ABSTRACT

Textbooks play a central role in teaching and learning processes, and textbook evaluation helps teachers to be familiar with merits and demerits of a particular textbook, to adapt and supplement textbooks, and to develop new materials. This study aims to evaluate Prospect series, the junior high school English textbooks in Iran, based on Bothelho’s (2003) checklist on the representation of Gardner’s (1983) multiple intelligences (MI) theory and to analyze their compatibility with Iranian junior high school students’ (IJHSS) MI profiles based on Multiple Intelligences Developmental Assessment Scale (MIDAS-kids) questionnaire. To this end, 68 English teachers and 300 high school students completed Bothelho’s checklist and MIDAS questionnaire, respectively. Descriptive statistics and chi square goodness-of-fit analyses were applied. The results revealed that visual/spatial, verbal/linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences were the most frequent types of intelligences represented in Prospect series, while interpersonal, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences were dominant in IJHSS’ MI profiles. The paper concludes that student’s books and workbooks of Prospect series did not cater for the interpersonal, kinesthetic, musical, and naturalistic intelligences of IJHSS. The findings of the study may have some implications for textbook designers to take into account all types of intelligences to satisfy teachers and learners, and thus to make textbooks more interesting and more effective.
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1. Introduction

Textbooks are the most extensively applied resources in English teaching classes and provide a road map and security for learners (Bahumaid, 2008). A textbook or course book is a language-learning material whose evaluation refers to the systematic appraisal of its value with regard to its aims (Tomlinson, 2011). McCullagh (2010) maintains that textbook evaluation helps teachers in deciding on an appropriate textbook, in being familiar with merits and demerits of a particular textbook, in comparing different textbooks, in adaptation and supplementation of textbooks, and in the development of materials.

Razmjoo and Jozaghi (2010) emphasize the need for a framework for textbook analysis and evaluation based on students’ different capabilities and needs. Accordingly, they refer to the MI theory (Gardner, 1983) as a framework for the analysis and evaluation of textbooks. Enhancing students’ understanding is the ultimate aspiration of the MI theory through which students’ different capacities, needs, interests, preferences, and satisfactions are identified (Gardner & Hatch, 1989).

The MI theory refers to different intelligences and capabilities of human beings in processing information with respect to their specific intelligence profile.
Gardner, 1983). Intelligences are important dimensions in the discussion of individual differences in education, language teaching, textbook selection, and designing textbooks (Gholampour, Kasmani, & Talebi, 2013; Nicholson-Nelson, 1998). Regarding the role of the MI theory in language teaching and learning, Kirkgoz (2010) asserts that the MI theory can be used in the language curricula and the design of textbooks. By analyzing ELT textbooks in terms of MI representation, the possible complementary exercises may be identified (Gholampour et al. 2013). In spite of the existing research body on textbooks, the Prospect series has not been touched upon to date regarding the representation of MI. As the series makes the textbooks which are used in Iranian high schools, the evaluation of the series from different perspectives, including the MI theory, may be of educational values and benefits for textbook writers and teachers. Thus, to fill in the gap, the present study aimed to analyze these textbooks, including student’s books and workbooks, in terms of the representation of MI. By knowing and understanding students’ MI profiles and their preferences, appropriate learning activities that improve their learning process can be distinguished and effective classroom activities can also be designed (Emmiyati, Rasyid, Rahman, Arsyad, & Dirawan, 2014). In view of these, the study establishes Iranian junior high school students’ (IJHSS) MI profiles through Multiple Intelligences Developmental Assessment Scale (MIDAS-kids) and MI profiles of Prospect series via Botelho’s (2003) checklist to explore the amount of their compatibility.

2. Literature Review

Gardner (1983) introduced the theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI). His theory “is biologically based…and makes a claim about how the brain has evolved and how it is organized … [each] intelligence has its own developmental trajectory” (p.30). Gardner (2006) states that after the demise of the unitary concept of intelligence and intelligence quotient (IQ), these concepts needed to be modified. Gardner (1983, 2011) defines intelligence in three different ways. To him, intelligence is “[a] property of all human beings…[a] dimension on which human beings differ…[t]he way in which one carries out a task in virtue of one’s goals…” (2011: xv). This last definition is closely related to his theory of MI. Gardner (1983) maintains that IQ concept needs to be redefined to include all types of individual’s capacities to process information.

