



The Stance of Communication Strategies in Iran's High School English Textbooks (Vision Series)

Fateme Jamshidian¹, Omid Tabatabaei^{2*}, Hadi Salehi³, Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi⁴

¹ PhD candidate in the Faculty of Literature and Humanities, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

² Associate Professor, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

⁴ Associate Professor, English Department, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran

Received: 25 October, 2020

Accepted: 25 May, 2021

Abstract

This content analysis study aimed to investigate whether communicative strategies (CSs) have been incorporated into Iranian high school English textbooks (*Vision Series*). To this aim, the strategic components highlighted in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles were selected to uncover its role in such textbooks. Moreover, Dornyei's communication strategy classification was used to scrutinize the extent to which the strategic competence was represented in high school EFL textbooks. The analysis of the results revealed that the textbook did not benefit from different kinds of CSs. The authors' claims were not met in the large portion of the textbook's content. Therefore, *Vision series* need to be modified so that CSs are more appropriately included. The central philosophy of incorporating explicit CSs into the *Vision series* was not to accomplish as many CSs as possible, but rather to draw the students' attention to special CSs, which could help them overcome the barriers faced in language communication.

Keywords: Communication strategies (CSs); Iranian high school English textbooks; CLT; *Vision Series*

² Corresponding Author's Email:

tabatabaeiomid@yahoo.com



INTRODUCTION

A theory of language as communication developed the communicative approach; moreover, the communication element was added to Chomsky's theory of competence (Hymes, 1972). Hymes (1972) believed that knowledge and the use of language are necessary to acquire communicative competence. Communicating a real meaning is very important in the communicative approach (Sayera, 2019). "Learners are involved in real communication, their natural strategies for language acquisition will be active and used, and this will allow them to learn to use the language" (Sayera, 2019, p. 474). Therefore, the Iranian authorities preferred to develop high school English textbooks based on the communicative approach.

The development of language materials in Iran can be divided into three phases: pre-revolution series (1939–1979), post-revolution series (1982–2010) and the 6-3-3 system (English for Schools). In 1960, the first high school English textbook (six-volume series) for Iranian students was developed and distributed. Direct method and Reading Method (RM) were used to convey the content of these six volumes. After a period, the six-volume Graded English series based on situational language teaching took the previous one from 1964 to 1978. In Iran, learning English as a foreign language acts as a tool to acquaint students with the science, literature, and art of the English-speaking countries to achieve a global understanding and sources of information (Birjandi & Soheili, 1982). Therefore, students needed appropriate English textbooks. Foreign language textbooks

should provide an appropriate platform for understanding, receiving, interacting, and transferring human knowledge gains through verbal, visual, and written linguistic components. The ability to communicate is the main aim of learning a second language for many people. Effective communications in foreign language learning receive significant importance rather than reading and writing (Ya-Ni, 2007). Therefore, communication strategies are vital for teaching and learning another language (Ya-Ni, 2007).

CLT principles created changes in the fundamentals of language education ranging from teaching structures to students' requirement for creating relational abilities. The Iranian Ministry of Education developed other English educational programs for high school students to promote communication activities in language classes; therefore, authorities performed Iranian textbooks based on the CLT model. English educational programs should promote learners' CSs as well. This study was about the Stance of Communication Strategies in Iranian high school English textbooks.

The following question was responded to in this scrutiny:

1. *To what extent are the principles of CSs incorporated into the Iranian high school Vision 1?*
2. *To what extent are the principles of CSs incorporated into the Iranian high school Vision 2?*
3. *To what extent are the principles of CSs incorporated into the Iranian high school Vision 3?*

LITERATURE REVIEW

Materials development

Evaluation of material is defined as a dynamic and subjective procedure that is not based on a systematic and rigid system (Sheldon, 1988). Evaluation is an essential process to determine the materials' proportion. This inevitable procedure evaluates whether the educational materials help learners achieve the aims of those materials (Sheldon, 1988). Materials evaluation is a systematic evolution connected with the objectives of materials and with the goals of the students utilizing them (Littlejohn & Tomlinson, 2011). Materials evaluation enables individuals to regard the materials meticulously and help them control the design and use of instructional materials (Littlejohn & Tomlinson, 2011). Textbooks need to be evaluated to expand and operate programs of language teaching (McGrath, 2002). The following studies highlighted some textbooks evaluations.

