Local Evaluation of an EFL Textbook: 'Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking'

Amir Marzban
Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Iran

Siavash Zokaeieh
Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Iran

Abstract—The present study was carried out to evaluate Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking. This study took an advantage of mixed method. The adopted checklist was retrieved from Al-sowat's (2012) with minor revision to gain qualitative data. The appropriateness of the checklist was sought vis a vis the comments by two faculty members of Guilan University with research interests in curriculum design and development. The evaluation was based on criteria, namely, lay-out and design, objectives, activities and tasks, balance of skills, language type, subject and content, social and cultural value, structures and vocabulary, and teachers' need. Some weaknesses and strengths of this book were discussed accordingly. In addition, the attitude of thirty freshmen towards this book was investigated via opinionnaire to gather quantitative data. The validity of the oppinionnaire was checked by the Faculty members of Guilan University. The estimated value of Cronbach's alpha for opinionnaire was (α=.780). Findings showed shortcomings and strengths such as limited number of pictures, usefulness of objectives, appropriateness of the activities for different learning styles, combination of different activities, little attention to reading and writing, lack of unplanned interaction, lack of different dialects and accents (World Englishes), culturally unbiased. Moreover, the result of the opinionnaire indicated highest positive attitude towards items (11, 13, 2, 6, 8, and 3) respectively. This study might be of help to speaking and listening teachers, syllabus designers, textbook evaluators in that they could apply appropriate addition, deletion, adaption and adoption if using Mosaic1: speaking and listening.

Index Terms—evaluation, EFL textbook, speaking and listening

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most crucial roles in language teaching/learning is played by the textbook. Hutchinson and Torres (1994) emphasized on the universality and essentiality of the textbook in educational context. Also, Sheldon (1988) determined textbook as the heart of ELT courses. Textbook could enhance the exposure of learners to authentic materials inside the classroom. It also could be considered as a linchpin for novice teachers by providing, time management procedure, guidelines and frameworks (Ansari& Babaii, 2002; Garinger, 2010; Tok, 2010). In other words, classroom management might be less bewildering phenomenon by utilizing prefabricated textbook. Usually teachers of EFL context are non-native speakers; therefore, not only the materials might be viewed as affluent source for the learners, but also they could be highly significant for the teachers' performance. As a result, it is influential to select appropriate materials and textbooks. To this end, textbook evaluation plays an important role.

McGrath (2002) remarked on the distinction between analysis and evaluation. Accordingly, analysis was referred to investigation of what exist and evaluation was referred to discovery of aims and objectives. There are several definitions for the term evaluation. Based on Farhady, Jafarpur and Birjandi (1994), evaluation was "the determination of the congruence between performance and objectives." (p. 3). More pertinent definition was highlighted by McDonough, Shaw and Masuhara (2013) which defined materials' evaluation as the "procedure that involves measuring the value (or potential value) of a set of learning material" (p. 50). To have a better grasp on the textbook and material's evaluation, definition of the term material might be of value. Tamlinson (2001) defined material as "anything which can be used to facilitate the learning of a language" (p.66). This definition broadens the concept of materials' evaluation to associating external and internal investigation. McDonough, Shaw and Masuhara (2013) considered external evaluation as an "overview of how the materials have been organized" by "checking the organization of the materials as stated explicitly by author/publisher by looking at the blurb and the introduction and table of contents" (pp. 45-54).On the other hand, internal evaluation was defined as "procedure by informing in-depth investigation into the materials" (McDonough, Shaw and Masuhara, 2013, p. 59).

Different categories exit for evaluation, namely, formative, summative, long term and short term (Nation & Macalister, 2010). Ellis (1997) classified evaluation into predictive and retrospective. In predictive evaluation, teachers predict which materials are important and in retrospective evaluation the outcome is scrutinized. Additionally, evaluation can be done in different situations such as open-market and ministry of education (McDonough, Shaw and Masuhara, 2013). This paper tries to investigate the open market evaluation, where the materials are not passed on to the teachers and where the teachers have a choice for selection of the main textbooks and supplementary materials.

