



Evaluating Overall Quality and Intercultural Communicative Competence in English Academic Writing Textbooks: A Comparative Study of Iranian and International Resources

Hamed Badpa¹ and Ali Beikian^{2*}

¹ MA Student in TEFL, Chabahar Maritime University, Chabahar, Iran

ORCID: 0009-0006-4923-5793 Email: hamedbadpa1377@gmail.com

²Corresponding Author: Assistant Professor of Translation Studies, English Language Department, Faculty of Management and Humanities, Chabahar Maritime University, Chabahar, Iran

ORCID: 0000-0002-7734-2370 Email: a_beikian@yahoo.co.uk / a_beikian@cmu.ac.ir

Abstract

Textbooks play a crucial role in language learning and the development of intercultural communicative competence (ICC). However, few studies have compared local and international English writing textbooks in terms of overall quality and ICC integration. In response, this study evaluates *Effective Academic Writing 2 (EAW2)*, an international textbook, and *Essay Writing (EW)*, an Iranian one, in terms of overall quality, ICC attributes, and potential areas for improvement. Using a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, data were collected from 27 purposively selected Iranian university teachers. Specifically, a 61-item Textbook Evaluation Checklist was administered, employing a five-point Likert scale (5 = Strongly Agree, 1 = Strongly Disagree), and analyzed by calculating means and standard deviations for both *EAW2* and *EW*. Additionally, responses to five open-ended questions were collected and examined through thematic content analysis to identify qualitative themes. Findings show *EAW2* excels in practicality (M = 4.0) and ICC attributes (M = 3.6), promoting global cultural exposure, but lacks local relevance (M = 3.1). Conversely, *EW* aligns with local contexts (M = 3.7) but neglects global perspectives (M = 2.9). Both textbooks exhibit weak multimedia integration and fail to provide interactive platforms to support writing instruction (M = 3.0). The small sample size limits generalizability, necessitating caution in broader application. In light of the findings, authors and designers of English writing textbooks should create materials that balance local cultural contexts with global perspectives to foster both linguistic proficiency and ICC in diverse English Language Teaching (ELT) settings. Furthermore, they should integrate innovative multimedia tools, interactive platforms, and AI-driven tools to enhance cultural exposure, engagement, and dynamic interaction.

Keywords: English academic writing textbook, textbook evaluation, intercultural communicative competence (ICC), overall quality

ARTICLE INFO

Review Article

Received: Saturday, February 1, 2025

Accepted: Tuesday, September 30, 2025

Published: Wednesday, October 1, 2025

Available Online: Tuesday, September, 30, 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2025.30314.1761>

Online ISSN: 2821-0204; Print ISSN: 28208986



© The Author(s)

Introduction

Textbooks play a critical role in language learning, serving not only as instructional tools but also as cultural conduits that shape pedagogy, language exposure, and intercultural understanding (Agustin & Wirza, 2020; Ariawan et al., 2022). Wang and Hemchua (2022) position textbooks as cultural vehicles, emphasizing their role in raising cultural awareness. Similarly, Sujiono et al. (2023) advocate for incorporating multicultural perspectives into learning materials.

The integration of ICC attributes in ELT materials has emerged as a critical focus, particularly given the global significance of English in education (Hicham et al., 2025; Tatzali et al., 2025). Studies emphasize that textbooks must transcend their traditional linguistic frameworks to address the cultural and communicative needs of learners in increasingly multilingual and multicultural contexts (Ayu, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2021). Despite this imperative, many ELT materials either inadequately represent cultural diversity or prioritize monolingual paradigms (Iswandari & Ardi, 2022; Mariyono, 2024).

In Iranian ELT contexts, textbooks must address the persistent challenge of aligning instructional materials with national curricula while fostering global communicative competence (Atai & Mazlum, 2013). Poorly designed textbooks can exacerbate issues like low student engagement, inadequate proficiency, and limited intercultural awareness (Banaruee et al., 2023; Masoumi Sooreh & Ahour, 2020). These shortcomings often stem from a lack of authentic and socio-cultural content, which hinders effective language instruction (Abdolhay et al., 2023; Sedaghatgoftar, 2022) and impacts students' academic outcomes and readiness for global interactions (Saidi, 2021), entailing that ELT textbooks be evaluated carefully (Basnet, 2024; Jafari et al., 2024).

Therefore, guided by the following research questions, the present study evaluates *Effective Academic Writing 2 (EAW2)* (Savage & Mayer, 2016) and *Essay Writing (EW)* (Khodabandeh & Hemmati, 2018) in terms of overall quality, ICC attributes, and potential areas for improvement:

1. How do *EAW2* and *EW* compare in terms of overall quality (practicality, objectives, teaching aids, content, and language skills)?
2. How do *EAW2* and *EW* compare in terms of ICC attributes (cultural representation, cultural perspectives, and integration, and ICC activities)?
3. How do *EAW2* and *EW* compare in terms of their strengths, weaknesses, and potential areas for improvement?

Literature Review

Theoretical Background

Among the various methods used in textbook evaluation, the criterion-based checklist approach is widely favored for its systematic and comprehensive nature (e.g., Al-Abdullah, 2022; Fatimah & Budiharso, 2025; López-Medina, 2021; Shieh et al., 2023; Syahid et al., 2024). One of its key strengths is its flexibility, as

noted by Mukundan and Ahour (2010), who emphasized that checklists can be adapted to suit different educational contexts and goals. Expanding on this, Mukundan et al. (2011) introduced a distinction between qualitative checklists, which include open-ended questions to provide in-depth insights, and quantitative checklists, which use Likert-scale items for more structured assessments. This classification enhances the method's versatility and makes it suitable for a wide range of evaluation purposes. Supporting this view, Demir and Ertaş (2014) argue that checklist-based evaluations are not only effective but also cost-efficient, enabling evaluators to gather meaningful data with minimal time and resources.

Recent advancements in the checklist method have increasingly focused on integrating contemporary educational priorities, particularly ICC. In line with this, Lei and Soontornwipast (2020) developed an evaluation checklist that assesses both the overall quality and ICC attributes of textbooks. Validated within ELT contexts, this tool aligns with global trends underscoring the importance of intercultural competence in language education (Kassymova et al., 2025; Shiryayeva et al., 2021). In addition, Brown (2023) highlights its effectiveness in promoting fair and empowering cultural depictions, positioning it as a robust and adaptable instrument for modern textbook evaluation. Therefore, the current study adopts the said checklist for its comprehensive framework, empirical validation in ELT settings, and recognition for supporting inclusive and culturally responsive pedagogy.

Review of Empirical Studies

The evaluation of ELT textbooks reveals persistent deficiencies in achieving comprehensive quality, particularly in skill integration and resource provision, which critically shape the current study's analysis of *EAW2* and *EW*. To begin with, Al-Makhmari (2024) scrutinized Omani writing textbook exercises using eight literature-derived criteria, identifying effective modals and genre approaches but condemning the glaring lack of integration with speaking, listening, and reading skills, thus undermining holistic language development. Similarly, Siregar et al. (2024) conducted a content analysis of three Indonesian high school textbooks, commending their coverage of academic and personal writing genres but criticizing incomplete sub-category representation and inconsistent task balance, which weaken pedagogical rigor. In contrast, Hanh (2022) surveyed ten Vietnamese teachers on *Solutions Pre-intermediate*, praising its organizational structure but faulting inadequate pronunciation support and glossary resources, limiting practical utility. Likewise, Sari (2022) qualitatively evaluated *Think Globally Act Locally* using a checklist, noting robust methodology and task quality (usefulness score: 3.8) but decrying partial syllabus alignment, which compromises curriculum coherence. Moreover, Efendi et al. (2023) applied Cunningsworth's rubric to *English for Change*, affirming curriculum relevance but highlighting overly advanced reading passages and inconsistent grammar instruction, exposing a lack of scaffolding. Finally, Yousif (2025) analyzed Iraqi textbook content, acknowledging strong skill coverage but criticizing the absence of digital tool integration, a significant flaw in modern ELT contexts.