Textbook evaluation

According to Grant (1987), the traditional textbooks made pupils learn English in a systematic way; they emphasized the forms and grammar of language more than the communicative functions of language. In addition, they focused on reading and writing rather than listening and speaking activities. Making use of a great deal of first language (L1), emphasizing the importance of accuracy, and focusing rather narrowly on a syllabus and examinations were other characteristics of traditional books. Incapability in using language and communication was the main

problem with traditional textbooks. Creating opportunities for using language in a classroom environment, communicative textbooks could solve the problem of traditional textbooks. Grant (1987) stated that communicative textbooks emphasized the communicative functions of language, needs analysis, fluency, the authentic language of everyday life, and four skills in using language. They were also activity-based and authentic. These issues clarified the significant role of textbook evaluation. Khodabandeh and Mombini (2018) investigated teachers' and learners' perceptions of 'Vision 1' via the distribution of a questionnaire. The results disclosed that teachers' perceptions were in line with students' attitudes. They enjoyed practical regard, plan and scheme, operations, the abilities to do something well, type of language, topic, and content without receiving any information related to culture. They believed that *Vision1* covered the weaknesses of *Prospects* Series, which suffered from over localization, lack of formal needs analysis and lack of piloting.

CSs

Dörnyei (1995) classified CSs into two parts consisting of avoidance and compensatory strategies. Avoidance strategies helped language learners avoid talking about topics for which they did not have the necessary vocabulary or avoid using the syntactic or lexical items when they were not able to use (Brown, 2000). Avoidance strategies had two different subcategories such as message abandonment and topic avoidance (Dörnyei,

1995). Message abandonment points to the role of language difficulties as the message transmission suppressor (Dörnyei, 1995). Topic avoidance assisted learners to avoid subject matter, which posed difficulties of language. Compensatory strategies, the second subcategory of CSs, helped learners compensate for their lack of knowledge in their communication. Compensatory strategies had 11 subcategories known as *circumlocution*, *approximation*, *use of all-purpose words*, *word coinage*, *prefabricated patterns*, *nonlinguistic signals*, *literal translation*, *foreignizing*, *code-switching*, *appeal for help* and *stalling or time-gaining strategies* (Dörnyei, 1995).

Circumlocution helps learners use a phrase to explain a specific idea with multiple words (e.g. an instrument for writing or drawing for pencil). *Approximation strategies* help learners utilize a word that does not have exact definition of the target lexical item (e.g. charming for beautiful). *All-purpose words* use refers to where special words are lacking; an empty lexical vocabulary can be extended to contexts (e.g. the overuse of thing, stuff, and what-do-you call-it). Language learners can use *Word coinage* to form a nonexistent second language word based on an assumed rule (e.g., vegetarianist for vegetarian). *The prefabricated pattern* is a tool to memorize stock phrases for survival goals to remedy language limitations (e.g., have you ever___?). *Nonlinguistic signals* included mime, gesture, facial expression, or sound imitation. *The literal translation* is used to translate a vocabulary item, idiom, compound word, or structure from their L1 to L2. Foreignizing facilitates the use

of L1 words and adjusting them to L2 phonology (i.e., with an L2 pronunciation) and/or morphology (e.g., adding to it an L2 suffix as cited in Dörnyei, 1995).

Code-switching strategies help learners utilize L1 vocabulary pronounced based on L1 language sound system or a L3 vocabulary pronounced based on L3 sound system in a way to facilitate their speaking. Language learners use *Appeal for help* strategies to ask help from teachers, peers or language partners either directly or indirectly (e.g., What is it or increasing intonation, pause, eye contact, puzzled expression). Learners can use *Stalling or time-gaining strategies* such as *well*, *now*, *let's see*, *uh*, *as a matter of fact* to fill gaps in communication to gain enough time to think (Dörnyei, 1995).