Mosaic series can be considered as one of the appropriate sources for speaking/listening courses at undergraduate's level. The purpose of this paper is to evaluate and to highlight the merits and demerits of this book (Mosaic 1). Generally, undergraduate students suffer from speaking and listening skill. These two skills are interwoven and very important at university levels. To this end, speaking/listening's textbooks for universities should meet some requirements. One of the important instruments to check the requirements is a checklist that provides systematic evaluation. Impressionistic evaluation wouldn't be a reliable and accurate source for judgment, yet checklists accomplished this shortcoming (Cunningsworth, 1995; Ellis, 1997).

The materials, the way it has been organized, the content and the way learners should be assessed are of value for investigation. Therefore, a checklist with different areas such as layout and design, objectives, activities and tasks, balance between skills, language type, subject and content, social and cultural values and teachers' needs beside is selected and adapted for this study. There are numerous textbook with discrepancy between their blurbs, intentions and their outcomes. These books not only affect the performance of leaners but also may change the attitudes of learners. To illustrate it, assessment and the ways of correction might have direct influence on the learners' attitudes or the types of activity might not suit students' learning styles. Therefore, the main concerns of this study are to check the strength, weakness, claims and possible features available in the Mosaic 1: speaking and listening along with the attitude of the learners.

The findings may hopefully be of use to the learners, teachers, syllabus designers, policy makers, and other stakeholders:1)Instructors, by finding the weakness of this book, might apply an appropriate adding and deleting, modifying, simplifying or reordering if using Mosaic1, speaking and listening.2) By providing different weaknesses of this book, learners might consciously realize the parts that they should pay more attention, the parts that possibly cause difficulties.3)Syllabus designers, by comparing the merits and demerits might find out the value of this book for inclusion or exclusion in their syllabus.

This paper tries to answer the following questions:
• What are the weaknesses and strengths of Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking?
• What are the EFL learners' attitudes towards Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking?

II. METHOD

This study was descriptive due to the nature of the research questions. Mixed method design was used for the sake of triangulation to show various vantage points of the issues. Riazi (2016) distinguished between types of mixed method designs, namely, eclectic, principled eclectic and innovative. In this respect, this study utilized principled eclectic model by manipulation of opinionnaire's statements with the aim of obtaining the criteria of the checklist.

A. Instruments

The data for the textbook evaluation was gathered and evaluated via a checklist for the sake of systematization and accuracy. The utilized checklist was based on the study of Al-sowat's (2012) with minor revision according to Nation and Macalister (2010) and Mukundan, Nimehchisalem and Hajimohammadi (2011).Two main reasons for selecting this particular checklist was comprehensiveness of the criteria and context relevance. The appropriateness of the checklist was approved by the Faculty members of Guilan University with research interests in curriculum designing and development. The second instrument, 4-point Likert scale opinionnaire with 23 items, was researcher made which took into consideration the attitude of the 30 freshmen. The opinionnaire was piloted to check the blind spots. The statements were clear and simple in terms of language. Since, this study was locally oriented; also the validity of the opinionnaire was approved by the faculty members of Guilan University. In terms of reliability, the estimated value of Cronbach's alpha for the opinionniare was (α=.780) which could be considered acceptable based on the standards suggested by Baker, Pistrang, and Elliott (1994).

B. Participants

The target participants of this study included 30 freshmen EFL learners who were learning English for their BA degree in TEFL. Using convenience sampling, the opinionnaire was distributed among learners participating in the course of speaking and listening with Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking as their main textbook. In addition, the background of the learners was checked for their familiarity with ELT materials.

C. Procedure and Data Analysis

In the first step, the textbook was evaluated by the present researchers. Furthermore, the shortcomings and strengths were discussed with faculty members using this book at Guilan University. After the common agreement, the opinionnire was administered to the participants at the end of the course. In accordance with the nature of the second question, the analysis of the collected data for the opinionnaire was done by the SPSS (version 21). Descriptive statistics was used to calculate means and standard deviations of the items.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section the weaknesses and strengths of Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking are briefly discussed in relation to the criteria of the checklist.