Intercultural communicative competence (ICC), vital for global communication, remains poorly addressed in ELT textbooks, directly informing the current study's focus on *EAW2* and *EW*'s cultural inclusivity. For instance, Novianti and Wirza (2024) evaluated *English on Sky* in an Indonesian Islamic boarding school using a checklist, student questionnaires, and teacher interviews, identifying source, target, and international cultural elements supportive of ICC but faulting imbalances that distort cultural representation. Similarly, Nurwahidah (2023) conducted qualitative content analysis of *Symphony 3*, highlighting values of love and non-violence as ICC enhancers but neglecting broader cultural shortcomings. However, Derakhshan (2024) applied Peircean semiotic theory and thematic interview analysis to *Vision 1*, exposing text-image-task mismatches that severely restrict cultural awareness, a critical barrier to fostering ICC. Likewise, Gheitasi et al. (2020) used frequency counts to critique *Vision*'s Persian-centric aesthetic focus, which marginalizes sociolinguistic competence and limits global applicability. Additionally, Sedaghatgoftar (2022) surveyed 60 Iranian teachers using a checklist, condemning a local ELT series for its near-total absence of cultural elements and urgently advocating for communicative revisions.

Curriculum alignment and local relevance are crucial for ELT textbook effectiveness, yet studies reveal significant shortcomings, with direct implications for *EAW2* and *EW*'s suitability in Iranian ELT contexts. For example, Saragih (2024) interviewed Indonesian literature students, identifying narrative writing weaknesses in vocabulary and themes, and faulting the lack of local wisdom integration, which diminishes cultural relevance. In contrast, Sujiono et al. (2023) employed mixed methods, including statistical analysis and interviews with 101 Buddhist college students, confirming a multicultural textbook's effectiveness in scientific writing but overlooking potential gaps in broader skill integration. Similarly, Fadilla et al. (2024) conducted qualitative content analysis of *Bright* with teacher documentation, verifying alignment with Indonesia's 2013 curriculum but criticizing interdisciplinary gaps that hinder holistic learning. In Iran, Banaruee et al. (2023) surveyed 120 teachers using the 5 Cs checklist, deeming *Vision 3* preferable but faulting its deficiencies in cultural and technological components, which undermine its applicability. Likewise, Masoumi Sooreh and Ahour (2020) surveyed 45 teachers with an 82-item checklist, endorsing *Vision 2*'s suitability with authentic task additions but noting persistent resource constraints. Similarly, Saidi (2021) combined a 38-item checklist and interviews with 130 teachers, praising *Vision 3*'s speaking strengths but highlighting inadequate resource provision, a recurring obstacle to effective implementation.

Despite these efforts, the literature exposes a critical gap in evaluating university-level writing textbooks, particularly in integrating overall quality, ICC, and local relevance, underscoring the urgent necessity of the current study. To the best of the authors' knowledge, few studies have systematically examined university-level ELT textbooks like *EAW2* and *EW*, leaving a substantial void in understanding their effectiveness in fostering academic writing and intercultural

competence. Previous research, while informative, predominantly focuses on secondary education (e.g., Siregar et al., 2024; Hanh, 2022) or specific cultural contexts (e.g., Novianti & Wirza, 2024; Gheitasi et al., 2020), neglecting the distinct demands of tertiary education, where academic writing and global competence are paramount. Furthermore, existing studies often rely on singular methodologies, such as content analysis or surveys, failing to integrate quantitative and qualitative approaches for a comprehensive evaluation. This study addresses these shortcomings by evaluating *EAW2* and *EW* through a mixed-methods framework, combining teacher perceptions with checklist-based assessments to examine overall quality, ICC integration, and alignment with Iranian ELT needs. This focus is particularly critical, as Iranian universities increasingly prioritize balancing global competence with local relevance, a challenge exacerbated by resource constraints and centralized curricula (Banaruee et al., 2023; Sedaghatgoftar, 2022).

Method

The following subsections detail the research design and approach, the participants, materials, and instruments, as well as the procedures used for data collection and analysis.

Research Design and Approach

This study adopted a descriptive comparative design with a convergent parallel mixed-methods approach to evaluate *EAW2* and *EW*. In this design, quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed concurrently, then integrated to compare the textbooks' overall qualities, ICC attributes, and potential areas for improvement. This approach, as supported by Creswell (2021) and Adhikari and Timsina (2024), combined objective measures with subjective perspectives to ensure a balanced assessment.

Participants

The study involved 27 university teachers, all holding PhDs in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). They were selected through purposive sampling to ensure expertise in academic writing instruction and familiarity with *EAW2* and *EW*, aligning with the study's focus on informed evaluations (Creswell, 2021). Invitations were sent to 40 eligible teachers, with 27 responding (67.5% response rate). Non-response bias may exist, as non-respondents could differ in their perceptions, potentially skewing findings toward more engaged educators. The sample comprised 15 male and 12 female instructors, aged 32–55 years ($M = 42.3$, $SD = 6.7$), with an average of 12.4 years of teaching experience ($SD = 4.2$) in undergraduate and postgraduate academic writing courses. For quantitative analysis, a post-hoc power analysis indicated moderate power (0.65 for medium effect size, $\alpha = 0.05$), suggesting caution in interpreting statistical findings due to limited statistical power. The sample size of 27 was deemed sufficient for qualitative thematic saturation, as recurring themes emerged consistently (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Materials and Instruments

Materials

The study evaluated two English language textbooks: *Effective Academic Writing 2 (EAW2)* (Savage & Mayer, 2016), an international publication, and *Essay Writing (EW)* (Khodabandeh & Hemmati, 2018), an Iranian publication. *EAW2* was selected over other books in the *Effective Academic Writing* series due to its similarity in topics covered in the Iranian book *EW*. Additionally, *EAW2*'s global perspective and structured approach to essay development made it an ideal candidate for comparing ICC attributes with a locally developed textbook. *EW* was chosen for its widespread use in Iranian universities, enabling a direct comparison between international and local materials in addressing overall quality and ICC attributes.

Instruments

The primary instrument was a Textbook Evaluation Checklist (Lei & Soontornwipast, 2020), selected for its precision, simplicity, and established validity in ELT evaluations (Brown, 2023; Kassymova et al., 2025; Shiryayeva et al., 2021). It comprised 61 five-point Likert scale items across two dimensions: Overall Quality (24 items) and ICC Attributes (37 items), spanning eight categories: practicality, objectives, teaching aids, content, language skills, cultural representation, cultural perspectives and integration, and ICC activities. The checklist was translated into Persian to ensure accurate responses, given that the participants' primary language was Persian, to mitigate potential misinterpretations of nuanced criteria. Linguistic validation was conducted through a multi-step process. Two researchers independently translated the checklist into Persian and then reached a consensus on a unified Persian version. A third linguist subsequently performed a back-translation into English to ensure accuracy. Any discrepancies that arose during the translation process were resolved to achieve semantic equivalence. In addition, two ELT experts validated the content relevance, and a pilot study ($n = 5$) confirmed the instrument's reliability, yielding a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.87.