Primarily, Gardner (1983) introduced seven different and independent intelligences in human beings, namely verbal-linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, spatial-visual, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences. Later, due to the evidence of the presence of two new intelligences, he added naturalistic (Gardner, 1995) and existential intelligences (Gardner, 1999) in order to extend his theory of MI.

According to Gardner (2011), verbal-linguistic intelligence refers to the capacity to use language through listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Musical intelligence relates to the sensitivity to melody, tonal patterns, and rhythm. Logical-mathematical intelligence deals with logical thinking and reasoning both inductively and deductively; it involves the ability to work with abstract symbols and numbers. Spatial-visual intelligence deals with space and visual perceptions like visual arts, architecture, painting etc.. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence deals with the ability to express emotions and ideas by using one’s body and physical skills like dancing and acting. Interpersonal intelligence relates to the ability to communicate with others and being able to demonstrate emotions and feelings in the community of others. Intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to understand personal feelings, thoughts, and one’s own manner. In defining naturalistic intelligence, Gardner (2006) refers to the understanding of nature, natural events, living things, and the ability to distinguish organisms from entities. Existential intelligence is the capacity to locate oneself in the cosmos. It relates to the ability to understand the meaning of life and death and to the capacity to ask questions about life and death (Gardner, 2006). Existential intelligence is disregarded in this study due to using Botelho’s (2003) checklist and Shearer’s (1996) MIDAS-Kids questionnaire in which existential intelligence is not taken into account.

The MI theory concerns individuals disparity in processing information; thus, an individual’s profile of MI might well differ in doing different tasks and solving various problems (Gardner, 1999). In this view, the MI profiles of students can aid knowing their preferences; therefore, appropriate practices and activities can be designed and presented to improve their learning process (Emmiyati et al., 2014). To do so, textbooks,
by providing learning activities, which should satisfy students’ needs (Byrd & Schuemann, 2014) and be appropriate to their learning styles, emotions, and intellectual engagements (Tomlinson, 2011), may motivate them to use their intelligences (Currie, 2003). Furthermore, MI-based teaching materials and strategies positively affect the development of students’ MI that, later, will influence their future success in their education (Winarti, Yuanita, & Nur, 2019).

Some studies have been conducted on the evaluation of English textbooks in terms of the representation of the MI theory. For instance, Kirkgoz (2010) investigated the frequency of representation of each type of intelligences in five ELT textbooks, which were locally published in Turkey. She identified naturalistic and existential intelligences as the least represented intelligences in the textbooks. In addition, Ibragimova (2011) evaluated the representation of the MI theory in the English textbooks of intermediate-level classes of Eastern Mediterranean University in Cyprus. She also identified the students’ MI profiles. She concluded that the MI profile of students and textbooks were not compatible. Arikian, Soydan, and Isler (2014) explored the extent of reflection of MI theory in two English textbooks, namely Texture of English 4 and My English 5 that were used in state schools of Turkey. According to their findings, existential intelligence was not included in the given textbooks. In addition, they revealed that verbal intelligence was the most represented type of intelligence in these textbooks. Wattanborwormong and Klavinitchai (2016) studied the similarities and differences of the representation of MI in locally-designed textbooks in English as a foreign language (EFL) and in Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) textbooks used in primary schools in Thailand. Their study revealed that the representation of spatial intelligence in both textbook series was the most prominent intelligence. In the same vein, musical and naturalistic intelligences were the least represented types. Likewise, Omer (2017) analyzed the content of North Star textbooks using Botelho’s (2003) checklist in Kurdistan region, Iraq. He revealed that verbal intelligence was the dominant one.

