

ENGLISH TEXTBOOK CHALLENGE IN JORDAN: AN IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS



 Ali Ata Alkhalidi^{1*}
 Ulas Kayapinar²

^{1,2} American University of the Middle East, Liberal Arts Department, Kuwait.

*Email: Ali.Al-Khalidi@aum.edu.kw

²Email: Ulas.Kayapinar@aum.edu.kw



(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Article History

Received: 12 July 2022

Revised: 26 August 2022

Accepted: 9 September 2022

Published: 23 September 2022

Keywords

English textbook

Language learning

Materials development

Professional development

Textbook analysis

Textbook evaluation.

Published textbooks are widely used as a main source for learning English language in countries like Jordan. The Jordanian learners often complain about the difficulty of learning English using the textbooks which are changed every few years. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of the textbooks, identify the potential problems, go beneath the authors' claims and their attractive designs, and provide insights about the textbook and the analysis process. The researchers analyzed the content of the Jordanian textbooks using the in-depth analysis method. A criterion-based checklist was used to analyze a sample of the published textbook "Action Pack 12", and the chosen sample was Unit 6. The study revealed significant findings about the role of the learners which was to "respond" rather than to "initiate", and most of their expected production was based on the word and/or sentence level. Moreover, the role of the teacher in providing useful, relevant input was not emphasized in the textbooks. Furthermore, this study guides English textbook writers and publishers on how to involve useful content in their published language materials, such as extended discourse, interactive linguistic activities, and interesting activities for creative thinking and critical thinking skills to enhance the quality of English language learning.

Contribution/ Originality: This study contributes significantly to the field of language material development, enriching the related literature about the effectiveness of the language teaching and learning theories. The study with the help of the analysis of textbook activities, would help gain useful insights about the analysis process of "published textbooks".

1. INTRODUCTION

English textbooks are used to teach English as a Foreign Language (FL) at Jordanian schools. Students generally start using textbooks for learning English from elementary school when they are five or six years old until they finish high school at age of eighteen years old. All Jordanian students must pass all the subjects at high school, including English, for university admission. The Jordanian Ministry of Education has introduced a series of textbooks for high schools called Action Pack. This series is a complete series from grade one until grade twelve.

An English textbook may not be satisfactory for successful language learning (McGrath, 2002), and it may not help the learners develop their communicative competence effectively (Tomlinson, 2011). Textbook publishers try to achieve financial success (Richards, 2001), and the ministries of education whose students use English as a FL

usually change their textbooks every few years (Alkhaldi & Oshchepkova, 2018). In other words, commercial considerations and the practice of changing textbooks frequently may result in the textbook not being fit for effective learning. Therefore, there is a need to analyse it thoroughly to determine its effectiveness and develop it to meet the learners' needs and levels.

The process of textbook analysis is an objective description that generates key data about the target textbooks (McGrath, 2002). There is a need to analyze the textbook closely to help the teachers develop their textbooks effectively (Littlejohn, 2011). They may also have professional development training in how to develop their textbooks. Furthermore, there is a need to test the claims of the textbook authors which are made in the teacher's guide and/or in the textbooks themselves (Cunningsworth, 1995). This study addresses this need. The textbook is one of the main sources that is used for language learning in Jordan. This analysis will help the teachers to get insight about the textbooks, activities, and authors' objectives.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Commercial textbooks are widely used in many countries, so they are changed every few years, that is, they are replaced by other textbooks (Alkhaldi, 2011; Alkhaldi & Oshchepkova, 2018). The main motive for publishers is likely to achieve financial benefits (Dat, 2006). Moreover, there is also a research gap between language theories, on which the language activities of the textbook or the related research findings are based (Alkhaldi, 2014; Saraceni, 2003). The students also struggle and complain about the textbooks and the difficulty of language learning (Alkhaldi, 2011). Therefore, it is important to analyze and test the effectiveness of the textbooks and the authors' claims. The strengths and weaknesses of language teaching and learning principles can also be assessed based on the findings of the related research studies (Alkhaldi, 2010).