A. Lay-out & Design

Based on the external investigation of this book it could be realized that it had an appropriate quality both in terms of brightness of the cover and quality of the papers but we should consider the fact that this textbook was offset in Iran's market. Therefore, the ultimate quality couldn't be expected. Considering academic objectives of this book, the cover was appealing.

Farther, units were organized in a systematic way through three features of lecture, learning strategy and language function. Each of these categories was expanded by listening, speaking, critical thinking and vocabulary building. Not only unites were consisted of easy progression but also they had a cumulative effect by the organization of content. To elaborate, building background knowledge was supported by pair work activity related to the background knowledge of learners.

Analyzing the visuals, a number of pictures in each chapter were approximately limited to 8-10. There could be a better combination of picture and material juxtaposing each other. Additionally, the pictures were designed and captured intellectually and deviated to be cultural biased. Different ethnic group's pictures were used in this book.

The tables, charts and graphic organizations were functional. The charts and tables were supportive for the claim of academic development. Moreover, this book included adequate list of vocabulary. The table of content indicated the page numbers of the topics, but activities' page numbers were not explicitly declared in the table of content. This might be problematic for the learners. Moreover, the instructions of textbook were fairly clear and informative. The instructions were sufficient for self-study as well. Some of the explanations were lengthy for the sake of thoroughness. Another important factor was the visualization of the types of activities that were informative by putting the picture of one head which represented individual activity, two heads for pair work and three heads for group activity. Appendix and indices were acceptable both in terms of form and function.

In this respect, Hashemi and Borhani (2012) reported acceptable layout and design for Touchstone series. This is inline with the findings of this study. In contrast, Hashemi and Borhani (2015) didn't find an appropriate lay-out and design for American English File series.

B. Objectives

Objectives are highly significant in the process of material development. Nazeer, Shah and Sarwat (2015) found a good result from the book by checking the balance between objectives and the content of the Oxon book. Long-term objectives of Mosaic 1 were to prepare students for academic success and short-term objectives were declared clearly at the beginning of each chapter. They were gradual in difficulties. Based on Swain's (1985) the production was more complicated (difficult) than the comprehension. Moreover, Psycholinguist's view towards language learning indicated that comprehension preceded production (Steinberg & Sciarini, 2006). So the progression might commence by comprehension and go through production. In like manner, Kumaravadivelu (2006) categorized input, intake and output respectively. As a result, the chapters' objectives were designed in well-organized manner to achieve these aims. The materials were articulated in correspondence with what experts considered as necessity. In other words, this book was designed to satisfy the needs of the leaners such as independent accomplishment of the tasks, utilizing listening/speaking strategies for learner's autonomy and as such.

Outlining could be considered as an important factor that equips learners with reasonable framework for the academic development. Although, Dudley-Evans & John (1998) mentioned "The idea that scientific or academic writing uses the passive voice more frequently than the active is a myth", yet the importance of passive voice in academic context especially from positivistic view was magnificent (P.76). To this end, the clear illustration of passive voice supported the academic objectives of this book. Tok (2010) evaluated Spot On and couldn't find clear and concise progression towards claimed objectives. Another supportive element for the objectives was the activity of research on a particular topic which might familiarize the students with crucial concepts of the research in English for academic purposes.

C. Activities & Tasks

Tasks and activities might be considered as important and affluent sections of textbooks. Different types of activities such as pair work or group work should engage learners' knowledge and ability. This might be achieved by balance between types of activities. Touchstone series also delivered acceptable balance between types of activities (Hashemi & Borhani, 2012). Activities and tasks of Mosaic 1were distributed almost equally and were influential in developing cooperative learning through the exchange of information.

Admittedly, Nation and Macalister (2010) emphasized on the role of task as an activity that learners use their knowledge to attain certain objectives with the focus on meaning. Also they have distinguished between task-based syllabus and task-supported syllabus. Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking utilized topic-based progression and varied on the different themes such as challenges, cooperation and competition, relationships. As a result, the materials could be accounted as task-supported.

The authors of this book used different types of activity such as group work, pair work, and individual activity that were appropriate for different learning styles. Nation and Macalister (2010) said that "There should be opportunity for learners to work with the learning materials in ways that most suit their individual learning style" (p. 64). This included group size, pace of teaching and learning the medium of language use. This combination might result in individual creativity during interaction.