Similarly, in the context of Iran, Razmjoo and Jozaghi (2010) investigated the representation of MI in Top Notch series. In their analysis, they observed some patterns in the frequency and distribution of intelligences concerning the levels of textbooks. Estaji and Nafisi (2014) examined four EFL young learners’ textbooks of Up and Away in English series in terms of MI representation. They realized that existential intelligence was absent in the given textbooks. Taaseh, Mohebbi, and Mirzaei (2014) scrutinized Right Path to English series to analyze the types of intelligences represented in these textbooks based on Botelho’s (2003) checklist and explored Iranian students’ preferred intelligences. They found that the intelligence profiles of students were not compatible with the represented intelligences in textbooks. Ebadi, Sabzevari, and Beigzadeh (2015) studied the representation of MI in Touchstone series and revealed that verbal and visual intelligences were the most frequent types, while musical, bodily, and naturalistic intelligences were the least frequent types that were represented in Touchstone series. They also compared students’ books with workbooks and concluded that students’ books reflected various types of intelligences in comparison with workbooks. The above-mentioned studies, unanimously, concluded that, in these textbooks, verbal-linguistic intelligence was the most prominent type of intelligences; however, the researchers did not pay attention to the balance of distribution of the representation of intelligences in textbooks.

As far as the balance of distribution of MI was concerned, only Jado (2015) investigated the level of balance of MI in Arabic language textbooks in analytical descriptive approaches. He concluded that all types of intelligences are required to be represented in these textbooks. He dealt with the quantitative as well as the qualitative representations of different intelligences in the Arabic textbooks. The quantitative representations were more highlighted and featured.

Textbooks play a central role in teaching and learning processes (Richards, 2001). The English textbooks that are currently used in Iranian junior high schools, Prospect series, are the main resources for teaching English to students at grades 7, 8 and 9 at schools. Due to the significance of English textbooks in the first official presentation of the English language to Iranian students and in language learning of Iranian junior high school students (IJHSS),
this study focuses on the Prospect series including Prospect 1 for grade 7, Prospect 2 for grade 8, and Prospect 3 for grade 9, in order to analyze the representation of MI in them through Botelho’s (2003) checklist. Furthermore, the research compares the MI profiles of the textbooks with the MI profiles of IJHSS to see the amount of their compatibility.

The steps to conduct the present study are three-fold: first, it quantitatively analyzes the Prospect series with regard to the amount and distribution of the representation of MI. Second, the MI profile of IJHSS, which reveals the frequency and dominance of different intelligences of them, is established. Third, it examines the extent to which the MI profiles of IJHSS are compatible with the MI profiles of the Iranian junior high school English textbooks (IJHSET). Thus, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. Is there any significant difference between MI representation in the student’s book and work book of Prospect 1 and the MI profiles of IJHSS at grade 7?
2. Is there any significant difference between MI representation in the student’s book and work book of Prospect 2 and the MI profiles of IJHSS at grade 8?
3. Is there any significant difference between MI representation in the student’s book and work book of Prospect 3 and the MI profiles of IJHSS at grade 9?

In response to the above-mentioned research questions, the following null hypotheses were formulated.

1. There is no significant difference between MI representation in the student’s book and work book of Prospect 1 and the MI profiles of IJHSS at grade 7.
2. There is no significant difference between MI representation in the student’s book and work book of Prospect 2 and the MI profiles of IJHSS at grade 8.
3. There is no significant difference between MI representation in the student’s book and work book of Prospect 3 and the MI profiles of IJHSS at grade 9.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

For establishing the MI profile of IJHSS, 300 Iranian male and female junior high school students who were randomly selected from Tehran state, Iran, participated in the study. They were in grades 7, 8, and 9 (each grade 100 participants) studying Prospect 1, 2, and 3, respectively, as their English course books. Furthermore, for analyzing Prospect 1, 2, and 3, 68 Iranian EFL male and female junior high school English teachers participated in analyzing textbooks in terms of the representation of MI using Botelho’s (2003) checklist. Both male and female junior high school English language teachers and students was included in this study; so, gender was not taken into account. All of the teachers were B.A. holders of translation studies, teaching English as a foreign language, and/or English literature, with 10-15 years of experience in teaching English in Iranian junior high schools.

