

Contents

序言	孙有中	iii
Tables and Figures		vii
Acknowledgements		x
Contributors		xii
1 Content, Consumption, and Production: Three Levels of Textbook Research		1
PART I Studies of Textbook Content		45
2 All Middle Class Now? Evolving Representations of the Working Class in the Neoliberal Era: The Case of ELT Textbooks		46
3 Reading Comprehension Questions: The Distribution of Different Types in Global EFL Textbooks		72
4 Teaching English Reading: What's Included in the Textbooks of Pre-service General Education Teachers?		111
PART II Studies of Textbook Consumption		143
5 Teachers' Conceptualization and Use of the Textbook on a Medical English Course		144
6 An Experienced Teacher's Use of the Textbook on an Academic English Course: A Case Study		178
7 Global Textbooks in Local Contexts: An Empirical Investigation of Effectiveness		205
PART III Studies of Textbook Production		241
8 Writing Materials for Publication: Questions Raised and Lessons Learned		242

9	An Interdisciplinary Textbook Project: Charting the Paths Taken	263
10	Tensions between the Old and the New in EAP Textbook Revision: A Tale of Two Projects	301
11	Chaosmos: Spontaneity and Order in the Materials Design Process	323
	Author Index	362
	Subject Index	372

序言

面对百年未有之大变局，提高人才培养质量是当前我国教育改革与发展的迫切任务。而人才培养的质量取决于两大根本支撑，其一是教师，其二就是教材。教材的重要性不仅在于它为教学提供知识内容与教学方法，而且在于它在很大程度上决定了人才培养的价值取向，即为谁培养人的问题。在此意义上，教材成为国家事权。目前，我国教育界普遍认识到，教材必须体现党和国家意志，必须坚持马克思主义指导地位，体现马克思主义中国化要求，体现中国和中华民族风格，体现党和国家对教育的基本要求，体现国家和民族的基本价值观，体现人类文化知识积累和创新成果。

外语教材在我国教育体系中占有突出的重要地位。外语（英语）是唯一贯穿我国基础教育和高等教育全过程的科目，又是直接输入外国文化特别是西方文化的科目，教学内容承载着各种意识形态和价值观，影响学生时间最长、人数最多。在高等教育阶段，外语不仅是人人必修的公共课程，而且成为最大的专业类课程之一。不仅如此，外语（专业）教学较之其他科目（专业）的教学，更多地依靠教材所提供的学习材料。就教材的种类和出版的数量而言，外语教材无疑名列前茅。因此，外语教材的建设和研究应受到特别重视。

当前，加强外语教材研究应着眼于两个基本目标。一是把握方向，即保障外语教材正确的价值导向，服务于立德树人和培养社会主义建设者和接班人的根本教育方针。二是提高质量，即根据外语教育教学的基本规律，结合我国外语教育教学的实践经验，揭示具有中国特色的外语

教材编写理论与方法，打造融通中外的外语精品教材。

随着全国首届教材工作会议的召开，外语教材建设和研究进入新的发展时期。中国高等教育和外语教育的提质升级对外语教材建设和研究提出了一系列重大课题。在外语教材编写中，如何全面贯彻党的教育方针，落实立德树人根本任务？如何扎根中国大地，站稳中国立场？如何体现社会主义核心价值观？如何加强爱国主义、集体主义、社会主义教育？如何引导学生坚定道路自信、理论自信、制度自信、文化自信，成为担当民族复兴大任的时代新人？在中观和微观层面，外语教材编写如何吸收语言学、应用语言学、教育学研究的最新成果？如何提炼和继承中国外语教育教学的宝贵经验并开拓创新？如何借鉴国际外语教材编写的先进理念与方法？在《教育信息化 2.0 行动计划》全面落实发展的时代背景下，外语教材如何支持和引领混合式教学、翻转课堂乃至慕课建设？一句话，外语教材如何为培养具有国际视野、中国情怀、思辨能力和跨文化能力的国际化人才提供坚实支撑？所有这些紧迫问题，都需要中国外语教材研究者用具有中国特色的理论与实践做出回答。

在此背景下，中国外语教材研究中心与外语教学与研究出版社策划了“外语教材研究丛书”。本套丛书一方面积极引进国外外语教材研究经典著作，一方面大力推出我国学者的原创性外语教材研究成果。在国内外语教材研究尚显薄弱的当下，我们首先精选引进了一批国外外语教材研究力作，包括：

- 《外语教材中的文化呈现》 (*Representations of the World in Language Textbooks*)
- 《英语教材研发：创新设计》 (*Creativity and Innovations in ELT Materials Development: Looking Beyond the Current Design*)
- 《英语教材研究：内容、使用与出版》 (*English Language Teaching*)

Textbooks: Content, Consumption, Production)

—《英语教材研究：国际视角》(*International Perspectives on Materials in ELT*)

—《英语教材与教师角色：理论与实践》(*Teaching Materials and the Roles of EFL/ESL Teachers: Practice and Theory*)

“它山之石，可以攻玉”，引进的目的在于批判性地借鉴和自主创新。期待本套丛书为中国外语教材研究提供理论启迪和实践指导，最终为中国特色外语教材的编写、使用和研究做出贡献。

孙有中

2021年1月30日于北外

Tables and Figures

Tables

2.1	Key dimensions of class (Block, 2012b: 194)	53
2.2	Textbook sample	55
2.3	Occurrences of working class representation	58
3.1	The number of readings and texts by edition and series in the study	84
3.2	Significance values for <i>Explicit</i> q-types in editions of <i>Headway</i>	91
3.3	Significance values for <i>HWay 2 Form</i> q-types	93
3.4	Significance values for <i>Lexical-Form</i> q-types in <i>E/File 1</i> and <i>2</i> , <i>I/Out 1</i> and <i>2</i> , and <i>C/Edge 2</i>	93
3.5	Significance values for <i>personal response – evaluation</i> q-types	95
3.6	Significance values for <i>E/File 1 + E/File 2 personal response</i> q-types compared to all other editions	96
3.7	Significance values <i>explicit, implicit, inferential comprehension, personal response</i> q-types <i>HWay 4</i>	99
4.1	Textbook information by inclusion of ESL, NRP components, spelling and assessment (N = 39)	121
4.2	Textbook information by inclusion of ESL, NRP components, spelling and assessment (N = 39)	131
4.3	Textbook information by number of five NRP components included (N = 35)	132
4.4	Average percentage of pages devoted to eight concepts by country and university (N = 39)	134
5.1	Informants' profiles	155
5.2	Teachers' use of the main components of a <i>Nursing 2</i> unit	160
7.1	Descriptive statistics for two-tail paired sample t-tests of Communicative English Program pre-test and post-tests from 2006 to 2011	227

9.1	Components of genre analysis addressed in <i>Write like a Chemist</i>	278
9.2	Common functions of different tense–voice combinations in journal article discussion sections	286
9.3	Common nominalizations used in chemistry writing	287
9.4	Common examples of the x of y by z pattern found in journal article titles	289
9.5	A sampling of textbook activities that center on organization and move structures (adapted from Robinson et al., 2008)	291

Figures

3.1	The taxonomy of comprehension questions	83
3.2	Occurrences and frequencies of comprehension questions: all editions of all series	87
3.3	The occurrence and frequency of Content, Language, and Affect question types in all series	88
3.4	Content question types by series: occurrence and frequency	89
3.5	Content questions. Change from edition to edition in <i>Headway</i> , <i>Cutting Edge</i> , <i>English File</i> , and <i>Inside Out</i>	90
3.6	Language question types in <i>Headway</i> , <i>Cutting Edge</i> , <i>English File</i> , and <i>Inside Out</i>	92
3.7	Language questions. Change from edition to edition in <i>Headway</i> , <i>Cutting Edge</i> , <i>English File</i> , and <i>Inside Out</i>	92
3.8	Affect question types in series of <i>Headway</i> , <i>Cutting Edge</i> , <i>English File</i> , and <i>Inside Out</i>	94
3.9	Affect question types in editions of <i>Headway</i> , <i>Cutting Edge</i> , <i>English File</i> , and <i>Inside Out</i>	95
3.10	Distribution of all eight comprehension question types in <i>Cutting Edge</i>	96
3.11	Distribution of all eight comprehension question types in <i>English File</i>	97
3.12	Distribution of all eight comprehension question types in <i>Headway</i>	98
3.13	Distribution of all eight comprehension question types in <i>Inside Out</i>	98
3.14	The range and repertoire of comprehension question types by series	100

3.15	A comparison of Pre-Teaching Vocabulary question types and <i>Lexical</i> question types in all editions	104
7.1	Three-week cycle implemented as a localized scaffold for <i>Interchange</i> (IC) and the <i>Interchange</i> video materials (IV). Copies of each cycle are provided as a PDF download for students and teachers	224
9.1	Milestones in the multiple-year <i>Write like a Chemist</i> textbook project	272
9.2	Overview of <i>Write like a Chemist: A Guide and Resource</i> (Robinson et al., 2008)	274
9.3	Schematic representation of the parallel processes that led to the successful completion of our textbook	282
9.4	The documents using ‘we’ at least once (relative to the number using ‘the’) over three time periods, determined using the ACS Journals Search. (Note: <i>Journal of Physical Chemistry</i> includes <i>Journal of Physical Chemistry A</i> and <i>B</i> after 1996)	288
9.5	A move structure depicting the organization of a typical experimental approach section in the project description part of a research proposal	290
11.1	Schematic outline of contents of Part II of <i>Motivating Learning</i>	333
11.2	Materials presentation template	333
11.3	Stages in the writing process	336
11.4	Sub- and micro-processes	337
11.5	Aim and activity fit	340
11.6	Initial design solutions	343
11.7	Writing the student materials	345
11.8	Refining the procedure	347
11.9	Complementary processes	351

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors and publishers acknowledge the following sources of copyright material and are grateful for the permissions granted.