1.2. Purpose of the Study

A textbook analysis aims to provide a description which may be used in conjunction with an evaluation or as an alternative to evaluation (McGrath, 2002). A textbook analysis can assist teachers to find out the strengths and weaknesses of their language textbooks, scrutinize the claims of the textbook authors carefully, and identify the mismatch between the levels of FL learners and their textbooks or identify the mismatch between theory and practice (Alkhaldi, 2011; Saraceni, 2003). A textbook analysis may also be used for selection (Mukundan, 2009) and/or development purposes. It can also help the teachers and researchers to gain insight about the textbook, analysis process, and authors' claims (Alkhaldi, 2011; McGrath, 2002). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to provide insights about the role of the textbook and its effectiveness, the role of teachers, the role of the learners, the analysis process, content, and activities.

1.3. The Role of the Textbook

The students in Jordan depend on the textbooks and accompanying materials for learning the English language. The textbook is important since it "fulfils a need, a purpose, it performs a function, conveys meaning... language and course books do not exist in a vacuum – they exist for and are shaped by a purpose within a particular context of use, culture and ideology" (Wala, 2003). The use of a textbook for learning English language has the following potential benefits:

- It guides the Jordanian learners and teachers about the language education process (Timmis, Mukundan, & Alkhaldi, 2009). It can guide them on how and when to teach and learn the language skills and items (Crawford, 2002) by presenting the language content, skills, and activities that shape what might happen inside the schools (Byrd, 2001).
- It standardizes the process of language teaching and learning in Jordan (Richards, 2001). The same textbooks are used in all schools to ensure that the same content and activities are delivered for all learners

to be tested with the same approach. However, this might be considered as a barrier for language learning since the textbook may not meet all the needs and levels of learners in all Jordanian schools (Canniveng & Martinez, 2003).

- It maintains the quality of content and activities (Bell & Gower, 1998). If the Jordanian students use well-designed textbooks, they may achieve quality language learning in all schools. Nevertheless, this may affect the teachers' creativity since they are restricted to specific topics and content, limited time, and same exam question items (Richards, 2001).
- It includes a useful input for students (Cunningsworth, 1995; Timmis et al., 2009). The textbook provides useful content which helps students to achieve effective learning, and it saves the teachers' time and efforts (Richards, 2001).
- It involves activities and tasks for classroom interaction (Mares, 2003). The interaction between learners and teachers through the textbooks is crucial for achieving the learning outcomes of language learning (Crawford, 2002), so the textbook presents activities to promote interaction inside the classroom (Timmis et al., 2009).
- It helps the teachers in their continuous professional development for teaching the language (Mukundan, 2009). The teacher's guide may include ideas on how to teach the language skills and aspects (Richards, 2001), and it provides them with the needed support related to language, methodology, and culture (McGrath, 2002). In other words, the textbook can include linguistic and cultural input which can assist the teachers to teach professionally (Crawford, 2002).

The textbook is written to assist the teachers and learners to learn the target language effectively in countries like Jordan through providing them linguistic, cultural, and methodological support at the highest quality standards. It is also a useful source for a creative classroom interaction.

1.3.1. Objectives of Textbooks

The objectives of textbooks are essential for teaching, evaluating and/or developing the textbooks (Graves, 2000; Richards, 2001). The textbooks should meet the objectives of the target language and reflect the learners' needs, interests, and levels (Cunningsworth, 1995). They should also be clearly stated (Graves, 2000; Richards, 2001). The objectives can provide guidelines for teachers and learners, facilitate planning, and provide the teachers with measurable outcomes (Richards, 2001). Despite the fact that the objectives are very important, they are not stated in the textbook or the target Jordanian teacher's guide. The available sections which are available in the teacher's guide are table of content, scope and sequence, introduction about the topics and skills, guidelines about using and teaching the textbook, features of the textbook, and suggestions for various classroom activities.

The textbook is a key site for studying the authors' objectives, language content, and language teaching and learning methodologies (Alkhalidi, 2011; Alkhalidi & Oshchepkova, 2018). The Jordanian textbook authors claim that the textbook is carefully designed to help students develop the language skills (Pelteret, Kilbey, & Greet, 2015b). This means that the students may be able to develop their language skills by studying their graded syllabus. The authors also state that their textbooks provide the students with a lot of opportunities for listening to English native speakers and for practicing speaking in English. However, the teachers who use Action Pack series for teaching English are not native speakers of English. The recordings are made by native speakers, but the teachers are not native speakers.