3.2. Instrumentation

The textbook series including Prospect 1, 2, and 3 designed for grades 7, 8, and 9 in new junior high school educational curriculum were used for analysis from the perspective of the representation of the MI. Botelho’s (2003) checklist for textbook analysis and evaluation, which is based on the MI theory, was used to analyze the textbooks. It examines both the presence and the frequency of the representation of each of the intelligences in textbooks.

Botelho (2003) presents an eight-part checklist consisting of the relevant information about eight intelligences and records of the activities, techniques, materials, and descriptions associated with each intelligence (Appendix). Taaseh, Mohebbi and Mirzaei (2014) evaluated Botelho’s (2003) checklist and estimated Cronbach’s Alpha reliability 0.81 for it. For this study, the researchers themselves also estimated Cronbach’s Alpha reliability as 0.76 for the Botelho’s checklist.

Furthermore, Multiple Intelligences Developmental Assessment Scale (MIDAS-Kids) (Shearer, 1996), which has been translated into Persian (P-MIDAS), was used for measuring the students’ MI profiles at grades 7, 8, and 9. MIDAS-Kids is a 93-item self-report questionnaire for measuring MI that can be run to participants of 10-15 years old; grades 7, 8, and 9 are included in this age-range in Iran. It is a six-point Likert scale from never or very little to always that takes 20-30 minutes to be completed. Shearer (2012) investigated the reliability and validity of the original MIDAS and it has been proven to be valid and reliable. Saeidi, Ostvar, Shearer, and Jafarabadi (2012) translated MIDAS questionnaire into Persian and estimated the reliability of P-MIDAS, ranging from .82 to .90 and proved it as valid. For this research, the researchers themselves also estimated Cronbach’s Alpha reliability as 0.78. Due to the copyright
rules, MIDAS cannot be included in the appendix.

3.3 Procedure
To begin with, the researchers trained 68 Iranian junior high school English teachers about the MI theory and the analysis of Prospect series using Botelho’s (2003) checklist. In this training, the procedure for sorting the type of intelligences and counting the frequency and distribution of the representation of MI in all the units of these textbooks was practiced. Later, the teacher participants analyzed the content of Prospect series to measure the frequency and distribution of the representation of MI in all these textbooks. Then, the student participants completed MIDAS-Kids for establishing their MI profiles. The collected data were submitted to data analysis for comparing the compatibility of MI profiles of Prospect series with the participants’ MI profiles.

3.4 Data Analysis
After collecting the data, descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data relating to the students’ MI profiles at grades 7, 8, and 9 and the data of MI profiles of student’s books and workbooks of Prospect 1, 2, and 3. In addition, in order to find any significant difference between MI representations in student’s books and workbooks of Prospect series and MI profiles of IJHSS, goodness-of-fit chi-square analyses were employed for analyzing and comparing the nominal data. Then, for calculating the strength of the relationship of the data, Cramer’s V was utilized.

4. Results
The research questions sought to compare the MI profiles of IJHSET, namely, Prospect 1, 2, and 3, including student’s books and workbooks, with the MI profiles of IJHSS to see the amount of their compatibility. For this purpose, the descriptive statistics of the main scales of the IJHSS’ MI profiles was calculated (Table 1).

Based on Table 1, it can be observed that the interpersonal intelligence in each grade has the highest mean, followed closely by linguistic and intrapersonal intelligences. Naturalist intelligence has the lowest mean, which is noticeably lower than that of other intelligences in each grade. The following graphic representation (Figure 1) makes the result more easily noticeable.
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Table 2: Frequency of representation of each intelligence in IJHSET (student’s books)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Prospect 1</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Prospect 2</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Prospect 3</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>17.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kines.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lng.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>43.77</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>35.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lgr.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>52.02</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>49.01</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>34.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of intelligence</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 demonstrates that in student’s books of Prospect 1 and 2, spatial, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences and in Prospect 3 student’s book linguistic, spatial, and intrapersonal intelligences are frequently represented. In these textbooks, naturalistic intelligence is the least represented intelligence. The following graphic representation displays the results of the intelligence profiles of student’s books of Prospect series (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Frequency of representation of each intelligence in Prospect series (student’s books)