Another merit of this book was the number of choices learners could make in accomplishment of the activities. The instructions of activities and tasks were sufficient and adequate. Nation and Macalister (2010) mentioned that the views of the learners in some cases may differ from the purpose of activities. To this end, they considered clearness of the headings and instructions as one solution which Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking met this criterion.

A number of activities and their types were suitable and practical, but the attention was more on functions rather than forms. Nation and Macalister (2010) explained about language-focused learning that "involves a deliberate focus on language features such as pronunciation, spelling, word parts, vocabulary, collocations, grammatical constructions and discourse features" that taken   into account both explicit and implicit knowledge(p. 92). Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking overemphasized on the explicit knowledge. Therefore, the authors overused explicit knowledge such as the lists of vocabularies in each unit.

The type of activities, namely, individual, pair work and group work activities were arranged appropriately for the learners. For instance, each lesson started with building background knowledge. At this level students might not be competent enough. To become more competent, help could be achieved by peer's interaction that farther might abolish frustration in many cases. Then, vocabularies would be introduced which could acquaint learners with the content. Later, listening activity could facilitate learning.

This book encouraged using computer and internet as well. However, the number of internet-based activities was limited. This might be good for the cases that learners couldn't have open access to the internet, but in general this could be considered as shortcomings. Alivina & Siyadat (2013) investigated inclusion of internet in commercial textbooks such as American English File, American Cutting Edge, Interchange and American Headway. Their findings revealed that only American English File utilized internet. Furthermore, participants of their study stated the importance leaning English through internet. Also, Shafiee Nahrkhalaji (2012) reported sufficient use of internet in Top Notch series.

Self-assessment at the end of each lesson could be viewed as a useful diagnostic tool. However, Nation and Macalister (2010) stated the problem of self-assessment as "it is often difficult to separate the learners' subjective concerns from objective judgment" (p.114).Therefore, Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking lacked the amalgamation of objective and subjective judgment.

D. Balance of Skills

In terms of quantity, the numbers of activities that support production (speaking) was higher than listening. However, the quality of listening as a pivot point of the lessons was highly significant. Other skills were given little attention since the focus was mainly on speaking and listening. Unlike Mosaic 1, Shafiee Nahrkhalaji (2012) found integration and balance between four skills in Top Notchseries. Moreover, it is of value to take into account the balance between instructional features of these two skills. The activities were sequenced based on the complexity which started with input and move towards output for both skills. It should be highlighted that both Language- process strategies and learning strategies were included in to the lessons. The book utilized approximate use of strategies for both skills.

The materials for the spoken language such as activities, dialogues and role play were parallel with the real life situation due to authentic language used in the textbook. In that, the role play activity could be changed into real play activity according to decision of instructor. The accuracy and the fluency were balanced by scaffolding technique in which the instruction and practice gradually developed to help learners with listening tasks. Authors of Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking designed the skills in instructional manner. In other words, listening skill was not mere test of comprehension, but instruction of listening. The same concept was applicable for speaking skill. Furthermore, the practice of critical thinking enhanced the capability of learners in speaking and listening. Critical thinking which might result in decision making and autonomy was characterized by Pennycook (2001) in narrow sense as "a way of bringing more rigorous analysis to problem solving or textual understanding, away of developing more critical distance as it is sometimes called" (p. 4).

Dudley-Evans and John (1998) explained about the difficulties of non native speakers both in getting into conversation and facing with signals. This book could equip learners to deal with real life situation. Accordingly, the objectives were preparing students for academic purposes; therefor learners should mostly deal with class situations, lectures or seminars in academic context. Brown (2001) divided the speech into monologue and dialogue. Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking was mostly monologue and planed, yet features of unplanned monologues such as hesitation or redundancy, slang and colloquial were fainted in this book. Additionally the speaking and the listening activities facilitated learner with critical thinking and problem solving techniques and which could be considered as merit of this book.