Five open-ended questions, derived from literature (Mukundan & Ahour, 2010; Mukundan et al., 2011) and validated by the two ELT experts, explored the textbooks' strengths, weaknesses, and potential areas for improvement, complementing quantitative data with qualitative insights. The five open-ended questions, administered in Persian, were designed to elicit detailed insights into teachers' perceptions of the textbooks' strengths, weaknesses, and potential improvements, aligning with the research questions (Mukundan et al., 2011). The open-ended questions are presented in Table 1 with their alignment to the research objectives.

Table 1*Open-ended Questions and Their Alignment with the Research Questions*

Open-Ended Question	Research Question Alignment
What are the overall strengths and weaknesses of this textbook as a resource for teaching academic writing?	Assesses overall quality, strengths, and weaknesses (RQ1, RQ3)
What are the overall strengths and weaknesses of this textbook as a resource for teaching ICC?	Evaluates ICC attributes, strengths, and weaknesses (RQ2, RQ3)
What emerging trends or technologies do you consider effective for developing textbooks to enhance academic writing and intercultural communication skills?	Explores technological improvements (RQ3)
What suggestions do you have for making the textbook more relevant to the Iranian context?	Identifies improvements for local relevance (RQ3)
What suggestions do you have for improving the overall effectiveness of the textbook in enhancing ICC?	Identifies improvements for ICC (RQ2, RQ3)

Data Collection Procedure

The adapted checklist and open-ended questions were administered online via *Porsall*, where the participants received unique links to access electronic copies of *EAW2* and *EW* alongside the evaluation tools. They first rated the 61 checklist items and then provided detailed responses to the open-ended questions. The participants gave informed consent after receiving the study details, and anonymity was ensured using unique identifiers for each participant's responses.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data from the checklist were processed in SPSS (Version 26), using descriptive statistics (means, frequencies, percentages, and standard deviations) to evaluate each item and category for the textbooks' overall quality and ICC attributes. Qualitative data from open-ended responses underwent content analysis using a thematic coding method, as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). A detailed codebook was developed to guide the process, with initial codes generated inductively from the participants' responses to capture recurring patterns and concepts. Two independent coders analyzed the responses, resolving discrepancies through collaborative discussion to ensure reliability. Codes were grouped into categories and synthesized into overarching themes, with direct quotes used to contextualize findings. Inter-rater reliability was established with Cohen's kappa ($\kappa = 0.82$), indicating strong agreement between coders. Quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated through triangulation, comparing Likert scale ratings with qualitative themes to identify convergences and divergences.

Results

This section presents findings from two phases: quantitative, addressing overall quality dimensions and ICC attributes of *EAW2* and *EW*, and qualitative, exploring the participants' perceptions of each textbook's strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement.

First Research Question: Comparison of Overall Quality Dimensions

The first research question asked, "How do *EAW2* and *EW* compare in terms of overall quality?" Using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree), we calculated means and standard deviations (SD) for both *EAW2* and *EW* to compare their overall quality dimensions. Table 2 presents the results for RQ1, assessing the overall quality of *EAW2* and *EW* through items 1–24. These items cover practicality (items 1–6), objectives (items 7–10), teaching aids (items 11–14), content (items 15–22), and language skills (items 23–24).

Table 2

Comparison of EAW2 and EW's Overall Quality Dimensions

Item Description	<i>EAW2</i> Mean (SD)	<i>EW</i> Mean (SD)
1 Navigability through the table of contents	4.22 (0.698)	3.67 (1.109)
2 Currency of content	3.93 (0.917)	3.41 (1.083)
3 Publisher credibility	3.93 (0.730)	3.19 (1.272)
4 Editorial board expertise	3.37 (1.043)	3.48 (1.051)
5 ICC expertise	3.33 (1.109)	3.00 (1.240)
6 Accessibility	4.33 (0.480)	4.37 (0.492)
7 Alignment with teaching aims	3.78 (0.974)	3.78 (1.086)
8 Responsiveness to learner needs	3.63 (1.043)	3.52 (1.221)
9 Clarity of objectives	3.78 (1.086)	3.67 (0.877)
10 ICC development	3.52 (1.014)	2.85 (1.262)
11 ICC information for teachers	3.00 (0.000)	3.00 (0.000)
12 Availability of complementary materials	3.00 (0.000)	3.00 (0.000)
13 Updating platforms for teachers	3.00 (0.000)	3.00 (0.000)
14 Updating platforms for students	3.00 (0.000)	3.00 (0.000)
15 Content authenticity	4.22 (0.698)	3.85 (0.864)
16 Content organization	4.15 (0.770)	3.74 (1.130)
17 Content currency	3.70 (1.137)	3.81 (1.075)
18 Grammar contextualization	3.85 (1.027)	3.67 (0.832)
19 Lexicon contextualization	3.85 (0.818)	3.81 (0.834)
20 Learner engagement	3.81 (0.962)	3.48 (1.087)
21 Content relevance	3.70 (1.031)	3.74 (0.984)
22 Language authenticity	3.93 (0.917)	3.44 (1.188)
23 Interactive skill presentation	3.56 (1.050)	3.70 (0.953)
24 Skill appropriateness to academic writing	4.00 (0.620)	3.52 (1.122)

In terms of practicality (items 1–6), *EAW2* scores higher in navigability (item 1: 4.22 vs. 3.67), content currency (item 2: 3.93 vs. 3.41), publisher credibility (item 3: 3.93 vs. 3.19), and ICC expertise (item 5: 3.33 vs. 3.00), with lower SDs (e.g., 0.698 vs. 1.109 for item 1), indicating more consistent teacher approval of its structured, credible, and culturally informed design, facilitating lesson planning. Conversely, *EW* slightly outperforms in editorial expertise (item 4: 3.48 vs. 3.37) and accessibility (item 6: 4.37 vs. 4.33), with similar SDs, suggesting comparable usability but stronger editorial oversight, supporting reliable content delivery. These findings imply *EAW2*'s advantage in practical design, while *EW* offers minor strengths in accessibility, setting the stage for pedagogical alignment.

For objectives (items 7–10), both textbooks score identically in teaching aims alignment (item 7: 3.78 vs. 3.78), with high SDs (0.974 vs. 1.086), suggesting varied perceptions, possibly due to diverse classroom goals. *EAW2* scores higher in learner needs (item 8: 3.63 vs. 3.52), objectives clarity (item 9: 3.78 vs. 3.67), and ICC development (item 10: 3.52 vs. 2.85), with lower SDs (e.g., 1.014 vs. 1.262 for item 10), indicating stronger alignment with academic and cultural goals, enhancing curriculum fit. *EW*'s lower ICC development score suggests limited cultural focus, impacting global readiness. These results highlight *EAW2*'s pedagogical clarity, leading to an analysis of teaching aids.