Chapter 9:

Table 9.1. Components of genre analysis addressed in *Write like a Chemist*^a

^ap.7: Tabl. 1.1 from *Write like a Chemist: A Guide and Resource*, by Robinson, Stoller, Costanza-Robinson, and Jones (2008), by permission of Oxford University Press, US.

Table 9.2. Common functions of different tense–voice combinations in journal-article discussion sections^a

^ap.189: Tabl. 5.1 from *Write like a Chemist: A Guide and Resource*, by Robinson, Stoller, Costanza-Robinson, and Jones (2008), by permission of Oxford University Press, US.

Figure 9.4. The documents using ‘we’ at least once (relative to the number using ‘the’) over three time periods, determined using the ACS Journals Search. (Note: *Journal of Physical Chemistry* includes *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* and *B* after 1996)

p.149: Fig. 4.2 from *Write like a Chemist: A Guide and Resource*, by Robinson, Stoller, Costanza-Robinson, and Jones (2008), by permission of Oxford University Press, US.

Table 9.4. Common examples of the x of y by z pattern found in journal article titles

Adaptation of pp. 246–247: Tabl. 7.1 from *Write like a Chemist: A Guide and Resource*, by Robinson, Stoller, Costanza-Robinson, and Jones (2008), by permission of Oxford University Press, US.

Figure 9.5. A move structure depicting the organization of a typical experimental approach section in the project description part of a research proposal

p.437: Fig. 13.1 from *Write like a Chemist: A Guide and Resource*, by Robinson, Stoller, Costanza-Robinson, and Jones (2008), by permission of Oxford University Press, US.

Chapter 11:

Appendix A, Distraction Reduction, from *Motivating Learning*, Hadfield, J. and Dörnyei, Z. (2013), Pearson Education, ©2013.

Appendix B, Reality Check, from *Motivating Learning*, Hadfield, J. and Dörnyei, Z. (2013), Pearson Education, ©2013.

CONTRIBUTORS

Emily Binks-Cantrell is Clinical Assistant Professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture at Texas A&M University and teaches reading education courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. She is also Co-director of the Texas A&M University Reading Clinic and adviser to the Houston Branch International Dyslexia Association Brazos Valley Regional Group. Her research interests include teacher preparation and knowledge in research-based reading instruction. She has published in various journals, including *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *Annals of Dyslexia*, and *Journal of Learning Disabilities*.

David Block is Research Professor in Sociolinguistics for the Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats, working at the Universitat de Lleida (Spain). Over the past 25 years he has published articles and chapters on a variety of applied linguistics topics, including second language acquisition, globalization, multilingualism, and identity. His books include *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition* (2003), *Second Language Identities* (2007), and *Social Class in Applied Linguistics* (2014).

Renata Burgess-Brigham is a doctoral student and a graduate assistant in the College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University. Her research interests focus on the language and literacy development of Spanish speakers, dual language education, second language acquisition (SLA), and pre-service English language learner (ELL) teacher training. She has co-authored a systematic review on SLA, which has been published in the *Review of Educational Research*.

L. Quentin Dixon is Assistant Professor of English as a Second Language and Reading at Texas A&M University. Her research interests include the literacy development of ELLs in the US and internationally and the preparation of pre-service general education teachers to teach ELLs effectively. She has published

in many journals, including *Review of Educational Research*, *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *Applied Psycholinguistics*, and *System*.

Christine Feak is a lecturer at the English Language Institute, University of Michigan, where she is the lead lecturer for academic writing courses. She is a co-author of *Academic Writing for Graduate Students* and of the newly revised *English in Today's Research World* book series.

Diana Freeman is currently studying for a PhD at the University of Essex. Her doctoral thesis discusses the questions and tasks accompanying reading texts in global English as a Foreign Language (EFL) textbooks. Although her research work is chiefly in the area of language teaching materials, her broader research interests include the teaching and learning of vocabulary and grammar. She has taught BA and MA modules on Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), reading, and vocabulary; is interested in teacher training; and is an experienced teacher of English as a foreign or second language, having taught in the UK, Italy, and Egypt.

Fotini Grammatosi is an English language teacher and a PhD candidate at the University of Essex. She has taught general English and English for Academic Purposes and English for Specific Purposes (EAP/ESP) for several years in different contexts in Europe and Central Asia. Her research interests focus on the role of materials in teaching and learning, on teachers' evaluation criteria, and on the impact of various factors on teachers' approach to, and evaluation/use of, materials.

John Gray is Senior Lecturer in TESOL Education at the Institute of Education, University of London. He is the author of *The Construction of English: Culture, Consumerism and Promotion in the ELT Global Coursebook* (2010) and the co-author with David Block and Marnie Holborow of *Neoliberalism and Applied Linguistics* (2012).

Jill Hadfield has worked as a teacher trainer in Britain, France, China, Madagascar, and New Zealand and conducted short courses, seminars, and workshops for teachers in many other countries. She is currently Associate Professor in the Department of Language Studies at Unitec, New Zealand. She has written 30 books, including the *Communication Games* series, the *Oxford*

Basics series, *Classroom Dynamics* and *An Introduction to Teaching English*. Her latest book, *Motivating Learning*, co-authored with Zoltan Dörnyei, was published this year.

Gregory Hadley received his PhD from the University of Birmingham (UK), with a focus in the Sociology of English Language Teaching (ELT) Management. He has taught in Japanese higher education for over 20 years. Currently he is a visiting fellow at the University of Oxford.

Nigel Harwood is a senior lecturer in the Department of Language and Linguistics at the University of Essex, where he teaches modules relating to materials and textbook design, English for specific and academic purposes, genre analysis, and teaching/researching second language writing. He edited an earlier volume on materials, *English Language Teaching Materials: Theory and Practice*, and has published articles in various journals, including *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *Written Communication*, *Journal of Pragmatics*, and *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. He is the co-editor of *English for Specific Purposes*.

R. Malatesha (Malt) Joshi is Professor of Reading/Language Arts Education, ESL and Educational Psychology at Texas A&M University, where he teaches and conducts research in literacy development and literacy problems among monolinguals and bilinguals. Dr Joshi is the founding editor of *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal* as well as the monograph series titled *Literacy Studies: Perspectives from Cognitive Neurosciences, Linguistics, Psychology and Education*.

Ahlam Menkabu is a PhD student in the Department of Language and Linguistics at the University of Essex. Her research is about how first and second language (L1 and L2) student writers use language to present themselves, express their opinions, and engage with readers in their writing. She is also a lecturer at Taif University, Saudi Arabia. She previously taught ESP for five years at the Health College in Taif.

Marin S. Robinson is Professor and Chair of Chemistry and Biochemistry at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, Arizona. She teaches organic chemistry and a junior-level scientific writing course. Her research interests

include chemistry-specific writing and atmospheric chemistry. She has published in various journals, including *English for Specific Purposes*, *Atmospheric Environment*, and the *Journal of Chemical Education*.

Fredricka L. Stoller is Professor of English at Northern Arizona University, where she teaches in the MA in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) and PhD in Applied Linguistics programmes. She is a co-author of *Write like a Chemist* (2008). Other publications on disciplinary writing include those appearing in *English for Specific Purposes*, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *Journal of Chemical Education*, and *English Teaching Forum*. Her professional interests include disciplinary writing, second language reading, project-based learning, and teacher training.

John M. Swales is Professor Emeritus of Linguistics at the University of Michigan, where he was also Director of the English Language Institute from 1985 to 2001. He is on several editorial boards and he was faculty adviser for the MICASE and MICUSP Corpus projects. His latest booklength publication is the third edition of *Academic Writing for Graduate Students* (2012), co-authored with Christine B. Feak.

Ivor Timmis is Reader in English Language Teaching at Leeds Metropolitan University. He has been involved in materials writing projects for Singapore, Ethiopia, and China and is an active member of the Materials Development Association (MATSDA). His other research interests include spoken corpus analysis and the relationship between corpus linguistics and ELT. He has published on these topics in *Applied Linguistics* and *ELT Journal*.

Erin Washburn teaches courses in literacy education at Binghamton University. She has conducted research on the effectiveness of reading and writing interventions and literacy teacher knowledge and preparation. Her research has been published in *Annals of Dyslexia*, *Scientific Study of Reading*, *Dyslexia*, and *The Reading Teacher*.

Shuang Wu is a PhD student in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture at Texas A&M University, specializing in English as a Second Language. Her research interests lie in bi-literacy and ESL/EFL writing. She has co-authored works that have been published in the *Review of Educational Research* and *Early Childhood Education Journal*.

1 Content, Consumption, and Production: Three Levels of Textbook Research

Nigel Harwood

Introduction: The importance of textbook research

Like my previous edited volume (Harwood, 2010a), this book is intended for teachers, teacher trainers, researchers, publishers, and materials writers who work with English Language Teaching (ELT) textbooks. The remit of the earlier book was wider, focusing on teaching materials in general rather than textbooks in particular, and so many of the chapters in the previous volume described unpublished teaching activities produced by the authors themselves. For the present purposes, in contrast, the focus is squarely on published ELT textbooks (also known as coursebooks) and, where relevant, the aids that accompany them (such as teachers' guides, workbooks, listening exercises, etc.). More specifically, much of the focus is on 'global' textbooks, normally published in the West and marketed worldwide, such as well-known series like *Headway*, *Interchange*, and *Cutting Edge*. While it is important to analyse unpublished, teacher-/researcher-produced materials, since no textbook can ever completely meet the needs of a class and, institutional and other factors permitting, teachers will wish to supplement their textbooks with other materials to cater to their learners' needs, it is also essential to focus on the published textbooks, because most teachers are required to use them to some degree. An oft-cited statistic is Tyson and Woodward's (1989) claim that textbooks structure up to 90 percent of what goes on in school classrooms in the US. Whatever the figure in English as a Foreign Language/English as a Second Language (EFL/ESL) contexts, textbooks are similarly important: indeed, in many contexts, textbooks constitute the syllabus, teachers being expected to follow them more or less faithfully, with end-of-course exams being based exclusively on textbook content. Furthermore, existing textbook research has been criticized by various researchers for its lack of theoretical and methodological rigour (e.g., Harwood, 2010b; Tomlinson, 2012), and there

is thus a need to extend and strengthen the research base in this area.