E. Language Type

Scrivener (2011) described authentic exposure as an "Exposure to language when it is being used fairly naturally" (p.397). Based on this statement the language used in mosaic 1 was to some degree authentic especially in academic context. The language of the book was appropriate for academic progression of students. Listening consisted of authentic sound, stress, rhythm, intonation and authentic rate of delivery but one of the weaknesses of the listening was the characters were native speakers of English. McDonough, Shaw and Masuhara (2013) considered English as lingua franca. Concomitantly, Kachru (1996) stressed on the concept of world Englishes. As a result, one of the shortages of this book was the lack of different dialects and accents. It was only restricted to North American and British accent which could be considered as widespread standard accents. Additionally, little attempt was made for explicit instruction of intonations and suprasegmental features. Language types used in the Mosaic 1 were appropriate for university and academic situations and could be beneficial for undergraduates in EFL context.

F. Subject &Content

The contents were based on the topics and real-life situations (*topic-based*) which could facilitate students in their educational lifespan. One of the important factors in the textbook evaluation is the sequence of content. Nation and Macalister (2010) divided the sequence of content into linear and modular arrangement. In the linear model the lessons were related to each other but in modular arrangement the lessons were separate from each other. This book also designed with modular arrangement (Topic-based) in which the content of materials would not be repeated in other chapters. This arrangement could be problematic in some circumstances. For example, absenteeism of the students might impede their progression in other lessons. It is worthwhile to mention that repetition existed, but within lessons. The topics were interesting. Also unites of progressions were mostly based on language functions, sub-skills and strategies. The other elements such as grammar was neglected to be part of unites of progressions. The subject and content were realistic. In contrast to Mosaic 1, American English File series were not much realistic, motivating and challenging (Hashemi and Borhani, 2015).

Johnson and Johnson (1999) explained learners' autonomy as the "capacity to take charge of both strategy and content of learning, and is obviously predicated on an assumption that the educational environment will provide the freedom for him or her to do so" (p.307). In this respect, Mosaic 1 provided content to develop learners' autonomy. The book was designed in a way that different leaners could have different choices in the activities based on their own leaning styles. This is inline with Ur (1999) statement that "the learner can use the course book to learn new material, review and monitor progress with some degree of autonomy" (p. 80). Moving towards other features of content, it could be realized that in some parts the content challenged listeners to think about their world view. This also might improve creativity and identity of the learners.

G. Social & Cultural Values

The cultural factors of the materials have always been a controversial issue among the practitioners. On the same scenario, Paige, Jorstad, Siaya, Klein and Colby (2003) stated that "No longer thought to be value-neutral, textbooks and other materials used in language learning generally present a certain way of looking at the world, that is, through the cultural lens of the author"(p.39). Concomitantly, Kumaravadivelu (2006) stated that "no text is innocent" (p.13). Investigating ideological, cultural and social aspects of texts require separate studies which are usually done via critical language studies and it is beyond the scope of this study. Overall, Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking was less culturally biased since the subjects and contents were designed academically. The authors didn't try to develop particular culture. Also the pictures were approximately equal between different races and genders. Generally, commercial textbooks with English for general purposes might be more cultural biased. For instance, Hashemi and Borhani (2015) found cultural bias and negative stereotyping in American English File. Touchstone series were also reported to be culturally biased (Hashemi & Borhani, 2012).

H. Structures and Vocabulary

There was no separate section for grammar which could be the weakness of this book. Explicit and implicit teaching of grammar together might be of help to make leaners accurate. Many scholars such as Richards and Renandya argued "people now agree that grammar is too important to be ignored and that without a good knowledge of grammar, learners' language development will be severely constrained" (p.145). Furthermore, Notion and Macalister (2010) provided three boosting features of grammatical structures and language – focused learning as "It can speed up learning. It can help learners to overcome some barriers to their language development. It can have positive effect on meaning focused learning." (p.57). Moreover, grammar is an umbrella term that cluster different areas such as pronunciation, word formation, syntax and as such. Accordingly, integrating implicit and explicit instruction of grammar could make learners more competent in terms of knowledge and ability.