In teaching aids (items 11–14), both textbooks receive neutral ratings (3.00 vs. 3.00, SD 0.000) across all items, indicating uniform perceptions of limited ICC information, complementary materials, and updating platforms. This suggests both lack dynamic resources, potentially restricting classroom adaptability and ICC integration, a critical consideration for content quality.

For content (items 15–22), *EAW2* excels in authenticity (item 15: 4.22 vs. 3.85), organization (item 16: 4.15 vs. 3.74), grammar (item 18: 3.85 vs. 3.67), engagement (item 20: 3.81 vs. 3.48), and language authenticity (item 22: 3.93 vs. 3.44), with lower SDs, suggesting consistent teacher approval of its structured, engaging material, ideal for academic writing. *EW* scores slightly higher in currency (item 17: 3.81 vs. 3.70) and relevance (item 21: 3.74 vs. 3.70), indicating stronger alignment with current, locally relevant topics. Lexicon contextualization (item 19: 3.85 vs. 3.81) shows similar performance, supporting vocabulary instruction. These findings highlight *EAW2*'s content strengths, with *EW*'s relevance as a strength, prompting a skills evaluation.

In language skills (items 23–24), *EW* scores higher in interactive presentation (item 23: 3.70 vs. 3.56), indicating more engaging tasks, which are beneficial for skill practice. *EAW2* outperforms in academic writing appropriateness (item 24: 4.00 vs. 3.52), with a lower SD (0.620 vs. 1.122), indicating stronger alignment with university-level goals.

Second Research Question: Comparison of ICC Attributes

The second research question asked, "How do *EAW2* and *EW* compare in terms of ICC attributes? Using a five-point Likert scale (5 = Strongly Agree, 1 = Strongly Disagree), we calculated means and standard deviations (SD) for both *EAW2* and *EW* to compare their ICC attributes. Table 3 shows the results for RQ2, evaluating ICC attributes of *EAW2* and *EW* through items 25–61. These items assess

cultural representation (items 25–32), cultural perspectives and integration (items 33–43), and ICC activities (items 44–61).

Table 3

Comparison of EAW2 and EW's ICC Attributes

Item Description	EAW2 Mean (SD)	EW Mean (SD)
25 Cultural appropriateness	3.52 (1.156)	3.70 (0.953)
26 Variety of cultural topics	3.59 (1.010)	2.89 (1.311)
27 Critical thinking	3.41 (0.971)	3.07 (1.269)
28 Cultural norm identification	3.52 (1.014)	3.11 (1.251)
29 Articulation of cultural positions	3.56 (1.086)	2.89 (1.013)
30 Motivational value	3.85 (1.027)	3.74 (1.095)
31 Real-life relevance	3.56 (1.219)	2.96 (1.192)
32 Explicit presentation of cultural topics	3.37 (1.214)	3.30 (1.235)
33 Cultural bias	3.44 (0.974)	3.26 (1.289)
34 Multiple cultural perspectives	3.37 (1.079)	2.85 (1.231)
35 Learner environment relevance	3.59 (1.118)	3.44 (1.340)
36 Little “c” culture	3.52 (1.221)	3.07 (1.107)
37 Global cultures	3.59 (1.152)	3.00 (1.359)
38 Iranian culture	3.11 (1.219)	3.30 (1.068)
39 Tolerance	3.74 (1.023)	3.74 (1.059)
40 Real-life issues	3.81 (1.111)	3.44 (1.155)
41 Course integration of cultural information	3.59 (1.047)	3.30 (1.137)
42 Appropriate images	3.48 (1.189)	2.81 (1.388)
43 Non-verbal communication	3.26 (1.163)	3.22 (1.050)
44 Activity meaningfulness	3.78 (1.013)	4.04 (0.854)
45 Variety of activities	4.00 (0.734)	3.96 (0.808)
46 Task differentiation	3.81 (0.962)	3.44 (1.251)
47 Task familiarity	3.78 (1.155)	3.81 (1.039)
48 Task authenticity	3.74 (1.023)	3.78 (0.934)
49 Cooperation	3.89 (1.013)	3.70 (1.103)
50 Independent learning	3.96 (0.808)	3.81 (0.786)
51 Assessment tools	3.30 (0.953)	3.30 (1.068)
52 Exercise flexibility	3.93 (1.174)	3.63 (1.006)
53 Cultural understanding	3.70 (0.724)	3.48 (1.156)
54 Iranian event linkage	3.22 (1.396)	3.33 (1.177)
55 Cross-cultural comparison	3.22 (1.121)	3.33 (1.144)
56 Cultural problem-solving	3.74 (1.163)	3.07 (1.299)
57 Stereotype challenging	3.19 (1.210)	3.11 (1.086)
58 Intercultural communication	3.81 (0.921)	3.30 (1.203)
59 Opinion expression on cultural topics	3.56 (1.086)	2.85 (1.231)
60 Cultural observation	3.63 (1.043)	3.22 (1.188)
61 Additional Iranian event linkage	3.63 (1.182)	3.30 (1.203)

In terms of cultural representation (items 25–32), *EAW* scores higher in cultural appropriateness (item 25: 3.70 vs. 3.52), suggesting stronger alignment with local cultural expectations, enhancing learner relatability. *EAW2* outperforms in variety (item 26: 3.59 vs. 2.89), critical thinking (item 27: 3.41 vs. 3.07), norm identification (item 28: 3.52 vs. 3.11), articulation (item 29: 3.56 vs. 2.89), and relevance (item 31: 3.56 vs. 2.96), with lower SDs (e.g., 1.010 vs. 1.311 for item 26), indicating consistent teacher approval of its diverse, cognitively engaging content. Both score similarly in motivation (item 30: 3.85 vs. 3.74) and explicitness (item 32: 3.37 vs. 3.30), suggesting comparable cultural engagement. These findings imply *EAW2*'s strength in diverse cultural exposure, while *EW* supports local alignment, leading to cultural perspectives.

For cultural perspectives and integration (items 33–43), *EAW2* scores higher in bias mitigation (item 33: 3.44 vs. 3.26), multiple perspectives (item 34: 3.37 vs. 2.85), little “c” culture (item 36: 3.52 vs. 3.07), global cultures (item 37: 3.59 vs. 3.00), real-life issues (item 40: 3.81 vs. 3.44), course integration (item 41: 3.59 vs. 3.30), and images (item 42: 3.48 vs. 2.81), with lower SDs, suggesting stronger global cultural integration, vital for ICC. *EW* scores higher in Iranian culture (item 38: 3.30 vs. 3.11), aligning with local contexts. Both score similarly in learner relevance (item 35: 3.59 vs. 3.44), tolerance (item 39: 3.74 vs. 3.74), and non-verbal communication (item 43: 3.26 vs. 3.22), indicating shared strengths in cultural sensitivity. These results highlight *EAW2*'s global focus and *EW*'s local relevance, prompting an analysis of ICC activities.

