossing out the word that does not belong in a list. Vocabularies are presented in the activities of topnotch fundamentals A through matching, circling the different word, completing puzzles, and ordering. However it seems that finding synonym or antonym or guessing the meaning of unknown words is missing in both books.

3) Do the exercises provide practice in different types of written work (sentence completion, spelling and dictation, guided composition)?

Writing is more expanded in activities of Four Corners (1) than Topnotch Fundamentals A. For example, in unit one of Four Corners (1) learners are asked to write a conversation, but in unit one of Topnotch Fundamentals A, writing is limited to short sentences. However, there is no rewriting or spelling activities in unit one of Four Corners (1), while they are existed in unit one of Topnotch Fundamentals A. It seems that a composition activity related to the topic of each unit is ignored in these two books. Writing in an expanded way seems more necessary for EFL learners, so the exercises of Four Corners (1) can desirably promote learners' capability of writing.

4) Does the book provide a pattern of review within lessons and cumulatively test new material?

One of the weaknesses of Four Corners (1) is that there is no review in workbook. And one of the positive points of Topnotch Fundamentals A is that it includes a review units 1-7. The review section consists of seven activities such as vocabulary, reading and writing. Thus, Topnotch Fundamentals A provides better pattern of review in comparison with Four Corners (1). Of course, a review section immediately after each unit is one of the most satisfactory patterns for a book.

5) Do the exercises promote meaningful communication by referring to realistic activities and situations?

All units of both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A promote meaningful communication by providing exercises similar to routine practices occurring in peoples' everyday life such as completing a conversation about names and titles in unit one of Four Corners (1) and introducing occupations in unit one of Topnotch Fundamentals A.

#### *D. Illustrations*

1) Do illustrations create a favorable atmosphere for reading and spelling by depicting realism and action?

Different teaching methodologies have been focused on visualization technique and it is considered as an important technique in designing instructional materials. Illustrations create a favorable atmosphere for practice in listening, speaking and reading. Both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A include desirable pictures. The illustrations are more natural in Topnotch Fundamentals A than Four Corners (1) in which animated pictures are seen. Depending on the age and level of the learners, some are interested in funny pictures and others are being attracted by natural pictures. So, we cannot say which one are more preferred, funny pictures or natural ones.

2) Are the illustrations clear, simple, and free of unnecessary details that may confuse the learner?

Illustrations are mostly clear, simple and free of unnecessary details that may confuse the learner in both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A.

3) Are the illustrations printed close enough to the text and directly related to the content to help the learner understand the printed text?

The illustrations of both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A are printed enough to the text and are directly related to the content to help the learner understand the printed text. In this way, students' background knowledge is activated and they can guess or predict the coming text. Even in grammar section, there are related pictures which activate the meaning part of the activity.

#### *E. Physical Make-up*

Is the cover of the book durable enough to withstand wear? Is the text attractive (i.e., cover, page, appearance, binding)? Does the size of the book seem convenient for the students to handle? Is the type size appropriate for the intended learners?

The last part of the evaluation checklist is the physical make-up. This section exists in almost all evaluation checklists that are sometimes with a different name such as Lay-out or Physical Appearance. At first, students pay attention to physical appearance of a book than its content.

The cover of both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A are both durable enough to withstand wear; their cover and page appearance is so attractive and motivating for students; they use red color for titles that cause readability of the texts. Both of them have a good quality of paper. The size of both of the books could be designed more convenient for the students to handle. The layout of both of the books is clear and well-organized. The topic of each part of the units is written in bold type. There is a good printing in both of the books, but the size and type of the fonts in Four Corners (1) is better than Topnotch Fundamentals A. However, the physical make-up of these two books and factors such as the quality and color of ink used, the top, bottom, left and right margins, the space between words, sentences, lines and paragraphs are nearly the same. In fact, they are satisfactory and well-organized.

Since both Four Corners and Top Notch series are almost newly published general English textbooks, there have been scarce studies comparing the two series simultaneously. In general, by the analysis of Four Corners and Top Notch, it was concluded that the two books almost did not differ based on Daoud and Celce-Murcia's (1979) checklist, though they both had some strengths and weaknesses. Hamidi and Asadi (2015) found the same results. They simultaneously evaluated Four Corners 1 and Top Notch Fundamentals A using Daoud and Celce-Murcia's (1979) checklist. Their comparison showed that both textbooks were almost the same in most parts. Though Four Corner seemed not to have appropriate illustrations and physical make up, as a dominating EFL textbook, it was flexible enough to be used. One reason for Four Corners to be used more could be its lower price (nearly half) comparing to Top Notch. Hamidi, Aghamalek, and Bahramian's (2015) findings were also in line the results of the present study. Using Daoud and Celce-

