Implementing the Communicative Approach in Tenth-Grade Iranian High School English Language Textbooks: An Analysis of *Vision 1*

Meysam Asadi[1] & Zahra Amani[2]

[1] M.A. in TEFL, Foreign Language Department, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran.

Asadi.Meysam.67@gmail.com

[2] *Corresponding Author*: M.A. in TEFL, Foreign Language Department, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran.

Amanizahra73@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to examine the Iranian high school teachers' perceptions towards the new English textbook named *Vision 1* and tried to find the level of these textbooks' communicative aspects based on the teachers' perceptions. To do so, one hundred participants were selected based on convenience random sampling, including 65 male and 35 female Iranian EFL teachers. To collect teachers' perspectives on *Vision 1*, a questionnaire, adapted from a similar previous study (Razmjoo, 2010), was used. To gain more valid data and to triangulate the data, a semi-structured interview was also conducted with 25 teachers. The results indicated that *Vision 1* was considered poor in terms of vocabulary, writing, and critical discourse analysis components by most teachers, but they rated it appropriate in terms of structure, reading, listening, and speaking tasks. The general methodological considerations of *Vision 1* were perceived to be good, but some believed that they were poor. The findings of the interview revealed that the participants agreed that *Vision 1* is based on the approach of CLT. Notwithstanding, they argued that this method has not been properly operationalized in the content of the book. The teachers pointed out that *Vision 1* has some features like conversations and pronunciation practices, which are beneficial for developing the communicative competence of the students. The results have implications for teachers and materials writers as well as the policy makers.

1. Introduction

There is no doubt that textbooks are one of the most important elements in every language classroom as they play several roles in the curriculum of language teaching

and help the stakeholders in the process of language teaching and learning (Richards, 2001). Any textbook or course book can have a very vital and effective role to play in English language teaching and learning (Hutchinson & Torres, 1994). Despite this fact, the authors also claimed that it is hard to define the role of textbooks in language classrooms. The same argument has been raised by Zohrabi, Sabouri, and Kheradmand (2014), who believe that textbooks are one part of the teaching and learning process that may encourage or discourage learners depending on the content they have and/or the way they present the content. They believe that textbooks are a kind of support for both teachers and learners, but this is not always true for all settings and contexts (Masoumi Sooreh & Ahour, 2020). Ahour and Ahmadi (2012) also stated that textbooks are the main sources that transfer the knowledge and information to the learners in a way that is organized and goal-oriented.

Textbook evaluation has thus become an essential research topic in the field of language teaching and learning, and its role in foreign language learning cannot be neglected (Shahmohammadi, 2018). Alshumaimeri and Alharbi (2024) believe that textbook evaluation has a significant role in enhancing language education. It is a complex and time-consuming process and needs models and frameworks. Ahour and Ahmadi (2012) mentioned that textbooks can transfer knowledge to the learners. As a result, to choose a culturally and locally appropriate textbook that suits the needs of the learners and the requirements of the teaching/learning process, evaluating a textbook is deemed necessary.

This study aims to evaluate current ELT textbooks in Iran, which are used for the primary levels at schools under the supervision of the Ministry of Education, from the perspective of communicative language teaching. This theory argues that ELT textbooks should develop the communicative skills of second language learners. Communicative textbooks try to create opportunities for the students to use the language in the classroom, as a sort of "halfway house" before using it in real life (Yusuf, 2008). Developing the communicative competence of the learners through real-life tasks and activities is the primary purpose of communicative textbooks in the field of ELT.

This study makes an effort to employ the CLT approach to examine the most recently locally developed ELT textbooks at the Ministry of Education in Iran. The *Vision* English textbook series has been recently developed as the main course book in Iran to gradually replace the old textbooks developed more than 20 years ago. The new English course books have been designed to compensate for some of the demerits of the old ones, including not paying attention to the speaking and listening skills.