For ICC activities (items 44–61), *EW* scores higher in meaningfulness (item 44: 4.04 vs. 3.78), familiarity (item 47: 3.81 vs. 3.78), authenticity (item 48: 3.78 vs. 3.74), Iranian events (item 54: 3.33 vs. 3.22), and cross-cultural comparison (item 55: 3.33 vs. 3.22), suggesting stronger local engagement. *EAW2* excels in variety (item 45: 4.00 vs. 3.96), differentiation (item 46: 3.81 vs. 3.44), cooperation (item 49: 3.89 vs. 3.70), independent learning (item 50: 3.96 vs. 3.81), flexibility (item 52: 3.93 vs. 3.63), cultural understanding (item 53: 3.70 vs. 3.48), problem-solving (item 56: 3.74 vs. 3.07), intercultural communication (item 58: 3.81 vs. 3.30), opinion expression (item 59: 3.56 vs. 2.85), observation (item 60: 3.63 vs. 3.22), and additional Iranian events (item 61: 3.63 vs. 3.30), with lower SDs, indicating robust ICC tasks. Both score similarly in assessment (item 51: 3.30 vs. 3.30) and stereotype challenging (item 57: 3.19 vs. 3.11), suggesting shared gaps.

Third Research Question: Comparison of Strengths, Weaknesses, and Potential Areas for Improvement

The third research question asked, “How do *EAW2* and *EW* compare in terms of their strengths, weaknesses, and potential areas for improvement?” Tables 4–6 present RQ3's qualitative findings, reporting codes and themes for strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement of *EAW2* and *EW*, with quotes integrated to illustrate dominant themes.

Table 4 presents the strengths of *EAW2* and *EW* from thematic analysis of open-ended responses, reporting codes, and themes. Codes reflect specific teacher feedback (e.g., “teaching academic writing”), and themes synthesize patterns (e.g.,

instructional robustness). Categories (e.g., academic writing focus) are omitted for conciseness, with themes capturing their essence.

Table 4

Strengths of EAW2 and EW

Textbook Codes		Theme
<i>EAW2</i>	Teaching academic writing, preparing students for university, promoting analytical skills, fostering critical reasoning, interactive quizzes, formative tasks, encouraging reflective practice, promoting self-assessment	Instructional robustness
<i>EAW2</i>	Clear language, easy-to-follow instructions, simplifying complex concepts, clarifying technical terms	Clear and accessible instructions
<i>EAW2</i>	Real-life scenarios, case studies, applying knowledge in real life, connecting theory to practice, using practical examples	Practical skill application
<i>EW</i>	Linking topics to Iranian traditions, reflecting Iranian daily life, fostering local engagement, incorporating community examples	Contextualized pedagogical design
<i>EW</i>	Teaching essay writing, preparing students for university-level writing, structuring arguments, guiding thesis development	Structured academic support
<i>EW</i>	Clear language, easy-to-follow instructions, simplifying abstract concepts, using relatable analogies	Inclusive content delivery

Table 5 shows the weaknesses of *EAW2* and *EW*, reporting codes, and themes. Codes reflect specific limitations (e.g., “failure to incorporate local examples”), and themes synthesize patterns (e.g., inadequate cultural contextualization). Categories are omitted for brevity.

Table 5

Weaknesses of EAW2 and EW

Textbook Codes		Theme
<i>EAW2</i>	Failure to incorporate local examples, insufficient local content, lack of culturally relevant tasks, neglect of Iranian contexts, overemphasis on Western perspectives, lack of local context, failure to balance global/local content, prioritizing Western examples	Inadequate cultural contextualization
<i>EAW2</i>	Failure to use sufficient images, lack of video/audio	Insufficient

	resources, insufficient interactive media, neglect of digital tools	engagement mechanisms
<i>EAW2</i>	Failure to address cultural differences, insufficient cultural navigation skills, lack of global exposure, neglect of intercultural dialogue	Limited intercultural competence
<i>EW</i>	Failure to integrate global perspectives, lack of cultural navigation skills, insufficient intercultural exercises, neglect of global contexts	Deficient intercultural integration
<i>EW</i>	Failure to incorporate visuals, lack of multimedia resources, insufficient digital content, neglect of interactive tools	Inadequate multimedia utilization
<i>EW</i>	Failure to include non-Western examples, lack of cultural diversity, insufficient stereotype challenges, neglect of diverse perspectives	Restricted cultural diversity

Table 6 mentions the areas for improvement for *EAW2* and *EW*, reporting codes, and themes. Codes reflect specific suggestions (e.g., “enhancing local examples”), and themes synthesize patterns (e.g., enhanced cultural integration). Categories are omitted for conciseness.

Table 6

Areas for Improvement of EAW2 and EW

Textbook	Codes	Theme
<i>EAW2</i>	Enhancing local examples, integrating Iranian traditions, promoting culturally relevant tasks, embedding community contexts	Enhanced cultural integration
<i>EAW2</i>	Incorporating more images, integrating video/audio resources, promoting interactive media, using digital tools	Multimedia and technology enrichment
<i>EAW2</i>	Designing interactive platforms, promoting multimedia tasks, integrating digital learning tools, enhancing e-learning resources	Multimedia and technology enrichment
<i>EAW2</i>	Promoting cultural difference understanding, enhancing cultural navigation skills, fostering global exposure, encouraging intercultural dialogue	Intercultural competence development
<i>EAW2</i>	Integrating cultural comparisons, promoting cultural analysis, highlighting cultural similarities, analyzing diverse contexts	Intercultural competence development
<i>EAW2</i>	Integrating AI for learning, promoting social media engagement, enhancing digital platforms, using adaptive learning tools	Technology-enhanced learning
<i>EAW2</i>	Incorporating virtual reality, promoting augmented reality, enhancing immersive experiences, integrating simulation tools	Multimedia and technology enrichment

<i>EAW2</i>	Promoting descriptive questions, enhancing essay-based tasks, integrating open-ended assessments, fostering critical responses	Advanced assessment strategies
<i>EAW2</i>	Integrating practical writing tasks, promoting real-world scenarios, enhancing task-based learning, fostering applied skills	Practical learning optimization
<i>EAW2</i>	Embedding real-life scenarios, promoting case studies, enhancing applied knowledge, integrating practical contexts	Practical learning optimization
<i>EAW2</i>	Promoting collaborative activities, enhancing peer discussions, integrating group tasks, fostering team projects	Collaborative learning optimization
<i>EAW2</i>	Encouraging peer learning, promoting cultural perspective sharing, enhancing peer mentoring, fostering collaborative feedback	Collaborative learning optimization
<i>EAW2</i>	Promoting stereotype challenges, enhancing cultural diversity, integrating bias-free content, fostering inclusive perspectives	Cultural sensitivity and inclusion
<i>EAW2</i>	Enhancing cultural complexity understanding, promoting nuanced cultural analysis, integrating diverse cultural insights, avoiding oversimplification	Cultural sensitivity and inclusion
<i>EW</i>	Promoting cultural difference understanding, enhancing cultural navigation skills, fostering global awareness, encouraging intercultural exercises	Intercultural competence development
<i>EW</i>	Incorporating more visuals, integrating multimedia resources, promoting digital content, enhancing interactive tools	Multimedia and technology enrichment
<i>EW</i>	Integrating AI for learning, promoting social media engagement, enhancing digital platforms, using collaborative tools	Technology-enhanced learning
<i>EW</i>	Embedding real-life scenarios, promoting case studies, enhancing contextual examples, integrating applied tasks	Practical learning optimization
<i>EW</i>	Promoting collaborative activities, enhancing peer learning, integrating group projects, fostering team-based learning	Collaborative learning optimization
<i>EW</i>	Promoting stereotype challenges, enhancing cultural diversity, integrating inclusive content, fostering diverse perspectives	Cultural sensitivity and inclusion
<i>EW</i>	Promoting descriptive questions, enhancing essay-based assessments, integrating open-ended tasks, fostering critical responses	Advanced assessment strategies

As regards the strengths (Table 4), *EAW2*'s instructional robustness (e.g., teaching academic writing, fostering critical reasoning) and practical skill application (e.g., real-life scenarios) align with RQ1's high content authenticity and engagement, as a teacher noted: "*EAW2*'s structured approach with case studies helps students apply writing skills practically, preparing them for university." Its clear and accessible instructions (e.g., clear language) complement RQ1's navigability, enhancing student accessibility. Conversely, *EW*'s contextualized pedagogical design (e.g., linking to Iranian traditions) aligns with RQ2's cultural appropriateness and RQ1's content relevance, as a teacher stated: "*EW* engages students by connecting writing tasks to Iranian traditions." Its structured academic support (e.g., guiding thesis development) and inclusive content delivery (e.g., clear instructions) support RQ1's accessibility. These strengths suggest *EAW2* excels in global academic preparation, while *EW* enhances local curriculum alignment and relatability.