According to Azizifar (2009), EFL learners encounter textbooks as the preliminary source of the language. They are the main sources for teaching and learning English in Iran considered as the foundation of school education and the early information source used by teachers. Finding the most effective ways to teach English is the main challenge of countries struggling to incorporate teaching and learning English in national activities (Azizifar, Koosha, & Lotfi, 2010).

According to Maleki (2007), a controversial issue was the feasibility of CSs and their incorporation into school syllabi. He stated that teaching CSs was pedagogically effective and the participants used interactional strategies more effectively and extensively. Language teaching materials with CSs facilitated language learning and could be more effective.

In Bachman's view, strategic competence and linguistic competence acted as two major components of language ability; their combination provided language learners with the ability to create and to interpret discourse in terms of the context requirements. Bachman and Palmer (1996, 2010) identified strategic competence as a set of strategies functioning in higher executive processes enabling individuals to recognize what information outside a certain discourse was relevant to the required communicative tasks.

According to House (2008), CSs were a vital scope related to strategic competence. She pointed to the role of CSs along with learning strategies, transfer from L1, transfer of training and overgeneralization in the emerging competence of interlanguage speakers. Vettorel (2019) highlighted the role of CSs as an essential element of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) interaction in business ELT materials.

Vettorel (2019) analyzed international business ELT coursebooks at the elementary/pre-intermediate/intermediate level to indicate the presence of CSs in activities and tasks. She used Global Communicative Competence (GCC) model to investigate the use of CSs in the materials (coursebook, teacher's guide, audio/video/online information). She found some CSs in elementary levels and stated these business ELT materials disregarded pragmatic strategies and even when examples were provided. Unities increased awareness of the role CSs played in business contexts; however, English as a Business Lingua Franca (BELF) was not overtly and consistently dealt with. These

sections put emphasis on business knowledge and skills, without regarding opportunities for explicit and active reflection on the interconnectedness of the various elements and competences. These sections disregarded the relevance of strategic competence played in BELF. Results of her study indicated these materials did not consider the complex set of competences and skills that BELF users needed to use in the workplace successfully. In summary, previous studies only examined one high school textbook and evaluated it generally. However, this study aimed to evaluate high school textbooks entitled *Vision* series to explore the extent to which CSs as a whole and strategic competence as a specific one were adequately used in the content.

METHODS

Materials

The materials under the study included Student book *Vision1* English for school (Organization of research and educational planning, 2018), Student book *Vision2* English for school (Organization of research and educational planning, 2018), Student book *Vision3* English for school (Organization of research and educational planning, 2018).

The *Vision* series was the continuous nonperiodic collection that consisted of three books following the CLT framework. It was designed for teaching English in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades of Iranian high school. The authors designed these books as a way to focus on four skills simultaneously. These textbooks included various educational activities, which emphasize learning the

language practically while utilizing substantial, significant, and comprehensible information in preparing instructional content, fostering the motivation of language learning through cooperation in the classroom, giving suitable feedback toward the errors of learners, and regarding efficient facets and their parts in the learning procedure. The *Vision 1-3* authors arranged the content list in the same logical sequence for each lesson. Each book had three to four lessons, including different parts (getting ready, conversation, new words and expression, reading, vocabulary development, grammar, listening and speaking, pronunciation, writing, what you learned).

Procedure

The content analysis method was used because it presented data in words and themes so that some interpretation of the results could be offered. The first step in this process was to determine the research problem and to change it into a research question. A directed approach was utilized for content analysis, and then predetermined variables were extracted from the intended CLT model. Direct analysis of content was used when an existing theory or earlier research was about an incomplete case, or a case would need further description (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

The researchers evaluated materials by dividing the contents into smaller units. In doing so, Dornyei's (1995) classification was used to clarify how communicative strategies incorporated in *Vision* series. Dornyei (1995) classified CSs into two parts consisting of avoidance and compensatory strategies (as

cited in Brown, 2000). He categorized them into two strategies to avoid sending message and discussing about topic. Compensatory strategies include different strategies such as periphrasis (e.g. it becomes water instead of melt), estimation (e.g. *aim instead of goal*), all-purpose vocabularies use (using e.g. *thing* too much), word coinage (e.g. unjunction), prefab patterns (e.g. I think that), nonlinguistic signals (e.g. pictures and images), verbal rendition (e.g. از تو حرکت از خدا برکت), foreignizing (e.g. *reparate*), codeswitching (e.g., *ferrum*) ask urgently for help, stalling or time-obtaining strategies (Dornyei, 1995). Dornyei's classification could aid the researchers to criticize the extent to which the authors represent strategic competence in high school textbooks.