Moreover, the authors also mention that the textbooks provide the students with useful controlled reading practice through reading passages in modules. They also discuss the importance of critical thinking skills claiming that they are included in their textbooks. They indicate that "Critical thinking has become a focus in the English language class along with the other language and study skills such as reading, listening, grammar, planning, and organizing information in a writing task... classes that involve problem solving and critical thinking are more

interesting” (pp. 12-13). This shows that the authors are aware of the importance of developing language skills and critical thinking skills through using the textbooks. The objectives are carefully written to satisfy the users.

1.4. The Role of Teachers

The teachers have a significant role in the teaching process, analyzing the textbooks, and developing them (Canniveng & Martinez, 2003; Tomlinson, 2003). They have different styles for teaching the language by using the textbook, so the same textbooks are taught differently, and their role is to facilitate, guide or monitor the learning process (Cunningsworth, 1995). Furthermore, they can know their students' needs and help them learn the language based on their levels (Byrd, 2001), so the teachers can be involved in analyzing their textbooks for development purposes (Graves, 2000).

Tomlinson (1998) indicates that “for any materials to contribute positively to teacher development they must not be imposed; they must invite and facilitate reflection, evaluation and adaptation by the teachers, and they must involve teachers in the development and testing of the materials” (p. 343). Moreover, the teacher's role is not taken into serious consideration by ministries of education and textbook authors. Masuhara (1998) concludes the following teachers' needs:

- a- Personal needs: age; sex; cultural background; interests; educational background; teachers' language proficiency.
- b- Professional needs: preferred teaching styles; teacher training experience; teaching experience. (p.240)

It is argued that identifying the teachers' needs can provide key information for developing the teacher's guide. McDonough and Shaw (2003) argue that the teachers who use the textbooks are keen on analyzing and developing their textbooks. In other words, the teachers should have a significant role in analyzing, developing and using the textbook professionally which will reflect positively on learners' progress.

1.5. The Role of Learners

Learners are the center of the learning process, and the textbooks are written for them. Learners' needs, levels, and interests should be taken into consideration in the textbook analysis and evaluation to be developed effectively (Jolly & Bolitho, 1998). McGrath (2002) indicates that "There needs to be a reasonably good fit between the material, the learners (age, level and cultural background, including sophistication) and the constraints under which teaching takes place (length of course, course aims, official syllabus, public examination)" (p. 35). The common learners' needs can be summarized as follows:

- Personal needs: age; sex; cultural background; interest; educational background.
- Learning needs: learning styles; previous language learning experiences; gap between the target level and the present level in terms of knowledge (e.g., target language and its culture; gap between the target level of proficiency in various competence areas (e.g., skills, strategies); learning goals and expectations for a course.
- Future professional needs: requirement for the future undertakings in terms of: knowledge of language; knowledge of language use; L2 competence (Masuhara, 1998).

Richards (2001) specifies the learners' needs with the linguistic needs indicating that it is useful to identify the learners' needs to know the language skills and items that the learners need to perform a particular role. The needs of the Jordanian learners are related to the language skills for lifelong learning and employment purposes.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section illustrates the characteristics of the participants, data collection, data analysis, and methods of textbook analysis. It also presents the checklist and its categories (i.e., Content, Expectations of learners, and Interaction inside the classroom based on the textbook activities).

2.1. Sample of the study

The researchers selected “Action Pack 12” as a sample of the study, particularly Unit 6. The textbook is used for teaching English language for 17- or 18-year-old learners. The sampled unit was analyzed around the midpoint of the target textbook which made up almost 15% of the total textbook as recommended by some studies (e.g., (Cunningsworth, 1995; Littlejohn, 2011)). The chosen unit consisted of 6 pages and 27 tasks in total. The researchers chose the grade 12 textbook because it was the last and top level of the series which was supposed to be well-designed.

2.2. Data Collection

The data was collected using an adapted framework from Littlejohn (1992); Littlejohn (2011) focusing on three major categories: 1) content, 2) expectations of learners, and 3) interaction. The first category involved form (input to learners and output by learners), nature, and source of the content. The second category included turn take, focus, and operations. It concerned identifying the expectations that the learners have to perform to fulfil the task requirements. The third category involved individual work, pair work, and group work. It was related to the tasks that constituted the interaction or the learners’ participation. This categorization helped the researchers to identify the learners’ classroom participation and calculate the feature percentages (see the analysis in Appendix 1).