For the weaknesses (Table 5), *EAW2*'s inadequate cultural contextualization (e.g., failure to incorporate local examples, overemphasis on Western perspectives) aligns with RQ2's lower Iranian culture score, limiting local engagement, as a teacher remarked: "*EAW2*'s Western focus and lack of Iranian examples reduce student relatability." Its insufficient engagement mechanisms (e.g., lack of visuals) and limited intercultural competence (e.g., neglect of intercultural dialogue) correspond to RQ1's neutral teaching aids scores and RQ2's low stereotype challenging. Similarly, *EW*'s deficient intercultural integration (e.g., failure to integrate global perspectives) and restricted cultural diversity (e.g., lack of non-Western examples) align with RQ2's lower global culture and ICC scores, as a teacher noted: "*EW*'s focus on local content limits students' global cultural exposure." Its inadequate multimedia utilization (e.g., lack of visuals) mirrors *EAW2*'s resource gaps, reinforcing RQ1's teaching aids limitations. These weaknesses highlight the need for cultural balance and modern resources in both textbooks.

Concerning the areas for improvement (Table 6), *EAW2*'s enhanced cultural integration (e.g., integrating Iranian traditions) and intercultural competence development (e.g., promoting cultural difference understanding) address RQ2's cultural gaps, as a teacher suggested: "Adding Iranian examples and cross-cultural tasks would make *EAW2* more relevant and globally oriented." Multimedia and technology enrichment (e.g., incorporating videos, virtual reality), technology-enhanced learning (e.g., AI integration), advanced assessment strategies (e.g., open-ended assessments), practical learning optimization (e.g., practical writing tasks), collaborative learning optimization (e.g., group projects), and cultural sensitivity (e.g., stereotype challenges) counter RQ1's resource limitations and RQ2's ICC gaps. For *EW*, intercultural competence development (e.g., fostering global awareness) and cultural sensitivity (e.g., promoting stereotype challenges) address RQ2's global culture gaps, with a teacher stating: "*EW* needs global cultural exercises and stereotype-challenging tasks to enhance ICC." Multimedia and technology enrichment, technology-enhanced learning, practical learning optimization, collaborative optimization, and advanced assessments tackle RQ1's

deficiencies. These suggestions align with quantitative gaps, offering a roadmap for culturally balanced, modernized ELT resources in Iran's context of national identity and global competence.

Discussion

This study evaluated *EAW2* and *EW* for their suitability in Iranian university-level ELT, examining overall quality (RQ1: practicality, objectives, teaching aids, content, and language skills), ICC attributes (RQ2: cultural representation, cultural perspectives and integration, and ICC activities), and strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement (RQ3).

RQ1: Overall Quality

The quantitative findings revealed *EAW2*'s superior performance in practicality, content, and language skills, excelling in navigability, content authenticity, and academic writing appropriateness, corroborated by qualitative themes of instructional robustness and clear instructions, as teachers praised its structured, academically focused design. In contrast, *EW* demonstrated strengths in language skills for interactive presentation and accessibility, supported by qualitative themes of contextualized pedagogical design and inclusive content delivery, with teachers noting its alignment with local traditions. However, both textbooks scored neutrally in teaching aids, with qualitative data highlighting limited digital resources, and *EW* lagged in objectives, particularly in ICC development.

These findings align with Al-Makhmari (2024), who lauded Omani textbooks' genre approaches but criticized poor skill integration, mirroring *EAW2*'s content strengths and *EW*'s interactive advantage. Similarly, Siregar et al. (2024) praised Indonesian textbooks' writing genres but noted incomplete coverage, paralleling *EAW2*'s robust content while diverging from *EW*'s weaker objectives. Furthermore, Hanh's (2022) critique of *Solutions Pre-intermediate*'s resource deficiencies aligns with both textbooks' teaching aids limitations, whereas *EAW2*'s academic strengths diverge due to its university-level design. Likewise, Sari's (2022) emphasis on strong methodology in *Think Globally Act Locally* supports *EAW2*'s practicality but contrasts with *EW*'s resource constraints. Moreover, Efendi et al.'s (2023) note of inconsistent grammar in *English for Change* parallels *EW*'s content weaknesses, while *EAW2*'s robust design counters this flaw. Finally, Yousif's (2025) critique of absent digital integration directly mirrors both textbooks' teaching aids' deficiencies, reinforcing their shared limitation.

RQ2: Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC)

The quantitative data established *EAW2*'s dominance in cultural representation, cultural perspectives and integration, and ICC activities, with strengths in cultural variety, global perspectives, and intercultural tasks, reinforced by qualitative themes of practical skill application, as teachers highlighted its globally oriented content. Conversely, *EW* excelled in cultural appropriateness, aligning with local contexts, with qualitative themes of contextualized pedagogical

design emphasizing its focus on Iranian traditions, yet it lagged in global perspectives and diverse ICC activities.

These results resonate with Novianti and Wirza (2024), who identified cultural elements in *English on Sky* but criticized imbalances, mirroring *EAW2*'s global strengths and *EW*'s local bias, as qualitative data noted *EW*'s over-reliance on local content. Similarly, Nurwahidah's (2023) focus on *Symphony 3*'s ICC-enhancing values aligns with *EAW2*'s motivational cultural content but diverges from *EW*'s limited global focus. Additionally, Derakhshan's (2024) critique of text-image-task mismatches in *Vision 1* parallels *EW*'s weaker visual integration, while *EAW2*'s robust ICC activities stand out due to their academic orientation. Furthermore, Gheitasi et al.'s (2020) Persian-centric critique of *Vision* aligns with *EW*'s local emphasis, whereas *EAW2*'s global focus counters this limitation, as confirmed by both quantitative data and qualitative themes. Likewise, Sedaghatgoftar's (2022) condemnation of minimal cultural elements in a local ELT series directly mirrors *EW*'s ICC deficiencies, while *EAW2*'s diverse content addresses this gap.

RQ3: Strengths, Weaknesses, and Areas for Improvement

The integrated findings underscored *EAW2*'s strengths in instructional robustness, clear instructions, and practical skill application, supported by quantitative data showing high practicality, content, and language skills scores, but weaknesses in cultural contextualization and engagement mechanisms, as qualitative themes highlighted inadequate local examples and limited digital tools. In contrast, *EW*'s strengths included contextualized pedagogical design, structured academic support, and inclusive delivery, bolstered by quantitative strengths in accessibility and interactive skills, yet weaknesses in intercultural integration and multimedia utilization, as teachers criticized its lack of global perspectives. Recommended improvements for both encompass multimedia enrichment, intercultural competence development, and collaborative learning optimization.