Strategy sections were selected as the unit of analysis that was the major entity being analyzed in this study. Descriptive design is used to describe what exists, determine the frequency with which it occurs, and categorizes the information. Then, categories and coding were made based on the deductive approach. Components of strategic competence of CLT model were used to arrange strategies in tables to clarify their roles in the contents of *Vision* series. Each strategy was listed and categorized to describe what it was. The researchers also recognized whether the categories were connected and listed them as prime categories or subordinate categories. All of the categories were assembled to examine each in detail and to see if they fit. After coding the data set, inferences were drawn based on the codes or themes. Dornyei's classification acts as a tool to

evaluate the incorporation of communicative competence in *Vision* series. Therefore, it was utilized to scrutinize the extent to which the authors represented strategic competence in high school textbooks.

RESULTS

Vision series (1, 2& 3) consisted of one lesson in 3-4 units. Each two-page lesson started with

stating clear communicative aims and finished with “what you learned” section to practice the learned information. Each lesson provided vocabulary development, grammar instruction, writing, reading, listening, and speaking sections. The following table shows different sections of *Vision1*.

Table 1
Different Sections of Strategy Use in Vision1

<i>Vision 1</i>	Section1	Section2	Section 3	Section4
	Pages (15-41)	Pages (43-69)	Pages (71-95)	Pages (97-119)
Lesson	First lesson	Second lesson	Third lesson	Fourth lesson
Topic	Saving Nature	Wonders of Creation	The Value of Knowledge	Travelling the World
Strategy	Speaking strategy: Talking and asking about schedule/ plans P (30)	Speaking strategy: Asking about details P (58)	Speaking Strategy: Narrating a story P (87)	Speaking Strategy: Asking about obligations/ possibilities P (112)

Table 2 indicated three kinds of compensatory strategies to present the contents of the textbook rather than teaching CSs. Literal translation strategies were not presented in all lessons. *Vision1* presented 24.63 % of nonlinguistic signals (e.g. using gesture reference pictures) in lesson one, 28.26% in lesson two, 28.98 % in lesson three, and 18.11 % in lesson four. Lesson one included 30.43 % of prefabricated patterns (e.g. I am going to ...) and lesson two and

lesson one consisted of 26.08 % and 30.43 % of prefabricated patterns, respectively.

Lesson three and lesson four included 8.69% and 34.78 % of prefabricated patterns. The results indicated 17.60 % of circumlocution (e.g. instead: in place of someone or something else) in lesson one, 29.40% of those in the second lesson, 29.40% of those in lesson three, and 23.50% of those in lesson four. Therefore, CSs were not equally presented in three lessons of *Vision1*.

communication strategies lesson	Avoidance Strategies Compensatory Strategies													
	Message abandonment	Topic avoidance	Stalling or time-	Appeal for help	Code-switching	Foreignizing	Literal translation	Nonlinguistic signals	Prefabricated patterns	Word coinage	Use of all-purpose	Approximation	Circumlocution	
Lesson one	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	7	0	0	0	3	
/Frequency Percentage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24.63	30.43	0	0	0	17.64	
Lesson two	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	6	0	0	0	5	
/Frequency Percentage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28.26	26.08	0	0	0	29.41	
Lesson three	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	2	0	0	0	5	
/Frequency Percentage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28.98	8.69	0	0	0	29.41	
Lesson four	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	8	0	0	0	4	
/Frequency Percentage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.11	34.78	0	0	0	23.52	
Book (total)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	23	0	0	0	17	