The same statistics was done for workbooks of Prospect series as Table 2; the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Frequency of representation of each intelligence in IJHSET (workbooks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Prospect 1 Workbook</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Prospect 2 Workbook</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Prospect 3 Workbook</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kines.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lng.</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>30.74</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>33.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lgr.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>37.81</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>41.20</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>28.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of intelligence</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reveals that while spatial, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences, respectively, are the most frequent intelligences in Prospect 1 workbook, linguistic, intrapersonal, and spatial intelligences, respectively, are the most frequently represented in Prospect 2 workbook. Moreover, linguistic, spatial and intrapersonal intelligences are regarded as the most frequent intelligences in Prospect 3 workbook. Figure 3 shows the graphic representation of the intelligence profiles of workbooks of Prospect series.

Figure 3: Frequency of representation of each intelligence in Prospect series (workbooks)

In order to find if there is any significant difference between MI representations in student’s book and workbook of Prospect 1 and MI profile of IJHSS at grades 7, goodness-of-fit chi-square analyses were run (Table 4).

Table 4: Chi-square statistics for the MI profiles of Grade 7 students and of Prospect 1 student’s book and workbook

As it can be seen from Table 4, there are significant differences between the representations of musical, kinesthetic, logical, interpersonal, and naturalistic intelligences in Prospect 1 student’s book and workbook and the MI profile of IJHSS at grade 7. As a result, the first null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is not any compatibility between most of the intelligences, namely musical, kinesthetic, logical, interpersonal, and naturalistic intelligences represented in Prospect 1 student’s book and workbook and the MI profile of grade 7 students.

To answer the second research question, the goodness-of-fit chi-square analyses were used to look for any significant difference between MI representations in student’s book and workbook of Prospect 2 and MI profiles of IJHSS at grade 8 (Table 5).
According to Table 5, there are significant differences between the representations of musical, interpersonal, and naturalistic intelligences in Prospect 2 student’s book and that of the MI profile of grade 8 students. The same analysis on Prospect 2 workbook demonstrates that a significant difference exists between grade 8 students’ MI profile and the representation of MI in Prospect 2 workbook with respect to musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal, and naturalistic intelligences. Based on the results of Table 5, the second null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is no compatibility between Prospect 2 student’s book and grade 8 students’ MI profile in terms of the representation of musical, interpersonal and naturalistic intelligences. In addition, the representations of musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal, and naturalistic intelligences in Prospect 2 workbook are not compatible with the MI profile of grade 8 students.

Concerning the third research question, to investigate any significant difference between the representations of MI in Prospect 3 student’s book and workbook and MI profile of IJHSS at grade 9, goodness-of-fit chi-square analyses were calculated (Table 6).

Table 6 indicates that there is a significant difference between the representation of interpersonal and naturalistic intelligences in Prospect 3 student’s book and that of MI profile of grade 9 students. As it can be seen in Table 6, the representations of musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal, and naturalistic intelligences in Prospect 3 workbook are significantly different from grade 9 students’ MI profile. According to Table 6, the third null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, Prospect 3 student’s book and MI profile of grade 9 students are not compatible in terms of interpersonal and naturalistic intelligences. In addition, it can be inferred that grade 9 students’ MI profile is not compatible with Prospect 3 workbook in terms of the representations of musical, kinesthetic, interpersonal, and naturalistic intelligences. In order to calculate the strength of relationship of the findings, Cramer’s V was used (Table 7).