These findings align with Yousif's (2025) critique of absent digital integration, mirroring both textbooks' weaknesses. Similarly, Banaruee et al.'s (2023) noting of technological deficiencies in *Vision 3* parallels these multimedia gaps, while *EW*'s local strengths align with its cultural appropriateness. Furthermore, Masoumi Sooreh and Ahour's (2020) emphasis on authentic tasks in *Vision 2* supports *EAW2*'s practical skill application, yet both textbooks' digital weaknesses diverge from their findings. Similarly, Saragih's (2024) narrative weaknesses contrast with *EAW2*'s academic strengths but align with both textbooks' limited cultural diversity, per qualitative data. In contrast, Sujiono et al.'s (2023) scientific writing effectiveness diverges from both textbooks' interdisciplinary gaps, while Fadilla et al.'s (2024) interdisciplinary gaps in *Bright* align with these weaknesses. Finally, Efendi et al.'s (2023) inconsistent grammar parallels *EW*'s content weaknesses, whereas *EAW2*'s improvement areas address its gaps.

Conclusion

This study establishes that *EAW2* excels in academic quality and intercultural communicative competence, while *EW* prioritizes local engagement but lacks global integration and robust resources. These findings highlight an urgent need for modernized, culturally balanced ELT textbooks in Iranian contexts. Thus, developers must enhance *EAW2* with locally relevant content and *EW* with global perspectives, integrating AI-assisted writing tools and AI-driven feedback systems for personalized writing assessments. Furthermore, embedding interactive digital platforms and collaborative AI-supported exercises will address resource gaps, ensuring both textbooks empower students with the academic rigor and intercultural proficiency required for success in a globalized world.

The findings provide critical practical and theoretical guidance for Iranian ELT. Practically, integrating local cultural elements into *EAW2* and global perspectives into *EW* can create balanced materials, essential for Iran's dual educational goals of academic rigor and intercultural competence. Furthermore, adopting AI-assisted writing tools alongside collaborative digital platforms can significantly enhance engagement. These tools address limited material access in universities constrained by rigid curriculum policies, fostering interactive and adaptive learning environments. Theoretically, these insights refine textbook evaluation frameworks by prioritizing cultural balance and digital integration, particularly through AI-supported pedagogies. Enhanced teacher training in intercultural competence and AI-driven instructional strategies will strengthen classroom delivery, ensuring effective textbook implementation within Iran's policy-driven educational system.

Limitations narrow the findings' scope. The sample of 27 teachers restricts statistical reliability and applicability across Iran's diverse ELT settings, with small textbook differences lacking clear significance. Excluding student perspectives limits insights into engagement, while reliance on teacher perceptions without performance data weakens evidence of learning outcomes. One-time data collection overlooks teacher adaptations, and centralized curriculum policies with limited teacher training hinder implementation, reducing broader applicability.

Consequently, future research should incorporate student feedback to capture engagement, employ larger and more diverse samples for broader applicability, and conduct longitudinal studies to explore teacher adaptations over time. Measuring student performance will clarify whether revised materials improve learning, ensuring ELT textbooks align with Iran's academic and intercultural needs while addressing institutional and training barriers.

Acknowledgments

The authors express their heartfelt appreciation to the 27 university teachers who participated in this study, generously sharing their expertise and invaluable insights. Additionally, special gratitude is extended to the ELT experts who validated the research instruments and offered constructive feedback.

References

- Abdolhay, S., Asharitabar, N., & Sarkeshikian, A. H. (2023). A critical discourse analysis of vision textbooks: Representation of social relations and ideology. *Journal of Language Horizons*, 7(2), 7–31. https://lghor.alzahra.ac.ir/article_7100_303367a5ea0153e5fc7d67e59321f9e6.pdf
- Adhikari, R., & Timsina, T. P. (2024). An educational study focused on the application of a mixed-methods approach as a research method. *The OCEM Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 94–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3126/ocemjmtss.v3i1.62229>
- Agustin, A., & Wirza, Y. (2020). Indonesian teachers' perspective towards the use of authentic materials on students' communicative competence in the EFL classroom. In *Proceedings of the 2020 4th International Symposium on Computer Science and Intelligent Control* (pp. 1–5). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3440084.3441215>
- Al-Abdullah, S. (2022). ESP textbook evaluation: The case of Kuwaiti students of business administration. *English Language Teaching*, 15(10), 75–80. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n10p75>
- Al-Makhmari, A. (2024). An evaluation of the writing tasks within “English for me” Omani textbook: A book review. *British Journal of Education*, 12(8), 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bje.2013/vol12n82230>
- Ariawan, D. A., Nurkamto, J., & Sumardi, S. (2022). Critical discourse analysis of cultural representations in EFL national commercial textbooks. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(3), 1112–1127. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i3.24579>
- Atai, M. R., & Mazlum, F. (2013). English language teaching curriculum in Iran: Planning and practice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 24(3), 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2012.744327>
- Ayu, M. (2020). Evaluation of cultural content in English textbooks used by EFL students in Indonesia. *Journal of English Teaching*, 6(3), 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v6i3.1925>
- Banaruee, H., Farsani, D., & Khatin-Zadeh, O. (2023). Culture in English language teaching: A curricular evaluation of English textbooks for foreign language learners. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1012786>

- Basnet, M. (2024). Cultural diversity and curriculum. *Panauti Journal*, 2, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3126/panauti.v2i1.66500>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, C. (2023). How well do materials evaluation schemes empower users to detect problematic social group portrayals within ELT materials? A corpus analysis. *IARTEM E-Journal*, 15(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.21344/iartem.v15i1.973>
- Creswell, J. W. (2021). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. SAGE Publications. https://perpustakaan.poltekkes-malang.ac.id/assets/file/ebook/A_Concise_Introduction_to_Mixed_Methods_Research.pdf
- Demir, Y., & Ertaş, A. (2014). A suggested eclectic checklist for ELT coursebook evaluation. *The Reading Matrix Journal*, 14(2), 243–252. <https://readingmatrix.com/files/11-1n844ug7.pdf>
- Derakhshan, A. (2024). ‘Should textbook images be merely decorative? ‘Cultural representations in the Iranian EFL national textbook from the semiotic approach perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(1), 79–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168821992264>
- Efendi, T. A., Nurhidayah, S., & Prihantini, A. F. (2023). An analysis of the English textbook entitled “English for Change” with reference to the independent learning curriculum. *LUNAR*, 7(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.36526/ln.v7i2.3133>
- Fadilla, G., Amiza, E., Syahrul, S., & Karden, A. (2024). An analysis of the English textbook “Bright” used for the ninth grade of MTSN 6 Agam. *Education Achievement: Journal of Science and Research*, 5(3), 1028–1041. <https://doi.org/10.51178/jsr.v5i3.2139>
- Fatimah, U. N., & Budiharso, T. (2025). Content analysis of an English textbook for eleventh graders based on the Merdeka curriculum at SMA Negeri 1 Pracimantoro. *Journal Scientific of Mandalika*, 6(6), 1660–1674. <https://doi.org/10.36312/vol6iss6pp1660-1674>
- Gheitasi, M., Aliakbari, M., & Yousofi, N. (2020). Evaluation of culture representation in Vision English textbook series for Iranian secondary public education. *Two Quarterly Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning University of Tabriz*, 12(26), 145–173. <https://doi.org/10.22034/elt.2020.11471>