Table 2
The Role of Avoidance and Compensatory Strategies in Vision 1

Table 3
Different Sections of Strategy Use in Vision 2

<i>Vision 2</i>	Section1	Section2	Section 3
	Pages (15-47)	Pages (49-79)	Pages (81-107)
Lesson	First lesson	Second lesson	Third lesson
Topic	Understanding People	A Healthy Lifestyle	Art and Culture
Strategy	1. Reading strategy: Scanning P (25)	1. Reading strategy: Skimming P (59)	1. Reading strategy: Recognizing reference words P (91)

2.Speaking strategy:shopping, asking and answering about prices and numbers P (34)	2.Speaking strategy: Talking about past experiences P (69)	2.Speaking strategy:Talking about conditions and future results P (99)
--	--	--

Table 3 indicated strategic parts of this textbook. The authors of *Vision2* believed that these parts could develop strategic competence. In each lesson, the authors used two kinds of strategies, including reading strategies and

writing strategies. However, it seemed that speaking strategies were merely introducing topics rather than teaching speaking strategies.

Table 4

The Role of Avoidance and Compensatory Strategies in Vision 2

Communication strategies lesson	Avoidance and Compensatory Strategies												
	Message abandonment	Topic avoidance	Stalling or time-gaining	Appeal for help	Code-switching	Foreignizing	Literal translation	Nonlinguistic signals	Prefabricated patterns	Word coinage	Use of all-purpose	Approximation	Circumlocution
Lesson one	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	4	0	0	0	5
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40.3	57.1	0	0	0	29.4
Percentage								3	4				1
Lesson two	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	3	0	0	0	7
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29.4	42.8	0	0	0	41.1
Percentage								1	5				7
Lesson three	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	5

Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30.2	0	0	0	0	29.4
Percentage								5					1
Textbook (total)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	7	0	0	0	17

Table 4 indicated the authors of *Vision2* did not use CSs in a wide range. They used three kinds of compensatory strategies to present the contents of the textbook rather than directly teaching CSs to high school students. In *Vision2*, literal translation strategies were not presented in all lessons. *Vision2* presented 40.33 % of nonlinguistic signals (in the first lesson, 29.41% in lesson two, and 30.25% in lesson three. Lesson one included 57.14% of prefabricated patterns (e.g. How much is it?), and lesson two consisted of 42.85%. Prefabricated patterns were not presented in the third lesson.

The results pointed to 29.41 % of circumlocution (e.g. vary: to be different from each other) in the first lesson, 41.17 % of those in lesson two, and 29.41% of those in the third lesson. According to the results, the most frequent kinds of compensatory strategies in *Vision2* were nonlinguistic signals and circumlocution. Therefore, CSs were not equally presented in three lessons of *Vision2*. They were used to present the contents of the textbook rather than teaching CSs to high school students.

Table 5
Different Sections of Strategy Use in Vision 3

<i>Vision 3</i>	Section1 Pages (15-41)	Section2 Pages (43-69)	Section 3 Pages (71-99)
lesson	First lesson	Second lesson	Third lesson
Topic	Sense of Appreciation	Look it up	Renewable Energy
Strategy	Reading strategy: Question generation 2.Speaking strategy:	Reading strategy: Highlighting p(53) 2.Speaking strategy: Talking about imaginary situation p(61)	1.Reading strategy: Note taking 2. Speaking strategy Talking about an activity before another in the past

Eliciting
agreement and
signaling
uncertainty

Table 5 indicated strategic sections of these textbooks, which include reading strategies and writing strategies. However, it seemed that

speaking strategies were introducing topics rather than teaching speaking strategies.