Table 7 shows that the values of Cramer’s V of the differences between MI profiles of IJHSS at grades 7, 8, and 9 and MI representations in Prospect series student’s books and workbooks are significant. To be precise, there are significant differences between the MI profile of grade 7 students and MI representation in Prospect 1 textbooks (for student’s book $\rho = .022 < .05$, Cramer’s $V = .089$ and for workbook $\rho = .027 < .05$, Cramer’s $V = .083$). Similarly, there are significant differences between the grade 8 students’ MI profile and MI representation in Prospect 2 textbooks (for student’s book $\rho = .043 < .05$, Cramer’s $V = .063$ and for workbook $\rho = .031 < .05$, Cramer’s $V = .071$). In the same way, there are significant differences between the MI profile of grade 9 students and MI representation in Prospect 3 textbooks (for student’s book $\rho = .041 < .05$, Cramer’s $V = .062$ and for workbook, $\rho = .034 < .05$, Cramer’s $V = .070$). Thus, Tables 4, 5, and 6 reveal significant differences in the sub-intelligences between MI

Table 5: Chi-square test for the MI profiles of Grade 8 students and of Prospect 2 student’s book and workbook

Table 6: Chi-square test for the MI profiles of Grade 9 students and of Prospect 3 student’s book and workbook
representation in *Prospect* series and the MI profiles of IJHSS.

**4.1. Discussion**

The present study aimed to investigate the MI representation in *Prospect* series, student’s books and workbooks, the MI profiles of IJHSS at grades 7, 8, and 9, and the amount of their compatibility. Regarding the first research question, the results indicated that the MI representation in the student’s book and workbook of *Prospect* 1 predominately catered for spatial, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences respectively, while grade 7 students, who study *Prospect* 1 textbooks, were highly intelligent in interpersonal, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences respectively. As a result, the representations of interpersonal, kinesthetic, logical, musical, and naturalistic intelligences in *Prospect* 1 student’s book and workbook were not compatible with the MI profiles of grade 7 students.

As far as the second research question is concerned, the findings were similar to that of the first question in the way that the representation of MI in *Prospect* 2 textbooks, including its student’s book and workbook, chiefly contributed to spatial, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences respectively, while the MI profile of grade 8 students, who study *Prospect* 2 textbooks, indicated that they were highly intelligent in interpersonal, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences respectively. Thus, the representations of interpersonal, musical, and naturalistic intelligences in *Prospect* 2 student’s book and the representations of interpersonal, kinesthetic, musical, and naturalistic intelligences in *Prospect* 2 workbook were not compatible with the MI profiles of grade 8 students.

Furthermore, concerning the third research question, the findings showed that interpersonal, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences were dominant in the MI profile of grade 9 students while linguistic, spatial, and intrapersonal intelligences were frequently represented in *Prospect* 3. Thus, the representations of interpersonal and naturalistic intelligences in *Prospect* 3 student’s book and the representations of interpersonal, kinesthetic, musical, and naturalistic intelligences in *Prospect* 3 workbook were not compatible with the MI profiles of grade 9 students.

The findings show that the MI profiles of *Prospect* series student’s books and workbooks are not compatible with the MI profiles of IJHSS. On establishing the MI profile of EFL learners, the findings are in line with some studies and in contrary with some others. For example, Hosseini’s (2011) conclusion that linguistic intelligence of Iranian female EFL learners is dominant does not support the findings of the present study in which interpersonal intelligence was the dominant intelligence type in IJHSS.

It seems that although these two studies were carried out in the Iranian culture and context, the difference in findings refers to the difference in the age and gender of the participants because her study focused on Iranian female university EFL students and explored their MI profile, while the present study attended to Iranian male and female junior high school students. In this regard, gender difference seems to be influential in the estimates of dominant intelligences (Furnham, Clark, & Bailey, 1999) and females yield higher scores on verbal intelligence (Furnham, 1996), whereas the present study does not take gender difference into consideration.