The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was developed in the 1970s as a reaction to traditional grammar-oriented approaches. It is focused on communication in real-life situations and is directed toward the expansion of the communicative competence of the learners, that is, the capability to behave in language adequate manners in any situation. CLT is not only concerned with accuracy and memorization but also with interaction, meaning-making, and fluency. This study is an attempt to investigate the content of the new textbooks through the lens of CLT theory and identify the possible problems. The motivation behind the research is the increased necessity to adjust the teaching resources on language to the principles of CLT. In most EFL settings, a book such as the Vision series is the principal source of input, but it has yet to be established whether it has anything to do with communicative competence. It has been affirmed that textbooks have only contributed to pedagogical paralysis in the

second or foreign language. The assessment of these materials can also assist in making sure that they stimulate meaningful use of language and that they are consistent with the contemporary instructional aims. The outcomes of this study are deemed beneficial for policymakers, materials writers, and syllabus designers. The following research questions are investigated in this study:

Research Question 1: To what extent are the materials in *Vision 1* based on communicative purposes?
Research Question 2: What are teachers' perceptions towards *Vision 1*?

2. Review of Literature

The need to evaluate materials in language education using context-sensitive and reflective approaches has been highlighted by several studies. As an example, Razmjoo (2007) discovered that evaluation of a textbook has to be a two-way developmental procedure whose legislation is not just on the selection and judgment of the materials but also on the improvement of their pedagogical consciousness. In his work, it was emphasized that the participation of teachers in the process of assessment and adaptation of materials results in more efficient classroom work. In the same breadth, Hutchinson (1987) asserted the non-universality of any textbooks since the compatibility of any textbook to any kind of teaching and learning situation matters so much. These results further confirm the need to change, adapt, or add to the textbooks to suit the needs of various learners and the teaching environments.

The definition of textbook is different depending on the topic, methodology, or the application of its content (Tomlinson, 1998). A textbook can be defined as a book made and published for educational purposes or any book used as a tool in the classroom (Richards, 2001). The term "textbook" can be applied to a range of teaching materials, including CDs, social networks, the Internet, and videos, which serve as examples of new media tools used for educational purposes. It was also mentioned by McGrath (2006) that textbooks are a core element in the teaching-learning process, and they are likely to tell what should be taught, in what order, and how, as well as what learners learn.

In Iran, Ansary and Babaii (2002) aimed to determine whether EFL/ESL textbooks shared common features. To do so, they analyzed ten textbook reviews and evaluation checklists, exploring authors' views on the qualities of effective language textbooks. Their findings revealed a set of commonly recognized features present in EFL/ESL textbooks. Similarly, Azizifar (2009) evaluated two local English textbook series—*Graded English* and *Right Path to English*, using Tucker's (1975) evaluation framework. Although he found no significant overall differences between the two series, *Graded English* showed major shortcomings in pronunciation, which ideally should have been addressed in *Right Path to English*. Azizifar's study also revealed that both textbook series were predominantly structural, focusing heavily on grammar rather than incorporating other language learning elements. Furthermore, he found that both series were deficient in promoting communicative language teaching. In other words, the primary emphasis was on practicing linguistic forms and structures, with little attention given to meeting the communicative needs of students and teachers. Like many existing textbooks, these lacked the essential communicative features expected in an effective ELT resource (Tavakoli, 2021).

Yusuf (2008) categorized the textbooks into two kinds: traditional and communicative textbooks. Communicative textbooks, as the author explains, try to create opportunities for the students to use the language in the classroom before using it in real life. The communicative textbooks emphasized the communicative functions of language – the jobs people do using the language, not just the forms. They attempt to reflect the students' needs and interests. They emphasize skills in using the language, not just the forms of language, and they are therefore activity-based.

Kecskes (2000) explored students' understanding of conventional expressions through three tasks: conversation explanation, conversation completion, and discourse completion. Students more easily recognized literal meanings than figurative ones. Advanced Asian learners often produced grammatically correct but non-native-like responses.

Razmjoo (2007) argues that textbooks designed by experts outside the foreign language instruction context do not regard EFL communicative teaching and do not pay any attention to language learners' needs. The researcher also introduced stages of developing CLT-based textbooks for Iranian textbooks.

In a study in Iran, Jahangard (2007) analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of four high school EFL textbooks used by the Ministry of Education. Using 13 standard evaluation criteria, he assessed aspects such as content clarity, vocabulary practice, layout, visual aids, grammar, and skills development. The findings showed that Book Four had superior features compared to the others. The study also proposed a more visual and systematic method for textbook evaluation to replace subjective approaches.

3. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study is rooted in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), an approach that prioritizes real-world communication, interaction, and the development of learners' ability to use language effectively in diverse contexts. Emerging in the 1970s as a departure from traditional grammar-focused methods, CLT emphasizes fluency, meaningful interaction, and authentic language use over rote memorization and structural drills (Richards, 2001; Yusuf, 2008). Central to this approach is the concept of communicative competence, which underscores the importance of textbooks and materials that facilitate functional language skills, task-based activities, and learner-centered instruction (Hutchinson & Torres, 1994; Tomlinson, 1998). The study evaluates *Vision 1* through this lens, assessing whether its design aligns with CLT principles, such as integrating the four language skills and providing opportunities for spontaneous communication, as highlighted by McGrath (2006) and Razmjoo (2010).

To systematically assess *Vision 1*, the study employs Razmjoo's (2010) textbook evaluation framework, which operationalizes CLT principles into measurable criteria. This framework examines language components (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation) for their communicative utility, alongside skills-based tasks (e.g., speaking, listening) to determine their authenticity and engagement potential. Additionally, the framework incorporates Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to evaluate socio-cultural relevance, an aspect often overlooked in structurally oriented textbooks (Kress, 2000). The study builds on critiques by Moghtadi (2014) and Zohrabi et al. (2014), who found that many Iranian EFL textbooks fail to meet communicative needs, instead prioritizing grammatical accuracy over practical language use. By applying this framework, the study seeks to identify gaps in *Vision 1*'s implementation

of CLT, such as whether its speaking tasks encourage genuine interaction or rely on scripted dialogues, as noted in teacher feedback.

The study's theoretical grounding also acknowledges the broader discourse on material adaptation and contextual suitability. Hutchinson (1987) and Tomlinson (1998) argue that no textbook is universally effective, emphasizing the need for localization to meet learners' specific needs. This aligns with findings from Alshumaimeri and Alharbi (2024), who stress the role of teacher perceptions in evaluating textbook efficacy. By triangulating questionnaire data with teacher interviews, the study addresses potential biases, such as social desirability in self-reported perceptions, while offering actionable insights for policymakers and material developers (Richards, 2001). Ultimately, the framework not only evaluates *Vision 1* but also contributes to the ongoing dialogue on bridging theory and practice in CLT-based material design, ensuring that textbooks serve as dynamic tools for fostering communicative competence.

4. Methods

4-1. Research Design

To address the main research questions, several steps were taken. A 41-item questionnaire was given to 100 teachers, with responses collected either on paper or via email. Teachers completed their questionnaires with the researcher's assistance. Additionally, interviews were conducted to explore teachers' views, recorded, transcribed, and translated into English. Participants could respond in either Farsi or English. The interviews, lasting about 20 minutes, included six open-ended questions focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the Vision I English textbook and suggestions for its improvement.

4-2. Participants (or Sample)

The present study was conducted in Chaharmahal-va-Bakhtiary province, Iran, in 2017. It involved 100 high school teachers. They were native speakers of Farsi and were between 23 and 52 years old. Both male and female participants were selected based on convenience sampling. The participants had 5 to 28 years of teaching experience, and their academic degrees were in TEFL, English Literature, and Translation Studies, ranging from BA to PhD. The participants were selected based on a non-random sampling method, including 35 males (35%) and 65 females (65%). This group was chosen because they actively teach English at the high school level, making them well-qualified to assess the *Vision 1* textbook. Their academic backgrounds in TEFL, English Literature, or Translation Studies, along with their teaching experience, provided valuable expertise for evaluating the textbook's content and teaching effectiveness. Convenience sampling was used to include a diverse range of participants in terms of age, gender, and experience, while also making the data collection process more practical and manageable. Participants were required to be high school English teachers currently working in Chaharmahal-va-Bakhtiari province, Iran, and native speakers of Farsi. They needed to hold academic degrees in TEFL, English Literature, or Translation Studies (from BA to PhD) and have at least five years of teaching experience to ensure adequate classroom familiarity. Additionally, only those who were willing to participate and complete the questionnaires or interviews were included in the study.