Murcia's (1979) checklist, they comparatively evaluated New Interchange, Top-Notch, and Four Corners series. They found that teachers were more satisfied with Four Corners series due to its similarities in presentation of materials with New Interchange series. However, Four Corners had more updates comparing to New Interchange and was cheaper in price comparing to Top Notch. Hamidi, Bagheri, Sarinavaee, and Seyyedpour's (2016, in press) findings were in line the results of the present study as well. They comparatively evaluated New Interchange 2 and Four Corners 3. Their findings showed that there was no significant difference between the two textbooks. Only in some issues Four Corners 3 was better than New Interchange 2. However, Four Corners was found to have more updates considering pictures and reading passages comparing to the New Interchange.

The studies mentioned above all used Daoud and Celce-Murcia's (1979) checklist. This checklist was used because of its comprehensive and clear criteria. However, it seems to be a little old. Different results might be found if evaluators use different checklists to scrutinize the sections of the textbook.

## V. CONCLUSION

In general, evaluation is considered as the systematic glean of information contributing to decision-making. It encompasses processes for gathering an enough deal of information about a program or curriculum aimed at being conducive to improvement. Evaluation of learning exists in different forms and is regarded as the key principle conducive to learning. Evaluation is taken into technical account as formal interpretation and examination of the components of a workplace development initiative so as to find out how well it is meeting its goals, thereby allowing an organization to improve the current initiatives and enabling decisions about support.

This paper made a comparative evaluation of two English course books; Four Corners 1 and Topnotch Fundamentals A, which aimed at improving EFL and ESL learners' English language proficiency. These two books appear to have similarly met the criteria specified in the course book evaluation checklist to the same extent. In the realm of subject matter, for instance, both books show substantial similarity. Both appear to have presented a variety of different topics, including occupation, events and times, and families. Topics are appealing to both males and females or both children and adults. The ordering of materials is arranged in a logical manner in both books. Besides, in both books, the content is graded according to the needs of the students. It was also seen that they were acceptable in terms of being accurate and up-to-date. The pictures of the books were attractive, motivating and relevant for learners. In terms of vocabulary exercises, as another example, it seemed that finding synonym or antonym or guessing the meaning of unknown words was missing in both books. The third instance verifying the similarity between these books referred to their physical make-up. The covers of both Four Corners (1) and Topnotch Fundamentals A were both durable enough to withstand wear. The layout of both of the books was clear and well-organized. The topic of each part of the units was written in bold type. There was a good printing in both of the books, but the size and type of the fonts in Four Corners (1) was better than Topnotch Fundamentals A.

However, these two books were different in a number of aspects. Four Corners (1) was more comprehensive in terms of the exercises, and regardless of listening activities, the exercises were adequate in Four Corners (1). In terms of writing, it was more expanded in activities of Four Corners (1) than in Topnotch Fundamentals A. For example, in unit one of Four Corners (1) learners were asked to write a conversation, but in unit one of Topnotch Fundamentals A, writing was limited to short sentences. In contrast to Four Corners (1), where there was no review in work book, Topnotch Fundamentals A included a review for units 1-7. The review section consisted of seven activities such as vocabulary, reading and writing. Thus, Topnotch Fundamentals A provided better pattern of review in comparison to Four Corners (1). Curriculum developers, syllabus designers, and EFL teachers may find the findings useful in their language teaching practice

## APPENDIX. SAMPLE CHECKLIST FOR TEXTBOOK EVALUATION (DAOUD & CELCE-MURCIA, 1979)

Daoud, A., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 302- 307). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