A number of vocabularies for the accomplishment of the exercises were adequate and each lesson consisted of a list of target words. However, through a precise probe on the listening sections it was realized that there were a lot of unmentioned (new) words. Schmitt (2002) has proposed that the number of unknown words should be limited in the text for the non native users. As a result this could be considered as a demerit for Mosaic 1. Another shortcoming was the absence of teachable strategies for dealing with unknown words. This shortcoming might be more problematic for novice teachers and could also overwhelm learners.

Brown (2001) believed that "traditional language-teaching methods highlighted vocabulary study with lists" (p.375). Mosaic 1 had lists of words in each lesson which seemed old fashion and outdated. It would have been much more comprehensive if the authors had brought the list of words in a text parallel to listening. In this case both reading skill and strategies such as guessing from context, word parts (word formation) and dictionary use could be encouraged.

Other demerits of this section would be the implicit exposure to idioms, phrasal verbs, lexical chunks and collocations. It would be much better if the authors wrote chunks instead of single words. However, the authors included both high and low frequent words in the lessons. The words that had been used were functional and practical but they were not introduced in different context and forms.

I. Teacher's Needs

Textbooks should include students' workbooks, suggested supplementary materials, teacher's guide, videos and as such. Unfortunately, since Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking was offset, it might deprive teachers from appropriate guidance such as teacher's guide or teacher's edition versions. Additionally, tests and ways of evaluation might be of help for teachers which in this case were not included.

In what follows, the attitudes of the Learners towards Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking are discussed briefly by making use of descriptive statistics, namely, mean and standard deviation.

TABLE I
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE ITEMS OF THE OPINIONNAIRE

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1) I enjoyed the interaction with other classmates.	2.0667	.73968	30
2) The instructions at the beginning of each chapter were useful.	3.6667	.60648	30
3) The speaking activities were interesting.	2.2667	.69149	30
4) I liked the color combination of the pages.	1.6333	.88992	30
5) I feel I can speak better because of the pair work activities.	2.1000	.84486	30
6) The listening activities were authentic.	2.8000	.75545	30
7) The cover of the textbook was interesting.	1.6000	.72397	30
8) I learned useful information that I could use outside the classroom.	2.6000	.62146	30
9) I am familiar with different accent because I heard different accent in this course.	1.4000	.56324	30
10) The pictures were motivating.	1.8000	.96132	30
11) The lessons were up-to-date.	3.9067	.34575	30
12) I liked this book because my absenteeism didn't cause problem for the next lesson.	2.0667	.90620	30
13) The book was interesting because didn't explicitly teach grammar.	3.8667	.34575	30
14) I can listen to English conversations better because of exercises in this book.	2.0667	.80153	30
15) I feel I can speak better because of group work activities.	1.7000	.75231	30
16) The topics were motivating.	2.0000	.74278	30
17) The contents of the lessons were close to my needs.	1.6333	.80872	30
18) The amount of activities and tasks were sufficient	1.5000	.68229	30
19) I use more passive voice in my lectures.	1.9000	.75886	30
20) I was responsible for the accomplishment of activities.	1.6333	.80872	30
21) Individual activities were boring.	1.9667	.61495	30
22) I talked more than the teacher.	1.8333	.79148	30
23) The self-assessment section was helpful.	2.0003	.80872	30

The participants of this study expressed their highest positive attitude towards items (11& 13) which showed their point of view with respect to "being up-to-date" (M=3.9) and "explicit teaching of grammar" (M= 3.8). Item 11 was supportive for the overall positive attitude of the participants towards Mosaic 1. Item 13 was in contradiction to the assumptions of the present researchers, in that one of the shortcomings of structure and vocabulary section was the absence of amalgamation in explicit and implicit grammar teaching. This might indicate the sickness of EFL leaners from explicit instruction of grammar. Respectively, items (2, 6, 8, and 3) showed good level of positive attitude. Item 2 investigated "the beginning instruction of each chapter" (M=3.6). This might also support the findings in Lay-out and design section regarding the appropriateness of instructions. Additionally, item 6 tried to find the attitude of the participants towards "authenticity of listening tasks" (M=2.8). In the language type section, researchers' evaluation indicated the authenticity of materials which was inline with the beliefs of the participants. Item 8 sought the "usefulness of information that could be used outside the classroom" (M=2.6). This item corroborated with the activities and tasks that was deigned in a systematic way to encourage use of language outside the classroom. This might also encompass using different strategies for listening and speaking. Similarly, learners showed good proportion of positive attitude in relation to item 3 "speaking activities were interesting" (M=2.2).