Meysam Asadi & Zahra Amani

4-3. Data Collection Instruments

4-3.1. Questionnaire

In order to collect teachers' points of view toward *Vision 1*, to achieve the purpose of the study, the teachers' questionnaire, adapted from a similar previous study (Razmjoo, 2010), was used. The questionnaire was a checklist by selected the items about the objectives of this research. The textbook evaluation scheme consisted of 6 main factors containing 41 items measured on a five-point Likert scale, a scale from excellent, good, adequate, and poor to lacking. The teachers were required to express their opinions about each statement by marking the options on a five-point Likert scale.

4-3.2. Semi-structured Interview

To gain more valid data and to triangulate the data, a semi-structured interview was conducted with 25 teachers. The interview was prepared following the opinions of teachers in some open-ended questions.

4-4. Data Collection Procedure

In order to answer the main research questions, the following steps were conducted. A teacher's questionnaire with 41 items was distributed among 100 teachers. The students answered the questions with the researcher's guide, and the teachers answered their questions on paper or via e-mail. The interview was carried out to investigate teachers' perceptions by recording and transcribing, and translating into English. The participants were free to choose Farsi or English in order to respond to the interview questions. The interview consisted of six open-ended questions, which were asked during an approximately 20-minute session. The open-ended questions were asked to find out the participants' opinions about the newly developed local high school English textbook, *Vision 1*, and how it could be improved to fulfill the expectations of the teachers. The questions focused on the merits and demerits of the textbook.

4-5. Data Analysis

Having gathered data to analyze, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 21) was used to analyze the data. The mean, frequency, and percentage were used to analyze the data taken from questionnaires and interviews. The teachers' comments and interviews on Vision I were transcribed and analyzed.

5. Results

After conducting the study and gathering the required data, in this section, the main results of the study are presented. Thus, the research questions are provided one by one, and then their answers based on the study findings are presented. In order to answer the first research question regarding which of the materials in "*Vision 1*" are based on communicative purposes, according to Razmjoo's (2010) checklist, the following results were detected. *Vision 1* is analyzed and interpreted based on the language items in the questionnaire, which include pronunciation, vocabulary, and structure. The results are shown in figures and tables.

Table 1
Results for the Pronunciation Component

Pronunciation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid					
	1.00	23	3.8	11.5	11.5
	2.00	51	8.5	25.5	37.0
	3.00	38	6.3	19.0	56.0
	4.00	59	9.8	29.5	85.5
	5.00	29	4.8	14.5	100.0

The frequency analysis in Table 1 also shows that almost 30% percent rated Vision 1 as excellent in the pronunciation Component.

Table 2
The Results of Frequency Analysis (Vocabulary)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Vocabulary			
Valid	1.00	107	17.8	26.8	26.8
	2.00	155	25.8	38.8	65.5
	3.00	52	8.7	13.0	78.5
	4.00	48	8.0	12.0	90.5
	5.00	38	6.3	9.5	100.0

The results of the frequency analysis in Table 2 showed that almost 40% found Vision poor in vocabulary development. This indicates that the new version could not change much in this regard.

Table 3
The Results of Frequency Analysis (Structure)

		Frequency	Percent Percent	Valid	Cumulative Percent
		Structure			
Valid	1.00	94	15.7	15.7	15.7
	2.00	194	32.3	32.3	48.0
	3.00	86	14.3	14.3	62.3
	4.00	114	19.0	19.0	81.3
	5.00	112	18.7	18.7	100.0

Note: The numbers 1 to 5 represent points on a Likert scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.

The results of the frequency analysis in Table 3 showed that 32% rated the textbook as poor concerning structure, while about 20% rated it as good, and almost the

same percentage rated it as excellent. This shows that the new version had a better performance than the older one in structure development.

Table 4
The Results of Frequency Analysis (Reading)

		Reading			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	28	4.7	14.0	14.0
	2.00	62	10.3	31.0	45.0
	3.00	14	2.3	7.0	52.0
	4.00	41	6.8	20.5	72.5
	5.00	55	9.2	27.5	100.0

The results of the frequency analysis in Table 4 also indicated that 28% of the teachers rated the reading exercises as excellent and 20% as good. Surprisingly, 31% rated them as poor, which again means that the new version has some drawbacks as well.