The findings of Ibragimova (2011) about the MI profile of Turkish students indicated that intrapersonal, logical, and kinesthetic intelligences were the most dominant and interpersonal and linguistic intelligences were the least dominate intelligences in Turkish students’ MI profile. In addition, she established the MI profile of an English textbook for Turkish students, namely *Success intermediate* students’ and workbooks. She found that linguistic, logical, and naturalistic intelligences were the most frequent and musical and kinesthetic intelligences were the least represented ones. The age of the participants in her study was the same as that of the present study while their contexts, cultures, and educational systems are different. These might be the causes of differences in findings. In addition, the English textbooks including *Success intermediate* and *Prospect* series were two dissimilar textbooks for the comparison with the MI profiles of students. This may be another reason for the incongruity in the findings. Although her results are not in agreement with our findings, her conclusion that the MI profiles of students and of textbooks were not compatible supports our findings. Moreover, Taaseh, Mohebbi and Mirzaei (2014) analyzed the MI profile of *Right Path to English* series and Iranian students’ preferred intelligences. Their conclusion that the intelligence profiles of students were not compatible with the represented intelligences in textbooks supports the results of the present study. It may be
because of the same context, culture, educational system, and age of participants. In their study, they used preferred intelligences of IJHSS, whereas the present research was based on the actual yielded scores of IJHSS on the MI assessment test.

Emmiyati et al. (2014) presented MI profiles of Indonesian junior secondary school students. Their results revealed that the existential intelligence was the strongest intelligence in the MI profiles of Indonesian junior secondary school students. Since the present study used Botelho’s (2003) checklist and Shearer’s (1996) MIDAS-Kids questionnaire in which existential intelligence is not taken into account, existential intelligence was disregarded in this study.

The present study supports the findings of Wattanborwornwong and Klavinichai (2016). They concluded that spatial intelligence was the most prominent and musical and naturalistic intelligences were the least represented ones in both textbook series. This may be attributable to the focus of these textbooks on attracting students to learn through the wide use of pictures (Gardner, 1999). Furthermore, musical intelligence may be less represented in textbooks owing to the religious issues or poor facilities of schools in playing music in the classroom (Wattanborwornwong & Klavinichai, 2016).

It can also be mentioned that since the aim of a foreign language teaching and learning is to enhance the linguistic knowledge and communicative knowledge of language learners, the content of textbooks as “language learning [student’s book] and use [workbook] are obviously closely linked to what MI theories label “Linguistic Intelligence”” (Richards & Rogers, 2001, p. 117). In addition, MIDAS interprets linguistic knowledge as formal knowledge and communicative knowledge (Akbari & Hosseini, 2008). In this regard, formal knowledge of language is classified as the linguistic intelligence, and communicative knowledge is classified as interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences (Akbari & Hosseini, 2008).

5. Conclusions

The present study aimed to answer the question whether there is any significant difference between MI representation in Prospect series and the MI profiles of IJHSS. The implicit aim of this study was to compare the compatibility of the MI profiles of Prospect series with that of IJHSS. Based on the results, it was found that visual/spatial, verbal/linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences were the most frequent types of intelligences represented in Prospect series, while interpersonal, linguistic, and intrapersonal intelligences were dominant intelligences in IJHSS’ MI profiles. Thus, based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that Prospect series did not cater for the interpersonal, kinesthetic, musical, and naturalistic intelligences of IJHSS.

The findings of the study may have some implications for the educational system, textbook designers, teachers, and students. Students’ different MI profiles lead to their differences in choosing, learning, remembering, performing, and comprehending materials (Gardner, 1999). Textbooks, by providing various learning activities, which are appropriate for students’ needs and intellectual engagements, can provide some opportunities to promote the students’ potential capabilities, encourage them to employ their intelligences, and show their performance (Byrd & Schuemann, 2014; Currie, 2003; Gardner, 2011; Tomlinson, 2011).

By preparing the MI profile of Iranian junior high school English language textbooks and by comparison of MI profile of the given textbooks and students, possible strong points and weak points of these textbooks can be identified. Accordingly, these kinds of studies can probably reveal the neglected learners’ needs, differences, and intellectual engagements in designing English textbooks for IJHSS. By comparing the degree of compatibility of MI profiles of students with the MI profiles of textbooks, more appropriate and compatible supplementary materials, tasks, and activities can be designed and employed to reinforce textbooks with regard to the MI representation and to make them more suitable for different students with various intelligence types. The results of the research may be constructive in enhancing the adequacy and efficiency of new editions or perhaps the new series of junior high school English textbooks. The findings of the study may have some implications for the educational system, textbook designers, teachers, and students.
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