0= totally lacking, 1= weak, 2= adequate, 3= good, 4= excellent

Items to examine	0	1	2	3	4
<b>A. Subject matter</b>					
1. Does the subject matter cover a variety of topics appropriate to the interests of the learners for whom the textbook is intended(urban or rural environment; child or adult learners; male and/or female students)?					
2. Is she ordering of materials done by topics or themes that are arranged in a logical fashion?					
3. Is the content graded according to the needs of the students or the requirements of the existing syllabus (if there is one)?					
4. Is the material accurate and up-to-date?					
<b>B. Vocabulary and structures</b>					
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?					
2. Are the vocabulary items controlled to ensure systematic gradations from simple to complex items?					
3. Is the new vocabulary repeated in subsequent lessons for reinforcement?					
4. Does the sentence length seem reasonable for the students of that level?					
5. Is the number of grammatical points as well as their sequence appropriate?					
6. Do the structures gradually increase in complexity to suit the growing reading ability of students?					
7. Does the writer use current everyday language, and sentence structures that fallow normal word order?					
8. Do the sentences and paragraphs follow one another in a logical sequence?					
9. Are linguistic items introduced in meaningful situations to facilitate understanding and ensure assimilation and consolidation?					
<b>C. Exercises</b>					
1. Do the exercises develop comprehension and test knowledge of main ideas, details, and sequence of ideas?					
2. Do the exercises involve vocabulary and structures which build up the learner's repertoire?					
3. Do the exercises provide practice in different types of written work (sentence completion, spelling and dictation, guided composition)?					
4. Does the book provide a pattern of review within lessons and cumulatively test new material?					
5. Do the exercises promote meaningful communication by referring to realistic activities and situations?					
<b>D. Illustrations</b>					
1. Do illustrations create a favorable atmosphere for reading and spelling by depicting realism and action?					
2. Are the illustrations clear, simple, and free of unnecessary details that may confuse the learner?					
3. Are the illustrations printed close enough to the text and directly related to the content to help the learner understand the printed text?					
<b>E. Physical make-up</b>					
1. Is the cover of the book durable enough to withstand wear?					
2. Is the text attractive (i.e., cover, page, appearance, binding)?					
3. Does the size of the book seem convenient for the students to handle?					
4. Is the type size appropriate for the intended learners?					

## REFERENCES

- [1] Belfiore, M. E. (1996). *Understanding curriculum development in the workplace: A resource for educators*. Toronto: ABC Canada Literacy Foundation.
- [2] Bentley, J., Sandy, G., & Lowry, G. (2002). Problem-based learning in information systems analysis and design. In E. Cohen (Ed.), *Challenges of information technology education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (pp.100-124). London: Idea Group Publishing.
- [3] Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Pearson education.
- [4] Daoud, A., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 302- 307). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- [5] Gearing, K. (1999). Teachers of English to evaluate teacher's guide. *ELT Journal*, 53 (2), 122-127.
- [6] Hamidi, H., Aghamalek, S., & Bahramian, E. (2015, in press). General English textbook evaluation: A qualitative-quantitative study of New Interchange, Top-Notch, and Four Corners series. *ELT Voices*, 5 (3).
- [7] Hamidi, H., & Asadi, F. (2015, in press). Textbook evaluation: Four Corners 1 vs. Top Notch Fundamentals A. *ICT and Innovations in Education-International Electronic Journal*, 3 (2).
- [8] Hamidi, H., Bagheri, M., Sarinavaee, M., & Seyyedpour, A. (2016, in press). An evaluation of two general English textbooks: New Interchange 2 vs. Four Corners 3. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7 (2).
- [9] Hamidi, H., & Montazeri, M. (2014). Dictionary of second language acquisition. Retrieved December 25, 2014, from <http://www.iranelt.com/index.php/introduction-to-sla>.
- [10] Hamidi, H., & Montazeri, M. (2015). Language syllabus design and evaluation. Retrieved December 25, 2014, from <http://www.iranelt.com/index.php/introduction-to-syllabus-design>.
- [11] Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. London: Routledge.
- [12] Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (1985). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Pearson Education.
- [15] Sarem, S. N., Hamidi, H., & Mahmoudie, R. (2013). A critical look at textbook evaluation: A case study of evaluating an ESP course-book: English for international tourism. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(2), 372-380.
- [16] Taylor, N., Fox, C., Bradshaw, C., Totsevin, A., & Williams, M. (2002). Secondary courses. *ELT Journal*, 56 (3), 306-329.



**Hadi Hamidi** has been teaching English for about 10 years at different institutes. He is currently a Ph.D. candidate in TEFL, 5<sup>th</sup> year, at Islamic Azad University, Science and Research branch, Tehran, Iran. He has carried out a number of researches, translated a couple of articles, and presented a number of papers in different conferences and seminars inside the country. His areas of interest include CALL, language assessment, and research statistics.



**Morteza Montazeri** has been teaching English for about 8 years at different institutes. He is currently a Ph.D. candidate in TEFL, 3<sup>rd</sup> year, at Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran. He has been an active participant of national ELT conferences and has published some research articles in international journals. His areas of interest include Curriculum Development, CALL and Teacher Education.

**Khadigeh Alizadeh** has her M.A. in TEFL from Islamic Azad University, Sari Branch, Iran. She has been teaching English for about five years at different language institutes. Her areas of interest are teaching methodology and syllabus design.

**Jamaloddin Rezaie** has his M.A. in TEFL from Islamic Azad University, Sari Branch, Iran. He has been teaching English for about 10 years at different language institutes in Sari. His areas of interest are classroom management and speaking.