2.3. Data Analysis

The following three methods of textbook analysis are widely prevalent and known by different names: Impressionistic Method, In-depth Method, and the Outcome Method.

- Impressionistic Method: The “impressionistic” method (Cunningsworth, 1995; McGrath, 2002) is also known as “Level 1 analysis” (Littlejohn, 2011), and “external materials evaluation” (McDonough & Shaw, 2003). This method gives the teachers a general impression about the target textbook. In other words, the teachers can get a general overview about the textbook description, table of contents, the textbook organization, topics, and designs (McGrath, 2002). However, this method is not enough to determine the effectiveness of the textbooks, so there is still a need to analyze the textbook deeply to get further details.
- The In-depth Method: This method has different names such as “internal evaluation” (McDonough & Shaw, 2003), “in-depth analysis” (Cunningsworth, 1995; McGrath, 2002), and ‘Level 2 analysis’ (Littlejohn, 1992; Littlejohn, 2011). This method aims at analyzing the textbook in depth and providing details about the activities of the textbooks. In other words, it helps the teacher to analyze the aims, goals, values in which the textbook is based, and authors’ claims in depth (McDonough & Shaw, 2003; McGrath, 2002). This method is significant in obtaining insights and detailed information about the textbook.
- The Outcome: This method has also different names such as “overall evaluation” (McDonough & Shaw, 2003), “conclusion” (Cunningsworth, 1995; McGrath, 2002), and “Level 3 analysis” (Littlejohn, 1992; Littlejohn, 2011). It is the complement of the previous textbook analysis methods. In other words, it is the outcome of the analysis process which provides directions to implement the findings and recommendations of the previous step of in-depth analysis. Based on the findings of the in-depth analysis, the teachers can decide whether the textbooks are suitable for their learners or not and how to develop them effectively (outcome).

The teachers may have useful information from the impressionistic approach of textbook analysis, but they need to get more useful feedback and detailed analysis (Cunningsworth, 1995). Researchers should be able to scrutinize the textbook implications, content and methodology to decide whether they are appropriate for a certain context or not (Littlejohn, 2011). It is also argued that there is a need to look “inside the Trojan horse” and develop a framework to let the textbooks “speak for themselves.” Littlejohn’s analysis framework (Littlejohn, 2011) was adapted in this study to analyse the target textbook in depth.

Level 2 or in-depth analysis has been used as it is applicable for achieving the purpose of this study. Moreover, it involves a variety of key features to analyze what is exactly required for the learners to do from the textbook activities. The features and sub-features are categorized to help the analysts to address the target textbooks. The percentages for features were calculated from the extract. All tasks of the chosen unit were identified and percentages were recorded on the analysis sheet (see Appendix 1).

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings of textbook analysis. The first category of analysis was the content analysis. The researchers calculated the percentages of tasks and content items as they were presented in the textbook based on the checklist criteria Table 1 shows key results about the form, source and nature of the tasks. The form of content provided to the learners consisted of a variety of features. The input from the textbook is concentrated at the level of sentences and/or words with a co-occurrence average of 51.85% (written content is 48.15% and oral content is 3.70% respectively). The average percentage for discourse provided to the learners (“extended discourse: written” and “extended discourse: oral”) is 37.04% (18.52% each). There is also repetition of the tasks, for example, the authors asked the students to “read the passage and answer the question”, “read again and/or listen and check your answers”. The textbook authors relied on repetition of content which may be useful for learning English as a FL.

Table 1. Content features.

I Content Features	
A Form	Average (in %)
1 Input to learners	
Graphic	11.11
Words/phrases/sentences: written	48.15
Words/phrases/sentences: oral	3.70
Extended discourse: written	18.52
Extended discourse: oral	18.52
2 Expected Output from Learners	
Graphic	0
Words/phrases/sentences: written	18.52
Words/phrases/sentences: oral	70.37
Extended discourse: written	11.11
Extended discourse: oral	0
B Source	
Materials	77.78
Teacher	0
Learner(s)	22.22
C Nature	
Personal opinion/information	40.74
Non-fiction	37.04
Fiction	7.41
Linguistic items	11.11
Metalinguistic knowledge (comment)	3.70

Table 1 exhibits that the expected content from learners is striking where the main output is focused on sentences and/or words with an average of 88.89% (18.52% for written words/phrases/sentences and 70.37% for oral words/phrases/sentences). The average of written extended discourse output, expected from the learners, is seen at 11.11%. The most striking result from the analysis is that there is no expected oral extended discourse from the learners. This means that the extended discourse is not well-emphasized in the textbook, so the learners may not be able to develop their communicative competence usefully, especially oral extended discourse.