I argue it is important to study textbooks at three different levels – the levels of *content*, *consumption*, and *production* – drawing on du Gay, Hall, Janes, Mackay, and Negus (1997), and Gray (2010b) in differentiating thus. At the level of *content*, we can investigate what textbooks include and exclude in terms of topic, linguistic information, pedagogy, and culture. Unlike studies of content, which analyse textbooks outside the classroom context, at the level of *consumption* we can examine how teachers and learners use textbooks. Finally, at the level of *production*, we can investigate the processes by which textbooks are shaped, authored, and distributed, looking at textbook writers’ design processes, the affordances and constraints placed upon them by publishers, and the norms and values of the textbook industry as a whole.

Each of these dimensions is covered in a survey of the field below. I draw on research in ELT, but, as in my previous survey (Harwood, 2010b), I argue that textbook research is more developed, rigorous, and sophisticated in mainstream education (i.e., non-ELT fields, such as mathematics), particularly regarding textbook consumption, and that we have much to learn from the work in this area. I therefore include in the discussion below work from mainstream education with which readers may be less familiar. The present survey is intended to complement my earlier piece, and so I focus for the most part here on literature I did not discuss previously.

Textbook content

The obvious way for teachers and researchers to begin an investigation into a textbook is to determine and evaluate the subject matter which is included – and omitted. Researchers may prefer to focus on one particular content-related aspect of the textbook (such as treatment of a specific grammar point) or attempt an overall analysis and evaluation using a framework such as Littlejohn’s (2011). Below I have organized my review of content analyses around the headings of language, culture, and pragmatics.

Content analyses of language

Numerous studies evaluate the linguistic syllabus of textbooks by assessing the closeness of fit (or more commonly, lack of fit) between textbook language and the language of real life, as attested by corpora (e.g., Biber and Reppen, 2002; Conrad, 2004; Holmes, 1988; Lee, 2006; Miller, 2011;

Mukundan and Khojasteh, 2011; Römer, 2005). One such study by Rühlemann (2009) analysed the treatment of reported speech in seven intermediate-level textbooks compared with British National Corpus (BNC) data, finding that a number of the most frequently used reporting verbs in real-life data were omitted from some of the textbooks, and that those verbs which were included differed widely between the books, suggesting that corpus information on frequency was not used by the writers when deciding what to include in their syllabus.

The textbook vocabulary syllabus has also been found wanting. Koprowski (2005) compared three textbooks' treatment of lexical bundles in terms of frequency and range with data in the COBUILD Corpus, finding that more than 14 percent (118) of the 822 bundles in the textbooks were absent from the corpus. Furthermore, not one bundle featured in all three textbooks. Gouverneur's (2008) results were similar: analysing the phraseological treatment of the high-frequency verbs *make* and *take* in three intermediate and advanced textbooks, she found the books covered a varied selection of lexical phrases, with only 7 percent and 15 percent of *make* patterns appearing in all three advanced and intermediate textbooks respectively, and with not a single *take* collocation appearing in all advanced books. Findings such as these cause Gouverneur and Koprowski to question the criteria the textbook writers used to compile their vocabulary syllabuses. Koprowski argues that, although it may be an onerous task for the textbook writer to *begin* the development of lexical phrase textbook materials by consulting corpora, it should not be too much to expect textbook writers to *check* the frequency and range of the lexical phrases they are teaching when the materials are in draft form, refining their choice based on corpus evidence.

Other studies finding patchy treatment of vocabulary include Brown (2011). Whereas Nation (2001) describes nine different aspects of word knowledge, Brown found that 'only three aspects consistently receive attention' (p.88) in the textbook sample examined. Similarly, the textbook in focus in Criado (2009) was judged unsatisfactory in terms of the items included, with many of the most frequent words in English being absent, in terms of the frequency with which words are recycled, being too low to suggest acquisition would be likely, and in terms of the amount of words it is assumed students will learn as they progress through the book, which is far higher than research predicts. For their part, Matsuoka and Hirsh (2010) found 'few opportunities' to acquire vocabulary knowledge beyond the 2,000-

word range in a best-selling textbook because of a lack of recycling (p.67); and Miller's (2011) recent study of advanced-level, academically focused ESL reading textbooks concluded that the books' vocabulary content was wanting.

An example of a content analysis focusing on a specific linguistic item is Lam's (2009) comparison of 15 textbooks' treatment of the discourse marker *well* with the use of *well* in a spoken corpus. Quantitative comparison revealed 'major discrepancies' (p.275) between textbook and corpus frequencies. And while *well* commonly occurs in either utterance-initial or medial position in the corpus, the textbooks give the impression that it occurs almost exclusively in utterance-initial position. Information is lacking in the textbooks about the various discourse functions of *well*, as are substantial, context-embedded examples.

An under-researched aspect of textbook content is pronunciation (but see Jones, 1997; Levis, 1999). Kopperoinen (2011) is a recent analysis of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) pronunciation in two best-selling Finnish textbook series. Kopperoinen studied all recordings and listening exercises, finding that outer/expanding circle accents accounted for between only 1–3 percent of accents. In commenting on these results, Kopperoinen quotes Seidlhofer (2003:13), arguing that the outer/expanding circle speakers currently play a role of 'exotic optional extras' in the materials (p.84), despite the fact that most communication in English now takes place between second language (L2) speakers.

Content analyses of culture¹

There have been calls for textbook evaluation checklists to make cultural concerns more prominent (Cortazzi and Jin, 1999; Feng and Byram, 2002; Kullman, 2003): as the number of culturally focused content analyses has grown, these analyses have criticized global textbooks for cultural inappropriacy, or at least inappropriacy when the materials are used in certain contexts (e.g., Canagarajah, 1993a, 1993b; Sokolik, 2007; Suaysuwan and Kapitzke, 2005; Yuen, 2011). For instance, 'buying by credit card, ordering meals for delivery, and finding out snow conditions for skiing' are seen by Auerbach and Burgess (1985: 479) as inappropriate lifestyle-related content in textbooks used by immigrants to the US and Canada. Auerbach and Burgess also point to what is absent, with no mention of typical issues likely to be experienced by immigrants, such as communication problems and difficulties in finding employment, tying in with Gulliver's (2010) analysis of textbook

accounts of Canadian immigrants' lives, which found the risk of failure is underplayed.

Focusing specifically on grammar textbooks, Sokolik (2007) concludes that these are helping to transmit, and tacitly approve, a culture of consumerism, as evidenced by example sentences from the books such as the following:

They go to Florida every summer. My watch is new.

Maria wears a lot of jewelry.

I shelled out a lot of money on the diamond engagement ring that I bought for her.

I bought a new car last month.

She's thinking about buying a new house.

And Boriboon (2004) points out that the provincial Thai learners he works with have very different social and cultural lifeworlds from those contemporary textbook characters cited by Sokolik, arguing that this may adversely affect the learners' motivation and willingness to communicate. Boriboon illustrates his argument by taking a sample communicative activity from *New Headway Intermediate* (Soars and Soars, 1996: 45) which focuses on shopping and has the learners buy petrol, pay an electricity bill, and collect plane tickets, none of which his learners are likely to have experienced.

Two particularly detailed studies of global textbook cultural content are a PhD thesis by Kullman (2003) and a book by Gray (2010b). Focusing on 12 UK-published global textbooks written in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s and featuring interviews with eight British textbook writers (although not the authors of the textbooks analysed), Kullman found textbooks have become more 'international' in flavour, featuring characters and settings outside the UK. Rather than focus on other people's lives, more recent books ask learners to talk about themselves, the tenor having shifted from the more 'educational' and 'serious' towards the more consumerist, emotional, and aspirational. Kullman also argues that some contemporary textbook topics will likely prove culturally inappropriate in certain contexts, singling out the treatment of 'assertiveness' in one book, which seemingly gives a straightforward message to learners that assertiveness is a useful attribute.

Examining four recent and not so recent best-selling intermediate-level textbooks, Gray (2010b) studies how textbooks have evolved in the cultural messages they transmit. He shows how the range of accents learners are exposed to moves away from mainly received pronunciation (RP) or modified

RP in the older material to a more diverse range in the newer textbooks to include non-UK inner and outer/expanding circle speakers, and how all four textbooks tend to associate regional accents with characters in lower-status employment. With regards to the depiction of race and ethnicity, Gray finds a gradual progression towards multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism. He also notes the spectacular success of the fictional characters that learners encounter in the newer materials – characters who supposedly juggle jobs such as UN ambassador, film star, and best-selling author. Gray claims the discourse is consumerist and aspirational: characters are defined by freely available choices, and succeed in their choices apparently unproblematically. In subsequent research, Gray (2010a) analysed representations of the world of work, again finding that discourses of aspiration, success, and individual choice pervade the materials. Finally, Gray (2012) showed that the theme of celebrity was absent from materials until the late 1970s, since when it has become more and more apparent. The focus has shifted from an emphasis on celebrities' achievements to their wealth, and the textbook activities in Gray's dataset apparently hold up these celebrities for learners' approval.