In contrast, the lowest mean rank was reported to be for the items (9, 18, 4, and 17). Item 9 scrutinized the concept of "World Englishes" (M=1.4) in relation to different accent which could be considered as one of the shortcomings of Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking. The attitude of leaners regarding item 18 was in contradiction with the evaluation of activities and tasks (M=1.5). Items 4 indicated low mean rank for "color combination" (M=1.6). Additionally, item 17 had low mean in terms of "needs of the learners" (M=1.6).

With respect to the diversity with which the participants rated the items of the opinionnaire, items (10 and 12) had the highest variation (SD≥ .90). Item 10 evaluated the participants' attitude in relation to "pictures were motivating"

(SD=.96). On the other hand, items (11 and 13) reflected the least degree of variance implying that the respondents were highly consistent in their responses to this item (SD≤.34). Item 11 appraised their reflection towards "the lessons were up-to-date" (SD=.34) and item 13 highlighted their opinion to "explicit teach of grammar" (SD=.34).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Some weaknesses and strengths in relation to Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking were discussed in the findings and discussion part. Overall, the evaluation showed reasonable balance between the short-term and long-term objectives of the book and design of the materials. The external factors of the book were acceptable; however, the participants' attitudes were not drastically positive in accordance with graphic organizations and as such. Types, purposes and amounts of activities were sufficient according to the evaluations, contrary to belief of learners towards items (14, 15, 18, 21, and 23). In relation to balance between skills, the textbook used more speaking tasks compering to listening, yet the quality of listening tasks were splendid. Additionally, language type used in this book was authentic and inline with the positive attitude of the participants in relation to item 6. The textbook was designed with the topic-based orientation and text was not culturally biased. Regarding the structures and vocabulary, it was mentioned that the balance between implicit and explicit teaching of grammars and vocabularies might be of help to learners. In other words, these two approaches might facilitate the process of learning. However, the item 13 rejected this notion in terms of positive attitude of the learners. The participants were interested in implicit instruction of grammar. Overall attitude of the participants was positive towards Mosaic 1: Listening and Speaking.

It is also of value to mention that the purpose of this study was a local evaluation not a tightly controlled global evaluation. The findings might be of value to speaking and listening teachers, particularly those who use Mosaic series in their classes. By recognizing demerits of this book, teachers could include useful supplementary materials. Theses findings might be helpful for possible adaption, adoption and deletion. Through the findings of this study, syllabus designers could arrange their syllabi to achieve the best possible result from their suggested materials.

V. SUGGESTIONS

This study was an attempt to evaluate the Mosaic1: listening and speaking and to check the attitude of the learners towards this book. It is suggested to conduct a study at global level by including more teachers in the process of evaluation. In this case more reliable result might be achieved. It is recommended to expand the evaluation in relation to other Mosaic series namely, reading and writing for further investigation in other skills. Since the present study was conducted on EFL series of Mosaic, the same study could investigate the ESL version of this book. A number of participants for investigating the attitude could be added to improve the level of generalizability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