- Hanh, N. T. B. (2022). Teacher evaluation of the textbook solutions pre-intermediate used in the English program for non-English majors. *TNU Journal of Science and Technology*, 227(04), 91–99. <https://doi.org/10.34238/tnu-jst.5620>
- Hicham, K., AlQbailat, N. M., Ismail, I. A., Qpilat, N. M., Al-Khawaldeh, N. N., Al-Shboul, O. K., & Masrar, F. Z. (2025). Interculturalizing ELT: Culture-based classes to enhance language skills and intercultural communicative competence dimensions. *Ampersand*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2025.100221>
- Iswandari, Y. A., & Ardi, P. (2022). Intercultural communicative competence in EFL setting: A systematic review. *rEFLECTIONS*, 29(2), 361–380. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v29i2.260249>
- Jafari S M, Curle S, Bahraman M. (2024). An Evaluation of English Textbook "Prospect 3" in Iranian Junior High Schools: A Mixed Methods Study. *Iranian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(3), 50-74. <https://doi.org/10.22034/3.3.50>
- Kassymova, G., Tulepova, S., & Bekturova, M. (2025). Enriching experiences: Unpacking Kazakhstani EFL teachers' attitudes and readiness for an intercultural approach. *Cakrawala Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 44(1), 72–91. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v44i1.73305>
- Khodabandeh, F., & Hemmati, F. (2018). *Essay writing*. Payame Noor University Publications.
- Lei, W., & Soontornwipast, K. (2020). Developing an evaluation checklist for English majors' textbooks in China: Focus on intercultural communicative competence. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(3), 92–116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no3.6>
- López-Medina, B. (2021). On the development of a CLIL textbook evaluation checklist: A focus group study. *TESL-EJ*, 25(1), 1-17.
- Mariyono, D. (2024). Indonesian mosaic: The essential need for multicultural education. *Quality Education for All*, 1(1), 301–325. <https://doi.org/10.1108/qea-05-2024-0042>
- Masoumi Sooreh, E., & Ahour, T. (2020). Internal evaluation of the English textbook "Vision 2" from teachers' perspectives. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 13(27), 237–256. <https://doi.org/10.30495/jal.2020.683594>

- Mukundan, J., & Ahour, T. (2010). A review of textbook evaluation checklists across four decades (1970–2008). In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning* (pp. 336–352). Continuum International Publishing Group. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474211949.ch-021>
- Mukundan, J., Hajimohammadi, R., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2011). Developing an English language textbook evaluation checklist. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 4(6), 21–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.19030/cier.v4i6.4383>
- Nguyen, T. T. M., Marlina, R., & Cao, T. H. P. (2021). How well do ELT textbooks prepare students to use English in global contexts? An evaluation of the Vietnamese English textbooks from an English as an international language (EIL) perspective. *Asian Englishes*, 23(2), 184–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1717794>
- Novianti, S., & Wirza, Y. (2024). Textbook evaluation: How does it assist intercultural communicative competence? *SAGA: Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.21460/saga.2024.51.178>
- Nurwahidah, M. (2023). *The representation of humanistic values in an English textbook "Symphony 3" for senior high school grade XII by Quadra: A descriptive content analysis* [Bachelor's thesis]. FITK UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. <https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/handle/123456789/66585>
- Saidi, M. (2021). A comparative study of the previous and the new English language textbook: Pre-university book versus Vision 3. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 13(27), 333–358. <https://doi.org/10.22034/elt.2021.42935.2313>
- Saragih, D. K. (2024). Analysis of student needs for writing textbooks based on local wisdom in the Indonesian literature study program. In EAI (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Humanities, Social Science, and Education (ICHSS)*. Pamulang University, Surakarta, Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-12-2023.2350319>
- Sari, N. (2022). An Analysis of English Textbook Based on the Evaluation Checklist By Mukundan and Nimehchisalem of the Ninth-Grade Junior High School [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. Raden Intan State Islamic University.
- Savage, A., & Mayer, P. (2016). *Effective academic writing 2* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

- Sedaghatgoftar, N. (2022). Evaluation of an Iranian ELT book series. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 4(2), 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.31763/ijele.v4i2.767>
- Shieh, J. J., Reynolds, B. L., & Ha, X. V. (2023). Using a design-based approach to develop a checklist for evaluating preservice teacher learning materials. *TESOL Journal*, 14(3), e717. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.717>
- Shiryaeva, T., Litvishko, O., & Mosesova, M. (2021). Bilingual textbook as a driver of knowledge transfer in the modern educational environment. *ARPHA Proceedings*, 4, 820–833. <https://ap.pensoft.net/article/22806/>
- Siregar, R. A., Sukyadi, D., & Yusuf, F. N. (2024). A critical content analysis of writing materials covered in Indonesian high school English textbooks. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 11(1), 205-227. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i1.30169>
- Sujiono, S., Andayani, A., Setiawan, B., & Wardani, N.E. (2023). The effectiveness of a textbook based on multicultural and contextual understanding as a learning material for scientific writing. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(2), 347–368. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16220a>
- Syahid, A., Nashir, A. M., Rinalgi, D., Shalehah, H. N., Jannah, M., & Rahmadaniati, N. (2024). Examining the effectiveness of "My Next Words Grade 4": A checklist evaluation. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 3(2), 36–42. <https://doi.org/10.56127/jukim.v3i02.1259>
- Tsatzali, K., Beazidou, E., Stavropoulou, G., Botsoglou, K., & Andreou, G. (2025). The development and validation of the intercultural communicative competence evaluation instrument (ICCEI). *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2464374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2025.2464374>
- Wang, Y., & Hemchua, S. (2022). Can we learn about culture by EFL textbook images? A semiotic approach perspective. *Language Related Research*, 13(3), 479–499. <https://doi.org/10.52547/lrr.13.3.19>
- Yousif, M. R. A. (2025). Technology and the 21st-century learner: Evaluating Iraqi ELT textbooks against international benchmarks. *Journal of Imam Al-Kadhum College*, 9(1), 181–203. <https://doi.org/10.61710/176v9n1>

Authors' Biographies



Hamed Badpa holds a B.A. in English-Persian Translation from Payame Noor University and is currently pursuing an MA in TEFL at the English Language Department, Faculty of Management and Humanities, Chabahar Maritime University, Chabahar, Iran. His academic journey reflects a deep commitment to language and translation studies, with a focus on enhancing English language teaching methodologies.



Ali Beikian is an Assistant Professor of Translation Studies at Chabahar Maritime University, Iran. He earned his B.A. in English-Persian Translation, and his M.A. and Ph.D. in Translation Studies from the University of Kashan, Allameh Tabatabaei University, and the University of Isfahan, respectively. His research interests include AI-Assisted Translation, Machine Translation, Localization, Corpus Linguistics, and Data-Driven Language Learning. He is particularly focused on the integration of AI in translation and language pedagogy, as well as the application of Natural Language Processing (NLP) and translation technology to enhance multilingual communication and improve translation quality.