Gender and sexist bias have been studied extensively in ELT textbooks (e.g., Carroll and Kowitz, 1994; Jones, Kiteu, and Sunderland, 1997; Matsuno, 2002; McGrath, 2004; Ndura, 2004; Sherman, 2010; Sunderland, 2000). Sunderland (2000) and Matsuno (2002) specify how and where sexist content may occur, Matsuno's classification being as follows: (i) in the omission or under-representation of females; (ii) in the depiction of females' occupations; (iii) in stereotypical gender identities; and (iv) in sexist language items (*chairman*, *houseman*, etc.) (pp.84–85). Sunderland suggests that there are fewer content analyses of gender nowadays, perhaps because bias is less evident in contemporary materials, and Gray's (2010b) study of textbooks' treatment of gender supports Sunderland's claims: in the older materials, men have a greater presence in the artwork and the listening tapescripts as well as in the textbook readings and practice dialogues. Women occupy subordinate positions, and are sometimes depicted as dependent on men and incapable of making decisions alone. In contrast, Gray finds the recent textbooks portray men and women more equally. Nonetheless, in their analysis of six textbooks, Carroll and Kowitz (1994) found that 'the most important adjectives used to describe women are *busy*, *beautiful*, *pretty* and *tall*' and that women are associated with 'passivity, physical characteristics, menial roles, irrational worries, [and] constant undemanding activities' (pp.79, 82). Other accounts of

locally produced textbooks which have identified gender bias include Matsuno (2002), Sherman (2010), and McGrath (2004), who reports on a large study of 289 textbooks conducted in Hong Kong SAR, P.R. China, where 71 percent of some 32,000 gender-specific references were to males, and where women were sometimes stereotyped as weak and emotional.

When it comes to cultural representations in textbooks, however, McGrath (2004) raises the difficult issue of how 'real' textbook writers' portrayals should be: 'Is it the role of textbooks simply to reflect reality or to change it for (what we think of as) the better?' (p.357). And, as we shall see below, when we focus on studies of textbook production, these choices are not always in the writers' hands: publishers avoid including materials which may provoke controversy since this can impact upon sales figures or even result in a textbook being excluded from a state-approved list. In the end, though, however well intentioned or politically correct the message of the textbook content, there is no guarantee this message will be taken up: as Gray (2010b) puts it, teachers and students may 'read against' or resist the intended meaning or message of the textbook (p.26).

Content analyses of pragmatics

Attention to the pragmatics of English should not be regarded as an optional extra in a textbook syllabus, since pragmatic norms in one language or culture do not always transfer straightforwardly to the target language:

What is considered in one culture to be a normal amount of complimenting may seem excessive in another. What may be viewed as accepted topics of phatic communion (i.e., small talk) in one culture may be perceived negatively in another.

(Meier, 1997: 24)

The potential dangers of miscommunication because of pragmatic failure (see Thomas, 1983) are very real, then. However, some studies of textbooks' handling of pragmatics conclude that treatment is 'arbitrary' and 'oversimplistic' (Meier, 1997: 24; see also Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, and Reynolds, 1991; Boxer and Pickering, 1995; Lee and Park, 2008; Millard, 2000; Nguyen, 2011; Wong, 2002), and that acquisition of pragmatic competence is 'highly unlikely' (Vellenga, 2004: 1) on the basis of the inadequate information textbooks provide. One of the problems researchers find with textbooks' treatment of pragmatics is that learners are often presented

with insufficient context when the target language is introduced; hence it is difficult to appreciate how factors such as the relationship between speakers in a dialogue would influence what interlocutors say. Another problem concerns the choice of speech acts focused on: these can appear idiosyncratic, with two of the textbooks in Vellenga's (2004) study teaching learners how to threaten, for instance, but not how to apologize. And a highly restricted set of linguistic items may be associated with a given speech act: in the same study by Vellenga, the only means of expressing making suggestions and giving advice is *should*. Vellenga's study is particularly noteworthy in that it includes an examination of both teachers' and students' versions of the materials, with the teachers' material also found wanting, containing 'no metapragmatic information or extensions beyond what was provided in the textbook' (p.14).

Nguyen's (2011) study of the presentation of speech acts in EFL textbooks produced in Vietnam identifies problems with the type of language presented and how it is taught. The books teach bald on record language of disagreement (*I completely disagree; That's wrong*, etc.: see Brown and Levinson 1987), which corpora suggest speakers largely avoid. It is therefore possible that

textbooks might mislead learners to falsely believe that English NSs [native speakers] tend to disagree more frequently and more directly than is the case, and that it is appropriate to use these unmitigated forms to express oppositional ideas, which might consequently cause learners to be perceived as impolite. (p.24)

Furthermore, while learners are taught constructions giving and receiving compliments, Nguyen points out that in Vietnamese speakers may be less likely to accept compliments than in Western contexts, and that therefore a useful textbook activity would have been to have the learners compare and contrast speech acts and responses across cultures. However, such activities are lacking.

Content analyses of pragmatic information in business English textbooks find similar deficiencies to those identified above. For instance, Handford (2010) notes that the best-selling business textbooks he analysed featured expressions such as *I disagree with you*, but that this expression was entirely absent from his 900,000-word corpus of business meetings (see also Angouri, 2010, for similar findings with regard to business meetings). It is not that disagreement is absent from the meetings; rather, disagreements are prefaced or hedged in the authentic data. As Handford notes, this mismatch is no trivial

matter, as *I disagree with you* and some of the other expressions taught by the textbooks are ‘potentially highly face-threatening in many situations’, and ‘learners are in danger of acquiring linguistic behaviour that may be highly detrimental to their professional career’ (pp.251–252). Similar corpus–textbook mismatches are described in a series of studies by Cheng and co-researchers, focusing on: opinion language (Cheng and Warren, 2006); language to disagree or check understanding (Cheng and Warren, 2005, 2007); language to interrupt a speaker (Cheng, 2007); and language to repair an utterance (Cheng and Cheng, 2010). Despite these gloomy findings, it is noteworthy that Handford and colleagues have now authored business English textbooks which are informed by corpus data and feature authentic readings and listenings (see Handford, 2012).

Other content analyses

Teachers’ guides

Very little research has been done on ELT teachers’ guides, and Coleman (1986) describes a teacher guide evaluation instrument, as well as providing analysis of extracts from a selection of guides. Coleman asks whether the pedagogical approach the guide claims to follow is ever properly explained. The framework also evaluates the extent to which teachers are assisted with what may be unfamiliar cultural elements in the materials, the demands the guide places on the teacher to supplement the textbook and to test learners’ progress, and its overall clarity and organization. Coleman concludes that, on the basis of the samples evaluated, ‘many [guides] appear to be little more than incidental afterthoughts [...], that far less care seems to have gone into their creation than into the materials for learners’ (p.31), and that there is a danger that poorly written guides will lead to poor textbook use. The few more recent pieces focusing on teachers’ guides are equally critical. Mol and Tin (2008), for instance, complain that one of the weaknesses of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) textbooks is that they ‘focus on *what* to teach rather than *how* to teach’ (p.88), and they suggest that information about research findings on second language acquisition, motivation, and other aspects of language learning could be usefully added to the guides to empower teachers. Interestingly, evaluations of teachers’ guides in mainstream education are no more favourable (e.g., Manouchehri and Goodman, 1998; Nicol and Crespo, 2006): for instance, Nicol and Crespo (2006) found that guides need to provide better support for inexperienced teachers as far as both subject knowledge and

pedagogical knowledge are concerned, with textbook writers explaining how the materials could be used in various situations and with different learners.

Limitations of content analysis

I end this section by describing some problems associated with textbook content studies. Some of these problems reveal the need for more rigorous research designs, and others the need for complementary research approaches.

In my earlier survey chapter (Harwood, 2010b) I criticized the sketchiness of the methodological procedures included in many content analyses; accounts such as those by Canagarajah (1993a, 1993b) contain few or no details of coding procedures or reliability checks, leaving open the possibility that they fail to represent fairly the overall content and messages of the textbooks. An example of content analysis which reports its methodological procedures carefully is Matsuda (2002), but such accounts, in the field of ELT at least, are currently the exception rather than the rule. (In mainstream education the standards appear to be higher, at least in the leading journals.)

Content analyses also lack data from (i) textbook creators (writers and publishers) and (ii) users (teachers and learners). Although content analysis is excellent at determining *what* is present or absent in textbooks, it is much less good at determining *why* this content looks the way it does: it is to publishers and writers that we must turn for answers to this question. And content analysis does not tell us what the teacher *intended* by their textbook use and what the teacher *enacted*: that is, *how* the textbook is used and the anticipated and actual effects in the classroom on teacher and learners – information we can gather only by extending our analysis to include textbook users.

To clarify my arguments, I briefly return to the content analyses of gender reviewed above. Sunderland (2000) rightly points out that simply examining a textbook page cannot accurately predict its effects:

Even an agreed case of gender bias in a text [...] cannot be said in any deterministic way to *make* people think in a gender-biased way [...] A text is arguably as good or as bad as the treatment it receives from the teacher who is using it; in particular, a text riddled with gender bias can be rescued and that bias put to good effect, pedagogic and otherwise.

(pp.153, 155)

However misleading or inappropriate the content of a textbook may be, there is no guarantee that the teacher will exploit it as specified by the

teacher's guide: textbooks are interactive artefacts and can be exploited in any number of ways. Neither can we predict how the materials will be received by learners. Thus Littlejohn (2011) usefully distinguishes between *materials as they are* and *materials-in-action*, the former being the materials at the level of the textbook page, 'with the content and ways of working that they propose', and the latter being '[p]recisely what happens in classrooms and what outcomes occur when materials are brought into use' (p.181; see also Tomlinson, 2003, for a similar distinction). Hence the need to consider users' attitudes and how the textbook is used *in situ*, addressed when we turn to studies of textbook consumption.