Table 6
The Role of Avoidance and Compensatory Strategies in Vision 3

Communication strategies lesson		Avoidance and Compensatory Strategies												
		Message abandonment	Topic avoidance	Stalling and time ga..	Appeal for help	Code-switching	Foreignizing	Literal translation	Nonlinguistic signals	Prefabricated patterns	Word coinage	Use of all-purpose	Approximation	Circumlocution
Lesson one		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	2	0	0	0	5
	/Frequency Percentage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36.36	22.22	0	0	0	20
Lesson two		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	7	0	0	0	5
	/Frequency Percentage	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.6	18.18	77.77	0	0	0	20
Lesson three		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	35	0	0	0	0	15
	/Frequency Percentage	0	0	0	0	0	0	93.33	45.45	0	0	0	0	60
	Percentage							3						
Book (total)		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	77	9	0	0	0	25

In *Vision3*, literal translation strategies were not presented in all lessons, but 6.6 % of literal translation strategies (e.g. از تو حرکت از خدا برکت) were presented in lesson two and 93.33% of those were indicated in lesson three. *Vision3* presented 36.36 % of nonlinguistic signals (e.g.

using gesture reference pictures) in first lesson, 18.18 % in the second lesson, and 45.45% in the third lesson. The first lesson included 22.22% of prefabricated patterns (have you ever heard of ...) and the second lesson consisted of

77.77% of those strategies. Prefabricated patterns were not presented in the third lesson.

Table 6 indicated circumlocution as the fourth CSs presented in *Vision3*. The results indicated 20% of circumlocution (e.g. forgive: to stop being angry with someone) in first lesson. 20% of those in lesson two and 60% of those in third lesson. According to the results, the most frequent kinds of compensatory strategies in *Vision 3* were nonlinguistic signals and circumlocution. Therefore, CSs were not equally presented in three lessons of *Vision 3*. They were used to present the contents of the textbook rather than teaching CSs to high school students. All lessons of *Vision* series disregarded avoidance strategies to present the contents. The third lesson of *Vision 3* used literal translation strategies to help learners connect their Persian proverbs with English proverbs. The literal translation strategies were to present cultural content rather than teaching literal translation strategies for communicating. Hence, the aim of *Vision* series was not to engage the students in a deep mental process and thinking about how to use CSs.

The authors used a limited number of compensatory strategies; they used nonlinguistic signal to clarify the meaning of each new word. The extensive captioned illustrations and photos demonstrated nonlinguistic signals. *Vision* series used circumlocution strategies to give definitions, examples, and contextualized sentences for each new word. *Vision* series was not designed for international communication because it did not support real communication and authentic language. These textbooks did not prepare

students for cooperative learning and real communication based on the target cultural and linguistic principles. English was regarded as the language of a particular country or region, rather than an international language. It was claimed that *Vision* series would promote learners' strategic competence; however, they did not fulfill the language learners' communicative needs in EFL contexts completely. The thorough examination of *Vision* series revealed that more than half of the tasks did not serve to strategies, especially CSs. To obtain more comprehension of what was concealed under the results of this study and to deepen the obtained data interpretations, the following discussion provided a deeper insight.

DISCUSSIONS

The study scrutinized how CSs incorporating into the *Vision* series. The contents of the *Vision* series did not follow the communicative approach pedagogically. So, the *Vision* series used CSs inefficiently for learning the language. The claims of the authors of the *Vision* series did not support the results of the current study because these textbooks consisted of a limited number of CSs to enable students to communicate effectively. Maleki (2007) pointed to the feasibility of teaching CSs and the possibility of including them in the curriculum. Textbooks including CSs as more effective tools played an important role in second language instruction than those without them (Maleki, 2007). Nevertheless, CSs were not incorporated in *the Vision* series and learners were not encouraged in using language in classroom activities. The pair works and the

exercises did not serve to this end how to use CSs in learners' daily conversation.

The study results could be compared with those announced by Chen (2006) who found that the students' feedback indicated they never received training on circumlocution strategies. Moreover, she emphasized the significance of promoting students' awareness of the nature of circumlocution strategies and emphasized students should know how to use them when necessary. The high occurrence of the circumlocution strategies was even more emphasized in the third textbook of the series. A circumlocution strategy facilitates interaction among interlocutors to convey the intended message successfully. Therefore, the *Vision* series should consist of explicit instructions about circumlocution strategy to help learners know how to overcome language obstacles. Training on the avoidance strategies and some subcategories of compensatory strategy were not covered in the *Vision* series. All of these strategies promote communicative language competence and can lead students to a successful interaction. It should be noted that high school students have to use the *Vision* series as a primary English textbook, so they should be acquainted with different communicative strategies. The following paragraph indicated *Vision* series not fulfill the need for language communications.