Table 5
The Results of Frequency Analysis (Writing)

		Writing			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	48	8.0	24.0	24.0
	2.00	90	15.0	45.0	69.0
	3.00	31	5.2	15.5	84.5
	4.00	16	2.7	8.0	92.5
	5.00	15	2.5	7.5	100.0

The result of the frequency analysis in Table 5 showed that 45% of the teachers rated the writing tasks of the new version as poor. This means that the new textbook is poor in the writing tasks and it has not been able to satisfy the needs of the learners based on the teachers' perceptions.

Table 6
Frequency Distribution of Listening Scores

		Listening			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	27	4.5	13.5	13.5
	2.00	63	10.5	31.5	45.0
	3.00	19	3.2	9.5	54.5

	4.00	41	6.8	20.5	75.0
	5.00	50	8.3	25.0	100.0

The result of the frequency analysis in Table 6 shows that 25% of the teachers rated the listening tasks as excellent and 20% as good. Notwithstanding, 31% rated them as poor, which shows that while some think they are good, some others disagree and believe they are still poor and more should be done.

Table 7
The Results of Frequency Analysis (Speaking)

		Speaking			
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	1.00	21	3.5	10.5	10.5
	2.00	53	8.8	26.5	37.0
	3.00	24	4.0	12.0	49.0
	4.00	41	6.8	20.5	69.5
	5.00	61	10.2	30.5	100.0

The result of the frequency analysis in Table 7 indicates that more than 30% rated the speaking tasks as excellent and more than 20% rated them as good. However, some teachers (about 27%) rated the speaking tasks as poor.

Table 8
The Results of Frequency Analysis (Teacher's Manual)

		Manual			
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	1.00	101	16.8	16.8	16.8
	2.00	221	36.8	36.8	53.7
	3.00	88	14.7	14.7	68.3
	4.00	84	14.0	14.0	82.3
	5.00	106	17.7	17.7	100.0

The results of the frequency analysis, as shown in Table 8, indicate that approximately 37% of the teachers rated the Vision 1 manual as poor; however, some others (approximately 18%) rated it as good.

Table 9
The Results of Frequency Analysis for Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

	CDA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	84	14.0	16.8	16.8
	2.00	183	30.5	36.6	53.4
	3.00	56	9.3	11.2	64.6
	4.00	71	11.8	14.2	78.8
	5.00	106	17.7	21.2	100.0

The frequency and percentage analysis in Table 9 also showed that more than 36% of the teachers rated the CDA features as poor. However, some teachers (more than 21%) considered them excellent. The results are still not satisfactory, and features like gender equality have not gained proper attention.

In order to answer the second research question regarding what teachers' perceptions are towards "*Vision 1*," The teachers' comments and interviews on *Vision 1* were transcribed and analyzed.

6. Discussion

This study is an attempt to analyze *Vision 1* (Alavi et al., 2015) from the perspective of CLT based on Razmjoo's (2010) textbook evaluation questionnaire. The research questions of the study were considered with the communicative purposes of this textbook to see whether it has been designed on the basis of the communicative needs of the students or not. Teachers' perceptions were investigated in this regard to find out how they rate the new version based on the aforementioned questionnaire.

While the study confirms that *Vision 1* aligns with the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), the participants' critique that the method is not fully operationalized highlights a common challenge in textbook design—bridging theoretical frameworks with practical application. This gap suggests that although the textbook includes communicative activities, their integration may lack depth or consistency, potentially limiting students' active engagement in authentic language use.

Moreover, the teachers' recognition of the book's motivating features, such as colorful visuals and varied tasks, underscores the importance of learner engagement in effective language acquisition. However, motivation alone cannot compensate for weaknesses in methodological implementation, which could impact the overall development of communicative competence.

The unanimous belief that *Vision 1* supports all four language skills suggests the textbook provides a balanced curriculum. Still, the emphasis on separate skill sections might reflect a more traditional, segmented approach rather than an integrated, communicative one. This raises questions about how effectively the textbook fosters interaction between skills in realistic contexts, which is a core principle of CLT.

Overall, the findings point to the need for ongoing refinement in textbook development, ensuring that communicative principles are not just present in design but are meaningfully embedded in practice to maximize students' language learning outcomes.