Textbook consumption

There are relatively few studies exploring how ELT teachers and students use textbooks inside and outside the classroom, a gap which has been recognized by well-known figures in the field (e.g., Tomlinson and Masuhara, 2010; Tomlinson, 2011, 2012). I therefore draw on high-quality work in mainstream education to complement the discussion of ELT-related research.

Mainstream education researchers have long acknowledged the importance of studying textbook consumption, recognizing that varying patterns of textbook usage are possible. Hence in their seminal article Ball and Cohen (1996) speak of 'a gap between [textbook] developers' intentions for students and what actually happens in lessons. Developers' designs [...] turn out to be ingredients in – not determinants of – the actual curriculum' (p.6). So, although many understand a curriculum to mean the contents of a policy document or textbook (the *intended* curriculum), it is the study of the *enacted* curriculum, 'jointly constructed by teachers, students, and materials in particular contexts' (p.7), which can enable a deeper understanding and evaluation of textbooks.

Another mainstream education researcher who theorizes about textbook use is Brown (2009), drawing parallels between teaching and music: like jazz musicians improvising from a musical score, two teachers may shape the same set of materials differently, and no two renditions (of the music or the materials) will be the same. For Brown, then, teachers are designers who craft textbook content to best meet their needs – like musicians, 'practitioners practice and plan according to instructions [...], but they also adapt and improvise in response to local factors and creative ability' (p.22). It is therefore important to understand 'how teachers' skills, knowledge, and beliefs'

influence their textbook use (p.22). There are various theoretical frameworks in mainstream education that attempt this, some of which will be described later, but at this point I turn to ELT contributions in the area.

Eunice Hutchinson's study (1996) is an important ELT textbook consumption study, although, because it is in the form of an unpublished doctoral thesis, it is not especially well known. Hutchinson explores textbook use on an EAP course in a Philippines fisheries college, particularly that of two teachers, Nancy and Marcia, who were observed repeatedly over a semester, interviewed, and an analysis conducted of the materials they used. Although Nancy had seven years' teaching experience, most of this was teaching undergraduate psychology; she had never taught English for Fisheries Technology before, and her ELT training was 'very meagre' (p.186). Unsurprisingly then, Nancy stuck closely to the textbook – nearly all textbook activities in the units Hutchinson observed were used, and Nancy never reordered them. Nancy did not supplement her textbook with any other materials, and appeared to choose modules from the book to teach which contained 'relatively easy subject matter that she felt she could manage' in terms of content (p.192). Hence a lack of content knowledge emerged as a factor in accounting for Nancy's patterns of textbook use. In contrast, Marcia had 17 years' experience and was much better qualified, holding a master's in ESL. She also had some background knowledge of fisheries technology. This greater content and pedagogical knowledge led to a more assured handling of the textbook: Marcia used the textbook more flexibly than Nancy, adapting the textbook to meet the learners' needs. Hutchinson (1996: 47–48, 99–100) shows that variation in textbook use is likely down to a number of factors: (i) the textbook (its content); (ii) the teacher (e.g., beliefs, training, pedagogical and content knowledge, experience, preferred teaching style, perception and evaluation of the textbook, attitude towards top-down mandates (e.g., school/state syllabus, directives from school principal)); (iii) the learners (e.g., level, aptitude, previous learning experiences, preferred learning styles); (iv) the classroom (e.g., physical layout); and (v) the school (e.g., timetable constraints, principal's attitudes towards textbook use and to EFL as a subject). There are more complex frameworks in the mainstream education literature accounting for teacher–textbook interaction (e.g., Remillard, 1999, 2005), but Hutchinson's succeeds in capturing the context-bound, mediated nature of textbook use.

Shawer (2010a, 2010b; Shawer, Gilmore, and Banks-Joseph, 2009)

studied the textbook use of ten EFL teachers, using repeating observation and pre-/post-lesson interview cycles, categorizing participants into three groups:

- (i) *curriculum-makers* rarely if ever used a textbook, creating their own materials in response to an initial needs analysis. Although much of the subject matter taught did not appear in the textbook, sometimes the book and its table of contents were used as inspiration for creating these materials. The teachers' guide was never consulted.
- (ii) *curriculum-developers* freely adapted their textbook to best suit their learners, creating materials if they felt the textbook fell short, albeit not on the scale of the curriculum-makers. The teachers' guide was seldom or never used.
- (iii) *curriculum-transmitters* strictly adhered to their textbook, proceeding exercise by exercise, page by page, rarely if ever changing the task order. The teachers' guide was consulted regularly.

Interestingly, Shaver found the freedom or otherwise that the teachers' schools afforded teachers regarding (non-)textbook use did not predict which category teachers belonged to: in other words, teachers who were curriculum-transmitters worked at the same schools as makers or developers. Similarly, all of Shaver's teachers were experienced, and so neither was an experienced/inexperienced descriptor predictive. Hence Shaver's work indicated that the impact of context and teaching experience on textbook use is not straightforward.

Shaver (2010a) also studied the link between textbook use and professional development. Teachers who adapted or created their own materials reportedly acquired a range of new pedagogical skills. For instance, because they sought to improve their textbook's treatment of grammar, the curriculum-makers and developers claimed they expanded their content knowledge:

Where I don't like what's in the textbook, [say] a grammatical point, I go and look elsewhere [...] and that's developing my own understanding. (p.607)

These teachers were also said to have improved their adaptation, content-sequencing, and materials evaluation skills, together with the ability to conduct needs analyses, as they strove to tailor materials for their learners. In sum, then, Shaver (2010a) claims that curriculum-makers and developers enhanced their subject knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and curricular content

knowledge, but that curriculum-transmitters made little if any progress.

Wette (2009, 2010, 2011) investigates how highly qualified, experienced ESL teachers shape their curriculum in general and textbook materials in particular, focusing on planning and organizing behaviours. Teachers' contextual conditions varied from high-constraint environments, such as intensive exam preparation classes, to low-constraint environments, in which no external syllabus or testing impinged on teachers' choice and use of materials. Wette found that teachers only planned at a 'modest, informal and tentative' level (2009: 348), since they also assessed how materials were received by the learners and responded accordingly. Hence plans were often changed during the lesson – various types of adaptations, additions, and deletions were made to the materials – and longer-term plans were modified in the light of learners' responses as the course progressed. However, in the high-constraint contexts this was problematic because of time pressures: exams loomed, and the syllabus needed covering. In sum, then, like Brown (2009), Wette finds teaching to be an essentially improvised activity, with context, syllabus, and learners exercising a profound effect on how materials are used.

Surveying 100 EFL teachers in Indonesia, Zacharias (2005) canvassed views of global and locally produced textbooks, the vast majority of teachers being L2 speakers. Global rather than local textbooks were favoured for teaching grammar and the skills, particularly with regard to listening and pronunciation: global textbooks were felt to consist of 'natural', 'authentic', and error-free language, to provide accurate cultural information, and to be of superior quality in terms of content and production to local equivalents, which were viewed with 'a general attitude of distrust' (pp.29–30). However, not all teachers found global textbooks easy to work with: some complained the material was too advanced for learners and difficult to understand in terms of cultural content (for both teachers and learners). Nonetheless, despite these difficulties, the overall preference was for global textbooks, despite the fact that for certain parts of the syllabus (e.g., reading) teachers felt local materials would be more likely to focus on content relevant to learners' lives.

Gray (2010b) interviewed experienced EFL teachers working in Barcelona about textbook cultural content. Overtly British subject matter in the textbooks was viewed 'with considerable reservation' (p.146), perceived as irrelevant for students learning English as a lingua franca rather than in order to move to the UK. Textbook content which stereotyped attracted censure: for instance, one teacher objected to a listening about women being bad

drivers because she felt by doing the activity she was giving these views her tacit seal of approval. However, other data revealed how culturally focused material may vary in relevance depending on the teaching context: one teacher explained how a listening about a group of women car mechanics made for a ‘fantastically successful lesson in Cairo’ but had ‘died a thousand deaths’ in Barcelona because Catalans found the idea of female mechanics unremarkable (p.152). And while the teachers were generally critical of the consumerist, aspirational tenor of contemporary materials, some of them conceded it was often successful in the classroom, inasmuch as it generated discussion. It would thus seem a formidable task to produce textbooks that satisfy most of the teachers – and learners – most of the time. I now turn briefly to selected textbook consumption studies in mainstream education which feature rigorous, triangulated research designs and sizeable datasets. For instance, Drake and Sherin’s (2009) study of textbook use was conducted over two years, with each teacher observed and then interviewed 15–30 times. Other projects, such as Collopy (2003), also feature large datasets, inter-rater reliability tests, and member-checking. Studies such as these are on a scale and of a quality not seen in ELT, and we have much to learn from them.

Mainstream educators have compared textbook use among beginning and trainee teachers (e.g., Behm and Lloyd, 2009), novice and experts’ planned/actual use of textbooks (Borko and Livingston, 1989), and the development over time of trainee/inexperienced teachers’ use of/beliefs about the textbook (e.g., Grossman and Thompson, 2008; Nicol and Crespo, 2006). An interesting line of research is the effect of innovative or ‘educative’ teaching materials – those materials designed to support and develop teacher learning at the content and the pedagogical level (e.g., Collopy, 2003; Grossman and Thompson, 2008; Manouchehri and Goodman, 1998; Remillard, 2000; Remillard and Bryans, 2004; and see Davis and Krajcik, 2005, for more on educative materials). For instance, Collopy (2003) shows that innovative textbooks do not necessarily help develop teachers: only one of her two highly experienced teachers changed their pedagogical approach as a result of using an educative textbook. The other teacher initially attempted to bend the textbook to her will (and make it suit her traditional pedagogy), before abandoning it altogether. Manouchehri and Goodman (1998) demonstrate the influence of context when assessing the impact of innovative textbooks: they show how teachers were more likely to persevere with the books in schools where there was mentoring and a supportive attitude towards innovation among colleagues.