Regarding the source of content, the results show that the textbook decides the content, and it is the most dominant source with an average of 77.78%. The learners are partially responsible for generating the content with an average of 22.22%. Furthermore, there is no role for teachers in generating the content. In other words, the teachers do not have the opportunity to be autonomous and provide the content for their students, and they have not been given the opportunities to adapt the textbook and meet their students' interests and needs as recommended by some researchers (e.g., (Alkhaldi & Oshchepkova, 2018; Richards, 2001; Tomlinson, 2011)).

Fiction also plays a significant role in developing learners' creativity and enriching the quality of learning (e.g., Maley (2015)), but it has not had much emphasis in the analyzed sample with an average of 7.41%. The nature of that content is often learners' personal opinions and information with an average of 40.74% and 'non-fiction' content with an average of 37.04%. This shows that students' personal opinions and information form a big part of the nature of the content, and fiction has not been encouraged in the textbook which might mean that the textbook may not promote students' creativity. In other words, the textbook may not support the teachers in the education process, and it may not inspire the teachers to teach the language skills and activities creatively in the classroom as recommended by some studies (e.g., (McGrath, 2002; Mukundan, 2009)).

Regarding the second category of analysis "expectations of learners," the researchers calculated the percentages of the tasks as represented in Table 2:

Table 2. Expectations of learners.

II Expectations of learners	Average (in %)
A Turn-Take	
Initiate	22.22
Respond	77.78
Not required	0
B Focus	
Language system (rules or form)	3.70
Meaning	88.89
Meaning/system/form relationship	7.41
C Mental Operation	
Repeat identically	11.11
Repeat with substitution	3.70
Repeat with expansion	18.52
Retrieve from Short Term Memory (STM)	25.93
Formulate items into larger unit	3.70
Decode semantic/propositional meaning	22.22
Apply language rule	7.41
Apply general knowledge	3.70
Attend to example, explanation	3.70

Table 2 shows the percentages for the related features in the analyzed unit. The average of the tasks which require the students to "respond" is 77.78%; however, the tasks that require students to "initiate" is 22.22%. This shows that the textbook may not help the students to develop their initiative and autonomous learning as recommended (e.g., (Alkhaldi, 2014; Tomlinson, 2011)). In other words, the textbook often promotes interaction in the class by asking the students to "respond" orally at the level of words and/or sentences. Furthermore, most of the tasks plan what the students have to reproduce which is provided by the textbook at a sentence or word level. Consequently, textbook activities may restrict learners' creativity and opportunity to initiate interaction.

Regarding "focus," the averages of the tasks that require students to focus on meaning, meaning/system/form relationship, and language system are 88.89%, 7.41%, and 3.70% respectively. This shows that the students are primarily requested to focus on the meaning of the tasks. Regarding "mental operations," the researchers tried to record as many of the mental operations as possible, but they were able to record 9 of them within the whole unit

out of the number of operations (see Appendix 1). There are many operations which were not seen in the activities such as retrieving from intermediate term memory and long-term memory.

Based on the analysis, the dominant tasks were “retrieve from Short Term Memory” and “decode semantic/propositional meaning” with co-occurrence averages of 25.93% and 22.22% respectively. Repetition is the most dominant task with a total average of 33.33% for “repeat identically,” “repeat with substitution,” and “repeat with expansion” (11.11%, 3.70%, and 18.52% respectively). The authors of the textbook claim that “Critical Thinking has become a focus in the English language class along with the other language and study skills” (Pelteret et al., 2015b). However, the findings reveal that most of the activities are restricted to a specific range of mental operations.

The third category was ‘Interaction’ among students to find out whether they could interact individually, in pairs or in groups. Table 3 shows the percentages of the related tasks.

Table 3. Interaction.