R<small>EFERENCES</small>

[1]   Alavinia, P., & Siyadat, M. (2013). A comparative study of English textbooks used in Iranian institutes. *International Journal of Asian Social Science,* 3(1), 150-170.
[2]   Al-sowat, H. (2012). An evaluation of English language textbook "Say It In English" for first year intermediate grade in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Studies in Curriculum and Supervision*, 3(2), 332-413.
[3]   Ansari, H., & Babaii, E. (2002). Universal characteristics of EFL/ESL textbooks: A step towards systematic textbook evaluation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 8(2), 1-9.
[4]   Baker, C., Pistrang, N., & Elliott, R. (1994). Research method in clinical psychology. Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, LTD.
[5]   Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by Principles an interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
[6]   Cunningsworth, A. (1995). Choosing your coursebook. Oxford: Heinemann .
[7]   Dudley-Evans, T. & John, M. J. (1998). Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi disciplinary approach. New York: Cambridge University Press.
[8]   Ellis, R. (1997). The Empirical Evaluation of Language Teaching Materials. *ELT Journal,* 51, 36-42.
[9]   Farhady, H., Jafarpur, A.Birjandi, P. (1994). Testing Language Teaching from Theory to Practice. Tehran: SAMT Publication.
[10]   Garinger, D. (2010). Textbook selection for the ESL classroom. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/ 0210garinger.html (accessed 3/6/2014).
[11]   Hashemi, S. Z., & Borhani, A. (2012). Textbook evaluation: An investigation into Touchstone series. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* 2(12), 2655-2662.
[12]   Hashemi, S. Z., & Borhani, A. (2015). Textbook evaluation: An investigation into American English File Series. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 3(5), 47-55.
[13]   Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The Textbook as Agent of Change. *ELT Journal*, 48(4), 315-328.
[14]   Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1987). English for specific purposes a learning-centered approach. New York: Cambridge University Press.
[15]   Johnson, K. & Johnson, H. (1998). Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell.
[16]   Kachru, B. (1996). The paradigms of marginality. *World Englishes*, 15(1), 241-225.
[17]   Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
[18]   McDonough, J., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). Materials and methods in ELT: A teachers guide. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
[19]   McGrath, I. (2002). Materials evaluation and design for language teaching . Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
[20]   Mukundan, J. Nimehchisalem, Haijimohamadi, R. (2011). Developing an English language textbook evaluation checklist: A focus group study. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(12), 101-106.
[21]   Mukundan, J., Nimehchisalem, V. (2012). Evaluation criteria of an English langauge textbook evaluation checklist. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(6), 1128-1134.
[22]   Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). Language curriculum design. New York: Routledge .
[23]   Nazeer, M., Shah, S. K., & Sarwat, Z. (2015). Evaluation of Oxon English textbook used in Pakistan public school for 6th & 7th grade. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 3(1), 51-79.
[24]   Paige, R. M., Jorstad, J., Siaya, L., Klein, F., & Colby, J. (2003). Culture learning in language education: A review of the literature. In D. Lange, & R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Culture as the core: Integrating culture into the language education* (pp. 173-236). Greenwich: CT: Information Age.
[25]   Pennycook, A. (2001). Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
[26]   Qu, W.and Yang, S. (2010). A peer and self-assessment project implemented in practical group work. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(6), 776-781.
[27]   Riazi, A. M. (2016). Innovating mixed-methods research: Moving beyond design technicalities to epistemological and methodological realization. *Applied Linguistics,* 37(2), 33-49.
[28]   Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). Teaching grammar. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 145-147). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[29]   Schmitt, N. (2002). An introduction to applied linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.
[30]   Scrivener, J. (1994). Language teaching the essential guide to English language teaching. Oxford: Macmillan.
[31]   Shafiee Nahrkhalaji, S. (2012). An evaluation of a global ELT textbook in Iran: A two-phase approach. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(3), 184-191.
[32]   Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 237-246.
[33]   Steinberg, D. D., & Sciarini, N. V. (2006). An introduction to psycholinguistics. Harlow: Pearson Education .
[34]   Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley: MA: Newbury House.
[35]   Tok, H. (2010). TEFL textbook evaluation: From teacher's perspectives. *Educational Research and Review*, 5(9), 508-517.
[36]   Tomilnson, B. (2001). Materials development. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 66-71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[37]   Ur, P. (1996). A course in language teaching: Practice and theory. UK: Cambridge University Press.
[38]   Zohrabi, M. (2011). Coursebook development and evaluation for English for general purposes course. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 4(2), 213-222.

Amir Marzban is currently an assistant professor of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Iran. His research interests are conversation analysis, L2 reading and writing, teacher education and CALL. Email: amir_marzban@yahoo.com

Siavash Zokaeieh is currently PhD student of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Iran. His research interests are critical language awareness, critical discourse analysis, critical language testing, and CALL. Email: szokaieh@gmail.com