And Smagorinsky and colleagues (e.g., Smagorinsky, Lakly, and Johnson, 2002; Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, and Fry, 2004) chart teacher *accommodation*, *acquiescence*, and *resistance* towards mandated materials and curricula.

I close this brief review of mainstream education consumption studies with work featuring imaginative data collection methods. Chval, Chávez, Reys, and Tarr (2009) point out that one of the most common methods associated with studies of textbook use – classroom observations – is expensive and difficult to implement on a large scale. Thus for their study of 70 teachers and 4,000 students in 11 schools, teachers used diaries to record what resources were used and how, while Davis, Beyer, Forbes, and Stevens (2011) had teachers write reflective narratives to explain textbook adaptations. Finally, Ziebarth, Hart, Marcus, Ritsema, Schoen, and Walker's (2009) fascinating five-year study examined how textbook writers and teachers using the writers' pilot materials interacted and how and why the materials changed as a result. Sometimes, in the light of teachers' uses and evaluations of the activities, the textbook writers revised the materials in line with teachers' wishes (e.g., to include more coverage of topics which featured in state examinations), but at other times writers' revisions were slight or nonexistent, as the teachers' proposals did not align with the writers' aims and pedagogy. The study illustrates how textbook writers must satisfy as best they can the needs and wishes of their readership without abandoning their principles, a theme continued in the studies of textbook production below.

Consumption of teachers' guides

Bonkowski (1995, cited in Hutchinson, 1996) is a rare study of the use of ESL teachers' guides. Focusing on three experienced teachers, Bonkowski found teachers' use of textbooks and guides varied, with several factors apparently accounting for this variation: teacher-related factors, such as the differences in teaching styles and pedagogical beliefs; textbook-related factors, such as the nature of the materials being used; and context-related factors, such as teachers' beliefs about the learners and their interests, and the time of day the class took place. The most experienced teacher in the study used the textbook the least, and all three teachers adapted and reinterpreted the teaching suggestions in the textbook guides. Again we see teachers shaping textbooks in response to their own beliefs, and to the micro- and macro-environment.

Bonkowski apart, we must once more look to mainstream education for consumption research on teachers' guides, particularly to Remillard's studies (Remillard, 1999; Remillard and Bryans, 2004), where we find some teachers following the guide closely to enhance their content and pedagogical knowledge, while others skip over or ignore the guide completely (see also Behm and Lloyd, 2009). The latter behaviour is sometimes associated with inexperienced teachers who adhere closely to the materials in the students' version of the textbook, believing it is enough simply to cover the material without considering how it would be most effectively exploited with their learners, or is associated with experienced teachers who already possess pedagogical routines and repertoires and apparently feel no need to question or add to them (see Collopy, 2003). These teachers' pedagogies and philosophies therefore remain intact and unchallenged however innovative the guides may be, since the advice therein is resisted or ignored (Remillard and Bryans, 2004).

Learners' textbook consumption

It is striking that most textbook consumption studies focus on teachers, with little or no attention paid to the use of materials by learners. This is regrettable because students are the largest group of textbook users, and their views on and use of the textbook will play a major part in determining its success or otherwise.

Peacock has published several studies on how learners consume materials. For instance, Peacock (1997) investigated learners' views on authentic and inauthentic materials, pointing out that it is sometimes assumed that the former better motivate learners, despite a lack of proper testing of this assumption. Peacock's study involved South Korean EFL beginners over seven weeks and 20 lessons, using authentic materials one day and inauthentic materials the next to supplement learners' routine textbook-based work. As the study progressed, learners' motivation and time on-task increased when using authentic materials, suggesting that learners unaccustomed to using authentic materials take time to adjust. Surprisingly, learners also judged the authentic materials to be less interesting than their artificial counterparts. So while Peacock's findings support the untested claims regarding the motivating qualities of authentic tasks, the finding that learners judged authentic materials significantly less interesting is worthy of further investigation.

Peacock (1998) also compared teacher/learner perspectives on the

usefulness of different activity types. Building on previous studies (e.g., Kern, 1995; Nunan, 1988; Willing, 1988), Peacock canvassed the views of learners and their teachers in Hong Kong SAR, P.R. China, using self-report questionnaires and short interviews. Like earlier studies, Peacock found significant mismatches between learner and teacher beliefs regarding different types of materials and their usefulness: learners rated error correction and grammar exercises more highly than teachers, and group/pair work was evaluated more favourably by teachers than learners. In sum, teachers rated 'communicative' activities most useful, while learners preferred 'traditional' activities, and Peacock's work suggests it is important for textbook writers to thoroughly research and cater for both parties' preferences.

Another type of learner consumption research examines the relative effectiveness of different task/activity types. Folse (2006) compared two vocabulary practice activities: (i) cloze exercises; and (ii) sentence-writing using target words, via a pre-/post-test design. The difference between the post-test scores for the two exercises was not significant, and so it could not be demonstrated that one activity led to superior acquisition. However, Folse, like Keating (2008), was able to show that asking learners to retrieve target words multiple times led to increased post-test scores, having implications for the amount of recycling textbooks should contain. And Gilmore (2011) measured the gains in communicative competence of two groups of Japanese learners over ten months, one group using predominantly authentic materials and the other working with predominantly inauthentic texts found in ELT textbooks. Post-tests indicated learners working with the authentic materials made greater gains.

To close this section, I add a brief word about other types of learner-focused consumption studies. Shak and Gardner (2008) studied Bruneian young learners' reactions to four different focus on form grammar tasks. Sakai and Kikuchi's (2009) survey of 656 Japanese high school students asked learners to identify demotivating factors associated with learning English, with several findings directly or indirectly referencing textbooks and teaching materials. And some learner consumption studies focus on culture, such as the study by Wu and Coady (2010), which solicited ESL immigrant students' reactions to a programme of reading materials they were studying in the US. Learners reported that, although they were able to relate to some of the cultural content of the materials (e.g., immigrants' difficulties in adjusting to life in the US), other parts created identity conflict, with one of the learners feeling that

the materials were ‘trying to force him to assimilate into the “American” way of life’ (p.159).

Textbook production

Production studies tell us why textbooks are the way they are (cf. Littlejohn, 1992), providing insights into the ‘culture and commerce’ of textbook creators and distributors (cf. Apple, 1985). We can divide textbook production accounts into narratives by writers and those by publishers/developers. These accounts underline the formidable nature of producing a textbook, reminding us of the inevitable and often unenviable constraints placed upon writers and publishers, and may therefore help explain why content and consumption studies continue to identify weaknesses and shortcomings in textbooks. Nonetheless, the narratives also highlight some industry practices which seem highly questionable.

Textbook writers’ perspectives

A key textbook writers’ account is by Jan Bell and Roger Gower, writers of the successful *Matters* series. Bell and Gower (2011) describe the compromises global textbook writers make: rather than designing materials that they themselves would be comfortable using, writers ‘need to cater for a wide range of students, teachers and classroom contexts with which they have no personal acquaintance’, anticipating as best they can what materials will be successful across cultures, in classes of various sizes, fronted by teachers with contrasting pedagogies (p.135). These difficulties are apparent from Bell and Gower’s publisher design brief for the *Matters* textbooks. The textbook series was to be used for UK intensive courses (15–21 hours/week) and less intensive courses overseas (2–3 hours/week), from Europe to the Middle East. Supposedly working on a course for adults, Bell and Gower realized some schools would nevertheless use their textbooks with younger learners. Hence they were writing for a diverse audience of both teachers and learners, inevitably leading to some dissatisfaction: for instance, some teachers complained that the book’s authentic listenings were too difficult. And because they were limited to a set number of pages, Bell and Gower were obliged to omit many practice activities.

Bell and Gower also write briefly about the piloting of the textbook. Although pilots were conducted, teacher feedback was ‘often contradictory’ and ‘not [...] as helpful as we had hoped’ (p.149). Crucially, there was little

piloting of the final version of the materials because of publishers' budgets and production scheduling, with the writers obliged to rely instead on their 'own experience and the experience of advisors' (p.149). Like Bell and Gower, Mares' (2003) account shows that global textbook writing is no easy task, and that compromise is key. Mares admits his early writing attempts were naïve and impractical, aimed at producing textbooks 'free of graded grammatical syllabuses' and indeed 'free of virtually any conventional constraints with respect to unit length or template' (p.136). These efforts were problematic because they were (subconsciously) authored for a specialized audience – 'clones of myself':

I was not writing for non-native teachers with low confidence in their command of the English language, but in the world of 'the market' these teachers make up a sizeable slice. (p.131)

Mares eventually accepted that 'the art of compromise is a vital one to learn for any writer' (pp.136–137), and designed more conventional materials, featuring graded grammar syllabuses. This is not to say Mares agreed with all the compromises he had to make: he describes the requirement that the grammar syllabus be graded not in line with SLA research, but 'apparently to precedent',

which as far as we could tell meant that the simple past could not be addressed until around Unit 7. This seemed odd to us, but apparently it was a market constraint. (p.137)

Mares closes by predicting that more innovative textbooks will eventually find their way into print, but portrays the industry as conservative and wary of change.