As the discussion mentions, there are issues in *Vision 1* with respect to the speaking tasks, yet the points remain undefined, and, therefore, the subsequent findings lack the specificity that would have helped make the necessary improvements. In response to the feedback of the teachers, the examples of such problems are the fully scripted or monotonous speaking activities that do not give the students a chance to talk spontaneously. As an example, certain activities are extremely dependent on memorizable dialogues that do not promote free-flowing conversations or interactions. Moreover, the absence of genuine communicative situations can also decrease the incentive of the students to train in order to develop fluent and imaginative speech. Such concerns indicate that speaking exercises present in the textbook might not support the formation of communicative competence of students as anticipated by the principles of CLT.

By adding such concrete examples and details, the educators and curriculum developers would be in a better position to learn and improve the inadequacies of the speaking components of the textbook. The analysis of the interviews also showed that all the participants agreed that *Vision 1* is based on the approach of CLT since it has a range of exercises for the students to develop their speaking and listening skills. Notwithstanding, they argued that this method has not been properly operationalized in the content of the book. The teachers pointed out that *Vision 1* has some features like conversations and pronunciation practices, which are beneficial for developing the communicative competence of the students. In addition, they acknowledged that the new textbook is more motivating with more colorful pictures and a range of tasks. All 25 teachers believed that *Vision 1* can improve the abilities of the students in the four skills since the book has separate sections for each of the speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills of the language and gives the students relevant exercises.

The findings of the present study reveal that Iranian EFL teachers generally rated the new textbook favorably, considering most of its language components and skill areas to be good or excellent. These results align with the study by Moghtadi (2014), who evaluated four Iranian high school EFL textbooks to identify their strengths and weaknesses from diverse perspectives. His analysis revealed a noticeable gap between learners' expectations and the content provided in the textbooks. Specifically, the textbooks were found to be largely structure-oriented, with minimal emphasis on the communicative aspects of language. Moreover, they were not developed following the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). While the *Vision 1* textbook was perceived as generally effective by most teachers, notable shortcomings were identified in its speaking tasks

The results of this study are also consistent with the findings of Zohrabi et al. (2014), who conducted a comparative analysis of two English textbooks-*Interchange 1* (Richards et al., 2005) and *English Book 1* (Birjandi et al., 2011)-used in Iranian high schools. Their evaluation, based on a checklist comprising eight criteria, including content, vocabulary, grammar, reading tasks, pronunciation, activities, physical presentation, and language functions, highlighted both similarities and differences between the two texts. One significant conclusion was that the Iranian textbook lacked authenticity, suggesting that it was not designed to meet learners' real-life communicative needs.

Ahmadi and Derakhshan (2014) conducted a study on the EFL instructors' viewpoint on the reading material "*Prospect1*". They attempted to assess the Iranian guidance school's new reading material "*Prospect1*" in light of instructors' recognition

and encounters. Fifteen male and female English guidance school's teachers in a few urban areas in Iran, running from 2 to 30 years of experience took an interest in this study. A semi-structured meeting was led to examine the qualities and shortcomings of *Prospect1*. The results of their studies were in line with the current work. Barzjan and Sayyadi (2023) conducted a study on the evaluation of "vision "English textbooks, their results were in line with the current study results.

This study's findings should be considered in light of certain limitations. First, the relatively small sample size may have affected the results; conducting the same study with a larger and more diverse sample might yield different outcomes. To enhance the reliability and generalizability of the findings, future research should involve a broader participant base and be carried out in different contexts. Second, the content analysis was grounded solely in the framework and theoretical principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Alternative frameworks, such as bimodality or other sociolinguistic theories, were not incorporated, which may limit the interpretive scope of the analysis.

 Although the study admits its limitations, such as insufficient sample size and the use of only one theoretical framework, it did not pay attention to other possible sources of bias that might affect the study results. As an example, the studied notion concerning the highly utilized self-reported perceptions of the teachers of the textbook poses a threat of subjective bias because participants can express a more positive attitude toward it knowingly or unknowingly due to the perceived conflict of interest (textbook success) or social desirability. Also, convenience sampling could constrain the sampling representativeness; thus, the outcome will not be generalizable to other areas or groups of teachers.

This study used content analysis of the newly developed ELT textbook to see how it follows the communicative approach. Other studies can examine the topic by conducting observations to investigate the application of a communicative approach from the viewpoints of teachers, learners, and other stakeholders in the field. Triangulation of the data would be a further point for future researchers.

7. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study's theoretical framework, grounded in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and operationalized through Razmjoo's (2010) textbook evaluation model, critically examines the extent to which *Vision 1* aligns with principles of authentic communication, skills integration, and learner-centered design. By synthesizing insights from Richards (2001), Yusuf (2008), and Hutchinson and Torres (1994), the study underscores the importance of bridging theoretical CLT principles with practical classroom application, particularly in addressing gaps identified by teachers, such as scripted speaking tasks or insufficient vocabulary development. The findings not only contribute to the ongoing evaluation of Iranian EFL textbooks but also highlight the need for localized, adaptive material design that prioritizes communicative competence, offering actionable recommendations for policymakers, curriculum developers, and educators to enhance future textbook iterations.

Acknowledgment

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflict of interest.

References

Ahour, T., & Ahmadi, E. (2012). Retrospective evaluation of textbook "Summit 2B" for its suitability for EFL undergraduate students. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *2*(5), 195-202.

Alavi, B., Kheirabadi, R., Rahimi, M., & Davari, H. (2015). *Vision 1: English for schools*. Ministry of Education.

Alshumaimeri, Y., & Alharbi, T. (2024). English textbook evaluation: A Saudi EFL teachers' perspective. *Frontiers in Education*, *9*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1479735

Azizifar, A. (2009). An analytical evaluation of Iranian high school: ELT textbooks from 1970 to 2010. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2(2)*, 52–79. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.010

Barzan, P., & Sayyadi, M. (2023). The evaluation of Vision English textbooks. *Journal of English Language and Literature Teaching*, *2(2)*, 93–114. https://doi.org/10.48310/jelt.2023.12619.1027

Birjandi, P., & Soleimani, H. (2011). *Right path to English 1*. Iran Publications.

Byrd, P. (2001). Textbook: Evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 415–428). Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your course book*. Heinemann.

Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal*, *48*, 315–328. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/48.4.315

Kecskes, I. (2000). A cognitive-pragmatic approach to situation-bound utterances. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(5), 605-625. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00063-6

Kress, G. (2000). Design and transformation. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies* (pp. xx–xx). Routledge.

Masoumi Sooreh, E., & Ahour, T. (2020). Internal evaluation of English textbook Vision 2 from the teacher's perspective. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, *13(27)*, 237–255. https://doi.org/10.30495/jal.2020.683594

McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh University Press.

Moghtadi, L. (2014). Iranian high school EFL textbooks: Why they should be modified. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, *5(2)*, 53–69.

Meysam Asadi & Zahra Amani

Razmjoo, S. A. (2007). High schools or private institutes' textbooks? Which fulfill communicative language teaching principles in the Iranian context? *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *9(4)*, 125–139.

Razmjoo, S. A. (2010). Developing a textbook evaluation scheme for the expanding circle. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, *2(1)*, 121–136. https://doi.org/10.22111/ijals.2012.64

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667220

Shahmohammadi, S. (2018). Textbook evaluation: Looking at the Prospect series from the teacher's perspective. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, *6(2)*, 182–204. https://doi.org/10.30486/relp.2018.542578

Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, *42*, 237–246. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/42.4.237

Tavakoli, E. (2021). Contribution of English textbook on an EFL curriculum and teachers' professional identity: The case of four EFL teachers and a private language school in Iran. *Applied Research on English Language*, *10(3)*, 105–135. https://doi.org/10.22108/are.2021.125221.1632

Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139042789

Tomlinson, B. (1999). Developing criteria for evaluating L2 materials. *IATEFL Issues*, *147*, 10–13.

Yousif, A., Bashirnezhad, H., & Andy, A. (2017). Digital storytelling listening influence on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' pronunciation. *Revista QUID*, *1*, 1702–1707.

Yusuf, F. N. (2008). Strategies of using textbooks: A case of school-level curriculum implementation. *Educationist*, *2(1)*, 18–26.

Zohrabi, M., Sabouri, H., & Kheradmand, M. (2014). Comparative study of Interchange 1 and English Book 1 of Iranian high schools. *International Journal of English and Education*, *3(2)*, 95–104