III Interaction	Average (in %)
Teacher and learner(s) whole class observing	48.15
Learners individually simultaneously	29.63
Learners in pairs	18.52
Learners in groups	3.70

Table 3 presents the results of the task analysis related to the interaction or class collaboration and work. The “teacher and learner(s) whole class observing” feature is the most prevalent with the highest score of an average of 48.15%. “Learners individually simultaneously” is the second highest with an average of 29.63%. Nevertheless, pair work is low with an average of 18.52%, and group work scored the lowest with an average of 3.70%. This means that classroom interaction is generally designed to be between the learners individually and their teachers.

The in-depth analysis helps teachers and researchers to know to what extent the textbook matches the claims of the authors (McDonough & Shaw, 2003). The textbook authors claim that the textbook activities are to help the learners develop their writing, practice speaking, and improve reading skill (Pelteret et al., 2015b). The claims are attractive for customers; however, the analysis shows findings related to the input which is provided by the textbook to the learners, and the output, which is expected of the learners, as discussed earlier. The language skills that the students are requested to develop are oral skills more than writing skills at sentence and/or word level. This shows that writing skills are not given equal attention.

Nunan (1999) argues that it is necessary to provide opportunities to the students to help them give extended discourse or presentations in an attempt to develop their discourse skills in the class. However, the analysis shows that the unit analyzed for the study does not provide the students with opportunities to produce oral extended discourse (oral extended discourse expected as an output from the students).

To sum up, the researchers of this study conducted an in-depth analysis of a unit from a high school English textbook. The findings revealed that the main role of the students is to “respond” rather than to “initiate”, and the content, expected from them, is mostly based on words and/or sentences without plenty of opportunities for oral extended discourse as claimed by the textbook authors. Moreover, the input provided by the textbook involves extended discourse and sentences with repetition, and the teachers have no role in providing the students with content. The major source of content is the textbook, and the “students’ personal opinions and information” and “non-fiction” constitute the nature of the content. Finally, the students are required to produce oral content at the sentence level more than written content, and the unit did not include fiction to promote learner’s creativity effectively.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis, this study provides key recommendations for the textbook writers, publishers, teachers, and ministries of education. It is recommended that the textbook should be analyzed and developed effectively by including more content related to the learners' needs with a variety of useful written extended discourse. They should have more useful tasks to help the learners to have the opportunity to initiate interaction rather than being responsive. Furthermore, the textbooks should include plenty of opportunities for equal oral and written extended discourse to help the learners use English effectively. They should also include more creative tasks to create an interactive learning environment for lifelong academic learning purposes. Finally, the teachers should be given a role in providing the content and adapt their textbooks to meet their students' needs and interests.

There are also additional recommendations for teachers and ministries of education such as having/offering professional development training programs for analyzing the textbooks in-depth, adapting the textbooks to meet the learners' needs and interests, and gaining insight about the textbook analysis process and the teaching itself. The researchers of this study also recommend conducting further research studies on different samples and series to triangulate or support the research instrument and results of this study.

5. CONCLUSION

This study analyzed one unit from a Jordanian English grade 12 textbook in an attempt to gain insights about the pedagogical implications and the analysis process, identify potential problems of the textbook, provide recommendations for professional development for teachers, and to evaluate the claims of the textbook against the content. In other words, the study has tested some objectives stated in the textbook by the authors and investigated the textbook in depth. It has also identified the potential strengths and challenges of the textbooks. It has revealed that there is a mismatch between what is stated in the objectives of the textbook and the content provided in it. Such insights can be helpful for any future English language materials development and teachers' professional development. However, this study is limited to the analyzed sample. With larger samples, researchers can get more reliable results, so more textbook analysis studies are recommended.

The key findings of the study have revealed that the main role of the students is to "respond" rather than to "initiate", and the content which is expected from the students is mostly based on sentences with no oral extended discourse. Moreover, the findings have revealed that the input which is provided by the textbook involves some extended discourse and sentences, and the teachers have a limited role in providing the students with appropriate content. The major source of the content is the textbook, and the "students' oral personal opinions and information" and "non-fiction" at the sentence level constitute the nature of the content. It is also evident from findings that the analyzed sample does not have plenty of opportunities for deep critical thinking and creative thinking. Finally, the recommendations have been provided to analyze the textbooks in-depth, develop them, enhance their quality, and help learners achieve effective language learning.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' Contributions: Both authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

REFERENCES

- Alkhaldi, A. A. (2010). Developing a principled framework for materials evaluation: Some considerations. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 1(2), 281-298. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.1n.2p.281>.
- Alkhaldi, A. A. (2011). *Materials development in Jordan: An applied linguistics challenge*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Leeds Metropolitan University, Leeds, UK.
- Alkhaldi, A. A. (2014). Language theories donation through materials development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(3), 112-123. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.3p.112>.