The difficulty of writing for diverse audiences is also apparent in McCullagh (2010). McCullagh co-authored a textbook on medical communication skills, and she describes its evaluation by a set of users from diverse locations and cultures. Although some topics were intentionally omitted because of cultural sensitivities, users nevertheless objected to some content: the textbook contains material on 'dealing with sensitive issues' (sexual health, alcohol consumption) and 'breaking bad news' (including a listening on a patient with HIV), but 'The fact that the materials were aimed at doctors intending to work in an English speaking context meant that the cultural specificity of the materials could not be avoided' (p.392). Her account also reveals how textbooks can be used in ways writers never intended: although

the textbook was intended as a supplementary communication skills resource, some users expected it to serve as a core medical English textbook, believing it should contain more practice of medical terminology and summary reading activities.

Prowse (2011) is an account of 16 textbook writers' practices elicited via questionnaires and correspondence which emphasizes the creativity of the design process. Writers also describe their experiences of working with designers and illustrators, reporting that relationships can become fraught because of the different perspectives of the different parties ('[The designer] wants the design to be aesthetically pleasing and you want it to be pedagogically effective', p.161). Textbook illustrations may differ from the designs writers requested and thus reduce the pedagogical effectiveness of the accompanying activities, and budget restrictions may result in poor artwork. There is little detail throughout the chapter, however, about whether and to what extent the writers take account of SLA/applied linguistics research in their materials. Accounts of piloting are also mostly absent. Although we are not provided with copies of the instruments used to collect the data, it appears that this missing information is explained by the focus of Prowse's instruments on 'syllabus, ideas and procedures' rather than on 'learning principles and objectives' (pp.165–166).

At this point I briefly review a textbook writer's account from mainstream education, Biemer (1992), which echoes many of the ELT writers' difficulties described above. Writing US history and social studies textbooks, Biemer was constrained in her writing by (i) the state syllabus; (ii) the publisher; and (iii) external reviewers of the draft manuscript. Biemer wished to go beyond the syllabus, which her publisher initially agreed to. However, the draft manuscript as a result was 150 pages longer than the publisher would entertain, because a book of this length was judged to be too expensive for the market. And while Biemer wanted to cover a narrower range of history topics in more depth, the reviewers, the publishers, and the teachers piloting the materials all wanted more breadth, to help prepare students for exams. Biemer also found through talking to teachers that her materials were sometimes used in ways she had not intended – including ways that the teachers' guide signalled were inappropriate. Biemer concludes that while textbook writing is seen in university departments as a low-status activity, criticizing textbooks is easier than producing one of high quality.

In sum, then, we get a sense from these accounts of the difficulties writers

face, and of the trickiness of writing for such a diverse set of needs. However, there are question marks over some of the writers' practices and of those practices imposed on writers by publishers.

Textbook writers and corpora

There are several pieces describing textbook authors' accounts of engaging (or refusing to engage) with corpora. Jeanne McCarten and Michael McCarthy describe how corpora have informed their *Touchstone* textbooks, providing examples of how spoken corpus data contradict conventional textbook linguistic information. However, McCarthy and McCarten also focus on 'the challenges of producing spoken corpus-based materials that are usable, useful and non-threatening to teachers and learners alike' (McCarthy and McCarten, 2012: 226). Some of the most frequently occurring words may be tricky for low-level learners in terms of meaning and grammatical structure; and word frequencies differ across spoken and written registers, meaning frequency information shared with the learner may be more complex and nuanced than the writer would wish. McCarten and McCarthy (2010) also describe the difficulties of incorporating authentic conversation data into textbook materials: such data can make much use of obscure, taboo, and 'incorrect' language, such as uses of *less* + plural countable noun (p.21). In addition:

real conversations rarely contain the number and variety of examples of a target language item [a textbook writer may wish for] [M]ost conversations are not particularly interesting in themselves [...] and teaching material needs more than anything to capture students' interest in some way (p.22)

There are also certain publishing constraints placed upon writers: while 'real' conversations can be lengthy, textbook writers of lower-level materials are 'sometimes restricted by publishers to as few as fifty-sixty words' (p.22). So textbook writers need to strike a balance between the real and the pedagogically effective.

EAP textbook authors have also drawn on corpora to good effect: *Write like a Chemist* (Robinson, Stoller, Costanza-Robinson, and Jones, 2008) is corpus-informed, and in Robinson, Stoller, and Jones (2008), the writers describe how they resisted basing their book on mere assumptions about chemistry-writing norms, arguing that these could be outdated, biased towards one particular chemistry subdiscipline – or just plain inaccurate. Hence the writing team built a corpus of chemistry journal articles as well as consulting

other, larger, ready-made corpora in the same field. And a more recent account, Stoller and Robinson (2013), provides an in-depth account of how the corpus analysis which informed the content of *Write like a Chemist* was validated by disciplinary specialists (i.e., chemists rather than applied linguists). To take another example, John Swales and Christine Feak are also well known for their corpus-informed materials. In Swales and Feak (2010), for instance, they describe how their textbook *Abstracts and the Writing of Abstracts* (Swales and Feak, 2009), draws on corpus data, and another account can be found in Swales (2002).

It is unsurprising that textbooks co-authored by McCarthy, Stoller, Swales, and Feak are corpus-informed, given their work as corpus linguists as well as textbook writers. In contrast, Burton (2012) surveys the uses of and attitudes towards corpora by the wider community of ELT textbook writers. Five of Burton's 13 writers who did not consult corpora spoke of not knowing how to use a corpus well enough, not having access to a corpus, not having time to use one, not believing a corpus was relevant to their textbook writing, and of corpora not yet being good enough to use. In contrast, nearly all writers reported accessing corpus data indirectly, using corpus-based dictionaries and/or grammars – although we are not told how extensively or otherwise these resources are consulted and inform the materials, and the sense is that corpora are perceived as time-consuming and difficult to use, neither of which mixes well with the demands of the job ('Ease of availability is crucial. We are working under tremendous time constraints and need to have the information at our fingertips', p.103). Hence some textbook writers remain to be persuaded that accessing corpora directly is worthwhile. Burton also reminds us that applied linguists and publishers approach textbooks from fundamentally different perspectives: an applied linguist's lens is that of *academic* research and a publisher's is of *market* research, and no matter how unsatisfactory an applied linguist may find a textbook to be, a publisher's 'only incentive for real change [in his/her company's product] is demand from the market' (p.97). Burton finds no evidence that teachers, school administrators, or policy makers currently demand a greater use of corpora in textbooks, meaning publishers have no incentive to move in this direction.

Methodological limitations associated with textbook writers' accounts

The writers' accounts reviewed above are useful, although, as Atkinson

(2008) points out, they do not offer us in-depth accounts of writers' actual behaviour. Atkinson adds that, while there are some studies of expert task designers at work (e.g., Johnson, 2003; Ormerod and Ridgway, 1999), task design is not the same as textbook design; textbooks require multiple tasks to dovetail and for the product as a whole to be balanced and coherent. We could add that Johnson's and Ormerod and Ridgway's studies may inaccurately represent what textbook writers do, because in both studies participants were given a task and an imaginary situation around which to design their work, rather than the writing process being studied in a naturalistic environment, as in Atkinson's case study of an experienced writer, where stimulated recall video sessions enabled the writer to view and comment upon his design behaviour retrospectively. This naturalistic approach has the potential to enable us to more fully understand the textbook writing process.

Publishers' and developers' perspectives

Valuable insights into ELT publishers' perspectives, particularly concerning piloting, are provided by Amrani (2011), updating an earlier insider account by Donovan (1998). Amrani explains that changing industry practices make extensive testing and trialling of textbooks difficult:

Whereas in the early 1990s a development time of seven years for a course from concept to launch was not unheard of, most publishers are now working to development cycles of only two or three years. This leaves little [or] no time for full piloting, which [...] requires almost a year to test sequencing and a full range of units across the same school year in order to ensure standardised results. (p.268)

So while a whole textbook may have been piloted in the 1980s, such thorough trialling is rare nowadays. The expense of producing pilot editions is considerable, it can be difficult to secure the cooperation of pilotee teachers, and when cooperation *is* secured, the motivated, experienced pilotees who often come forward may be unrepresentative of the teachers the textbook was designed for. Other problems include receiving overly brief, vague, and unhelpful comments by pilotees (e.g., expressing dissatisfaction with the materials but failing to explain why) and the fact that pilot materials could be seen by publishing rivals.

These difficulties mean that publishers may rely instead on other techniques to evaluate draft materials. For instance, experienced teachers may evaluate sample units via questionnaire, without classroom testing,

although Amrani does not talk about the drawbacks of the questionnaire as an evaluation instrument – that respondents are often unwilling to provide extensive responses to open questions, or may not believe the closed questions identify the most salient features which need to be commented on, etc. (see Masuhara, 2011, for further criticisms). Alternatively, teacher focus groups may be used, and focus group coordinators may ask participants to quickly plan a lesson for a class using some of the materials in order to better evaluate them. Again, however, the textbook is not piloted with actual learners.

Amrani also makes clear how difficult it is to publish global textbooks that please most of the people most of the time. He points out that it is particularly difficult for publishers to ascertain learners' wants and needs across diverse settings, lamenting that 'There is no real opportunity to gradually review and refine materials already in use' (p.271). Clearly the difficulties Amrani describes are formidable; yet surely a way to reduce this knowledge gap would be to reintroduce more extensive piloting and trialling before and after publication.

Another informative piece is by Singapore Wala (2003), who was part of a Singaporean textbook development team, and whose narrative opens with a description of a change in government textbook policy. In 1998, parliament announced that as of 2000 the Ministry of Education would no longer produce textbooks, publishers being free to issue their own materials. However, the Ministry would continue to draw up syllabuses, and to ensure textbooks adequately covered these, there would be an official authorization process, the Ministry reviewing each textbook and releasing an approved list. The Ministry expected materials to be submitted for their approval just over a year after the syllabuses appeared, with no requirements for publishers to trial or pilot.