Prefabricated patterns in *Vision* series implicitly emerged in the highest number of frequency in *Vision1*. In contrast, they were presented in the lowest number of frequency in *Vision 2-3*. *Vision 2* and *Vision3* included separated sections presenting prefabricated

patterns explicitly. Unlike circumlocution, prefabricated patterns, and literal translation strategies, nonlinguistic signals emerged slightly more often, mainly in *Vision1*. The contents focused on reading and speaking strategies rather than CSs. There was no meaningful task, which followed the strategic competence principle. *Vision* series did not act as a provider of necessary input for learners to develop their strategic competence. The compensatory strategies presented the contents for the high school students in an intangible way. Horváthová (2014) pointed to researchers' opinion focusing on explicit strategy instructions; in other words, the value and applications of the strategies should be clarified for students. Oxford (1990) emphasized informed training and highlighted the beneficial aspects of the strategy use, the way of transferring them to different tasks, and the way of evaluating the success of this strategy in learning (as cited in Dörnyei,1995). This idea could serve as an explanation for the necessity of explicit communication strategy section in *Vision* series, which covered some SCs superficially. With such poor content, high school students have to bear the responsibility of language learning on their shoulders. That means they cannot follow self-study language learning; they should go to a language institute and pay money to improve their communicative skills.

Most parts of *Vision 3* did not encompass literal translation strategies. This finding confirmed the main principle followed in *Vision 1* and *Vision 2*. It is in line with the implications of the findings as well of Horváthová (2014)

who scrutinized the course books and investigated the use of language learning strategies. She found that using the first language to understand and /or produce the foreign language was not applied to the course books. She believed that using the first language connected English as the already learned language to German as the new language regularly in a way that persuades the students to use the already learned foreign language knowledge intentionally. She pointed to the interference of the first language with general input processing as well.

CS as a basis can develop adult interactive competence. Horváthová (2014) claimed that students use and implement specific learning techniques to learn a second foreign language; in fact, they make use of their first foreign language learning experiences. In the current study, students did not receive explicit CSs instructions to implement them for learning the third language. Hence, CSs should be incorporated into school syllabuses and taught to keep students in communication by assisting them not to give up the conversation. Dörnyei (1995) believed that CSs should directly be taught by introducing linguistic techniques to express CSs. He emphasized the necessity of preparing circumstances for specific communicative strategy-based practice to automatize using of CS.

CONCLUSION

This paper regarded the role of CSs in *Vision* series and revealed the insufficient representation of CSs. Considering Iran's context, high school textbooks should be

equipped with the enriched materials to promote language learners' self-confidence and motivation in language learning and communication. However, *Vision* series superficially presented the content by a limited number of CS such as circumlocution, prefabricated patterns, nonlinguistic signals, and literal translation. This led to uncertainty and confusion among teachers and learners how to improve their communication strategies. To conclude, *Vision* series should be modified to incorporate CSs they could employ to help students overcome barriers faced in language communication. They should tightly be related to the actual exercises, tasks, and texts in terms of preparing communicative opportunities. For upcoming research, additional content analysis should be conducted to investigate CSs listed in the student's books and teaching strategies given in teacher's books of the *Vision* series to seek how these correspond with CSs. It is hoped that the results of this study will unfasten the door of new dimensions for the benefit of authorities, authors, teachers, students, and material developers to enrich *Vision* series with sufficient and effective language input.

Teachers can benefit the suggested textbook evaluation model of this study as a way to promote their professional development and the quality of current and future ELT textbooks. Teachers should be informed how to teach components of CLT model and how to expand the *Vision* series tasks and activities to improve student's communicative abilities. This study will help them consider this textbook evaluation an integral practice in their daily practice to evaluate their teaching methods and techniques.

Textbook designers and educational policymakers can utilize the suggestions and implications of this study to improve the quality of current and future textbooks. This study gives them an awareness of the shortcomings of *Vision* series. Therefore, they can strengthen the use of all CLT elements, especially, intercultural competence to enrich the English textbooks.