- Alkhalidi, A. A., & Oshchepkova, T. (2018). An analysis of English language theories: A case study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(4), 227-236. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.9n.4p.227>.
- Bell, J., & Gower, R. (1998). Writing course materials for the world: a great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 116-129). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrd, P. (2001). Textbooks: Evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation. In M. Celce-Murcia, (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 415-427). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Canniveng, C., & Martinez, M. (2003). Materials development and teacher training. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing Materials for Language Teaching* (pp. 479-489). London: Continuum Press.
- Crawford, J. (2002). The role of materials in the language classroom: Finding the balance. In J. Richards & W. Renandya, (Eds.), *Methodology in language Teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 80-90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Dat, B. (2006). Developing EFL materials for local markets: Issues and considerations. In J. Mukundan (Ed.), *Focus on ELT materials* (pp. 52-76). Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language course: A guide for teachers*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Jolly, D., & Bolitho, R. (1998). A framework for writing materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 90-115). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlejohn, A. (1992). *Why are English language teaching materials the way they are?* , Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.
- Littlejohn, A. (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan Horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 179-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maley, A. (2015). Overview: Creativity - the what, the why and the how. In A. Maley & N. Peachey (Eds.), *Creativity in the English language classroom* (pp. 6-13). London: British Council.
- Mares, C. (2003). Writing a coursebook. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development for language teaching* (pp. 130-140). London: Continuum Press.
- Masuhara, H. (1998). What do teachers really want from coursebooks? In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 239-260). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mukundan, J. (2009). *ESL textbook evaluation: A composite framework*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing AG and Co. KG.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Pelteret., C., Kilbey, L., & Greet, J. (2015b). *Action pack twelfth grade, Teacher's Book*. England: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saraceni, C. (2003). *Adapting courses: A critical view*. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development for language teaching*. London: Continuum Press.
- Timmis, I., Mukundan, J., & Alkhalidi, A. A. (2009). Coursebooks: Soft or fair targets? *Folio*, 13(2), 11-13.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Materials development for language teaching*. London: Continuum Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wala, D. A. S. (2003). A coursebook is what it is because of what it has to do: An editor's perspective. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development for language teaching* (pp. 58-71). London: Continuum Press.

Appendix 1. Textbook analysis sheet.

Task Analysis: Unit 6																											
I Content																											
A Form																											
1 Input To Learners																											
Task number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
Graphic	/				/					/																	
Words/phrases/sentences: written		/			/		/	/			/	/	/			/		/			/		/		/		/
Words/phrases/sentences: oral							/																				
Extended discourse: written			/							/								/					/		/		
Extended discourse: oral			/												/	/				/	/						
2 Expected Output From Learners																											
Graphic																											
Words/phrases/sentences: written					/				/						/	/				/							
Words/phrases/sentences: oral	/	/	/	/		/	/		/	/	/	/	/	/				/	/		/	/	/	/	/	/	
Extended discourse: written								/										/									/
Extended discourse: oral																											
B Source																											
Materials	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		/	/	/	/		/	/			/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	
Teacher																											
learner(s)								/	/					/		/	/										/
C Nature																											
Personal opinion/information	/		/		/		/	/	/			/	/		/		/		/								/
Fact (non-fiction)			/							/	/			/	/				/		/	/		/	/	/	/
Fiction																		/						/			
Linguistic items		/					/													/							
Metalinguistic knowledge (comment)				/																							
II Expectations from Learners																											
A Turn-Take																											
Initiate								/				/				/	/	/					/				
Respond	/	/	/	/	/	/	/		/	/	/	/		/	/	/			/	/	/	/		/	/	/	/
Not required																											
B Focus On																											
Language system (rules or form)							/																				
Meaning	/	/	/	/			/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Meaning/system relationship				/	/																						
C Mental Operation																											
Repeat identically	/		/						/																		
Repeat with substitution																					/						
Repeat with transformation																											