This study has some potential limitations. The main shortcoming was insufficient national and international research studies on the high school textbook evaluation based on a specific CLT model. In terms of directions for future research, further work could examine the

contents of the *Vision* series to verify whether they could improve high school students' communicative competence practically. So, the sample of high school students could be recruited to scrutinize their performance based on Bachman and Palmer's (2010) model. The study should be repeated using Junior English textbooks (*Prospect* series) as the corpus to investigate the communicative competence components based on Bachman and Palmer's (2010) model. More information on Iranian English textbooks would help Iranian to establish a greater degree of accuracy on this matter.

References

- Azizifar, A. (2009). An analytical evaluation of Iranian high school ELT textbooks from 1970 to 2010. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Ppractice*, 2(5), 52 -79.
- Azizifar, A., Koosha, M., & Lotfi, A. R. (2010). An analytical evaluation of Iranian high school ELT textbooks from 1970 to the present. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 36-44.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1): Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., Palmer, A. S., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*: Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Birjandi, P., & Soheili, A. (1982). English Textbooks. *Roshd Foreign Language Teaching Journal*, 1(7).
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (Vol. 4): Longman New York.
- Chen, Y.-F. (2006). Foreign language learning strategy training in circumlocution. *Journal -Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 41(3), 1.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL quarterly*, 29(1), 55-85.
- Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook* (Vol. 11): Longman London.
- Horváthová, B. (2014). Implementing language learning strategies into a series of second foreign language learning

- textbooks. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 2(1), 60-94.
- House, J. (2008). English as lingua franca in Europe today. *Multilingual Europe: Facts and Policies*, 96, 63.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 269-293.
- Khodabandeh, F., & Mombini, R. (2018). Iranian EFL Teachers' and Students' Perceptions towards the First Grade High School English Textbook (Vision1). *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 11(22), 141-167.
- Littlejohn, A., & Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Materials Development In Language Teaching*. In: Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Maleki, A. (2007). Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience. *System*, 35(4), 583-594.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*: Edinburgh University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies What every teacher should know*: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Sayera, A. (2019). The Communicative approach in English language teaching. *Бюллетень науки и практики*, 5(4).
- Student book Vision1 English for school*. (2018). Organization of research and educational planning. Tehran: Textbook Publishing Company of Iran.
- Student book Vision2 English for school*. (2018). Organization of research and educational planning. Tehran: Textbook Publishing Company of Iran.
- Student book Vision3 English for school*. (2018). Organization of research and educational planning. Tehran: Textbook Publishing Company of Iran.
- Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 237-246.
- Vettorel, P. (2019). Communication strategies and co-construction of meaning in ELF: Drawing on "Multilingual Resource Pools". *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 8(2), 179-210.
- Ya-Ni, Z. (2007). Communication strategies and foreign language learning. *US-China Foreign Language*, 5(4), 43-48.

Biodata

Ms Fateme Jamshidian is a PhD candidate in the Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran, where she teaches undergraduate courses. Her main research interests include Psycholinguistic and Corpus Study. Email: f.jamshidian1@gmail.com

Dr Omid Tabatabaei is an associate professor in the Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran, where he teaches undergraduate and postgraduate courses. His main research interests include 1/L2 Acquisition, Teaching Skills, Testing and Assessment and, Psycholinguistic.

Email: tabatabaeiomid@yahoo.com

Dr Hadi Salehi is an assistant professor in the Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran, where he teaches undergraduate and postgraduate courses. He received his BA in English Literature from Isfahan University, Iran, his MA in TEFL from Allame Tabatabaei University/Tehran Payamenur University, Iran and his PhD in TESL from the National University of Malaysia (UKM). His main research interests include Language Learning Strategies, Material Development, Language Assessment, ICT, E-Learning and Washback of High-stakes Tests.

Email: hadisalehi1358@yahoo.com

Dr Hossein Vahid Dastjerdi is now retired from the Department of English, University of Isfahan, and works at different branches of Islamic Azad University. Hossein teaches and researches Discourse Analysis, Translation Studies, Pragmatics and Metaphoricity of Language.

Email: h_vahid@yahoo.com