Singapore Wala's team used a teachers' questionnaire and two teacher focus group meetings to determine the kind of textbook teachers wanted, but no piloting was conducted because of time constraints: given the time needed for proofing and printing, only six months were available to write the students' book and workbook. The team were therefore limited to informal feedback, obtained by 'showing the proofs of the units [...] to different teachers' (p.150). The draft materials were duly submitted to the Ministry on schedule. While waiting for the Ministry's evaluation, the team piloted a sample of the materials. However, this proved far from straightforward: some school authorities were reluctant to grant permission, 'thinking of the disruption and extra work piloting would cause' (p.152), while others saw no benefit to

taking part and simply refused. Five schools eventually agreed to piloting, but publishers were not permitted to observe the classes, relying instead on teacher questionnaires for feedback. And teachers from only three schools returned the questionnaires – the fourth provided oral feedback, and the fifth provided nothing. But due once more to tight deadlines, there was insufficient time to use the feedback to revise the materials. Like the accounts by Amrani (2011) and Donovan (1998), Singapore Wala highlights the difficulties of piloting. It seems reasonable to conclude that at least some of the shortcomings in the textbooks produced were attributable to the excessively tight deadlines imposed by government, which made proper piloting impossible. And it is noteworthy that there are similar accounts of ministries failing to provide publishers with adequate time for trialling in textbook production accounts in other contexts (see Lee and Park, 2008).

Publishers' guidelines to textbook writers

Gray (2010b) analyses British ELT publishers' guidelines to textbook writers regarding acceptable content, providing insights into the constraints and affordances of textbook production. Gray finds there is a requirement to portray both sexes equally in terms of the number of male/female appearances and in terms of the characters' status. With regard to 'inappropriate topics', authors are granted freer rein in 'UK and northern European markets' but must exercise caution when writing materials for 'more conservative and religious markets' (p.119). References to religion, drugs, alcohol, sex/sexuality, and political controversies may be ruled off-limits. Further examples of publishers' constraints emerge from Gray's (2010b) interviews with editors and publishing managers. What Gray calls the 'extreme market-sensitivity' (p.175) of ELT publishing brings to mind constraints imposed on writers producing textbooks for other educational settings (see Ravitch, 2003; Skoog, 1992).

Conclusions and implications

The foregoing discussion has shown that textbooks, writers, and publishers are often subject to criticism (see also McBeath, 2006, for a humorous example of a catalogue of criticisms, and Viney, 2006, for a reply). However, in the current chapter and previously (Harwood, 2005, 2010b), I have stressed that the difficulty of writing and producing successful textbooks should not be understated: as Mares (2003) puts it, textbooks 'are far easier to criticize than they are to write' (p.136). When a teacher and/or learners

negatively evaluate a textbook, we need to ask whether the book was an apt choice given the profile of the micro-/ macro-context; if not, it is difficult to see why the textbook and the textbook writers are to blame. And if the textbook *does* appear suitable, was it being used appropriately? If not, it may be that teachers are inadequately trained to exploit textbooks. Alternatively, teachers' lack of access to or failure to consult the teachers' guide could partly explain unsuccessful textbook use, since no account is taken of the writers' intentions. Nonetheless, there is plenty of evidence above to suggest legitimate concerns regarding textbook quality, and, where criticisms of textbooks, writers, and publishers are valid, we need to specify ways in which things could be improved.

Implications for textbook writers

We saw how many analyses judge textbooks to be falling short in terms of content, and how textbooks may be consumed in markedly different ways, for various reasons. Writers should draw on this research to assess the soundness of their materials and to consider the purposes for which their books are used.

Particularly significant for writers are consumption studies of teachers' guides. Although the area is under-researched, it is clear that innovative guides can develop teachers, expanding their content and pedagogical knowledge through exposure to the latest research findings and ideas for activities they never previously considered (Remillard and Bryans, 2004; Valencia, Place, Martin, and Grossman, 2006; see also Remillard, 1999). However, there is also evidence that guides which provide teachers with insufficient information can frustrate users and result in less teacher development than would have otherwise occurred; and that some teachers simply ignore these parts of the textbook as a result of these frustrations (Remillard, 2000). All of this suggests that writers should accord a higher priority to teachers' guides than is sometimes the case, as can be seen in the fact that guides may not even be authored by the writers responsible for the students' material. Rather than seeing teachers' guides as 'little more than student editions with [...] answer keys' (Sheldon, 1988: 239), textbook writers should see them as potentially powerful tools for teacher development and learning.

Davis and Krajcik (2005) and Remillard (2000) specify how to produce truly 'educative' guides. Guides should stress the rationale behind activities, present alternative tasks and pedagogical approaches, and include transcripts of student and student/teacher classroom interactions resulting from using the

materials. These transcripts could then include commentary by the writers to show readers how and why the materials were used (in)effectively. Guides could also feature reflections by real or fictional teachers about adaptations and their rationale behind these adaptations, with the aim of enhancing readers' content/pedagogical knowledge and their ability to adapt the book to best meet their needs. In sum, Remillard (2000) contends that too often guides simply focus on telling teachers how to implement activities without explaining the pedagogical/content rationale behind them. Proposals such as these would necessitate extensive classroom trialling to help textbook writers determine how students are likely to react to the activities and the kind of output which could result (Ball and Cohen, 1996), but have rich potential.

Implications for textbook publishers

Like textbook writers, publishers need to pay careful heed to the research surveyed here: if the findings are ignored or dismissed by industry insiders, very little will change. Indeed, the lines of communication between writers, teachers, learners, publishers, and textbook researchers need enhancing (cf. Harwood, 2010b; Masuhara, 2011; Tomlinson, 2011). Masuhara (2011) focuses on teacher–publisher communication, arguing that teachers' needs and wants should be more carefully analysed and addressed in materials. She proposes various approaches publishers could use to enhance their dialogue with teachers, including fora in which teachers critique samples of materials which are at an early stage in the production process so the textbook writer could revise accordingly.

Another cause for concern for textbook publishers is the contrast between the mainstream education and ELT literature regarding textbook piloting (e.g., see Ziebarth et al., 2009, and Amrani, 2011, respectively; see also Viney's (2006) disturbing accounts of ELT piloting). Ziebarth et al. drafted multiple versions of mathematics textbook units, re-shaping each draft in response to teacher–writer focus groups, multiple classroom observations of the materials in use, and individual teacher and learner interviews. The contrast with Amrani's account, which explains why systematic piloting is rare in ELT, is sobering. Certainly one would be more confident that a textbook which was the product of careful and rigorous trialling would be more likely to do its job than another book which was not; and so, logistics and costs notwithstanding, it is difficult to see a pedagogical downside to more systematic piloting during ELT textbook writing.

Implications for teacher education

Pre-service textbook education

Some pre-service teacher education programmes apparently encourage a sceptical attitude towards textbooks, viewing their use as ‘uncreative’ (see Ball and Feiman-Nemser, 1988; Nicol and Crespo, 2006). And in Grossman and Thompson’s (2008) study, trainees focused on creating materials from scratch rather than learning how best to exploit textbooks. This is profoundly unhelpful, given that the textbook occupies a central position in most classrooms.

The research shows us that textbooks can be exploited in many ways, and we can agree with Shower (2010b) that trainees should be made aware of these possibilities. However, some pre-service manuals emphasize exhaustive planning and faithful adherence to these plans, behaviour markedly at odds with how expert teachers exploit textbooks (Wette, 2009, 2010). Pre-service teachers must be made aware that teaching in general and textbook use in particular are ‘fundamentally organic, relational and contextualized [...] it is vital for [teachers] to monitor how the curriculum is being received by learners, and [...] respond to the implicit and explicit feedback they receive’ (Wette, 2010: 570).

In-service textbook education

If there is evidence of inadequate textbook training on pre-service teacher education programmes, it would seem sensible to bolster in-service instruction. There is also a case for highly experienced teachers to take in-service textbook refresher courses: in Remillard and Bryans (2004) we see that it is the most experienced teachers who fail to develop when using an innovative textbook because they are unwilling to depart from their familiar classroom routines and repertoires. Remillard’s work (Remillard, 1999, 2000; Remillard and Bryans, 2004) shows that innovative, carefully written textbooks are capable of developing teachers; but to achieve their full potential teachers should have the opportunity to reflect on and reconsider their textbook use.

Future directions for textbook research

We can point to research gaps in all areas – at the levels of content, consumption, and production. At the level of content, there is less analysis of local as opposed to global textbooks, including the under-researched area of teachers’ guides, where Qu and Tin’s (2010) comparison and contrast of

local and global teachers' guides suggests a potentially interesting avenue of exploration for future researchers. Finally, as Kullman (2003) points out, little research has been conducted on the visual aspect of ELT textbooks.

Ideas for textbook consumption research include studies of the effects of different kinds of teachers' guides on teacher behaviour. Another interesting question posed by Remillard (2005) is how the teacher–textbook relationship changes when the textbook is used over an extended period. Gray (2010b) calls for more research into learners' views of textbooks, and we would also benefit from studies of how and to what extent learners use textbooks outside of class. And Maley (2011) calls for materials which provide 'greater flexibility in decisions about content, order, pace and procedures' (p.380), proposing several possible forms such resources could take, and their efficacy needs to be studied from both teachers' and learners' perspectives.

Production studies of textbook writers at work featuring think-alouds or stimulated recall interviews, as in Atkinson (2008), Johnson (2003), and Ormerod and Ridgway (1999), would give us a better understanding of the design process. Indeed, the latter authors used their findings on the processes of experienced and inexperienced task designers to create an online task design guide which provides designers with video clips and transcripts of both efficient and inefficient examples of materials writing practices, with the aim of enhancing users' design procedures. This is an innovative proposal for the training and development of textbook writers, and its effectiveness could be investigated. There are currently a few studies of textbook development projects in non-centre contexts (e.g., Katz, Byrkun, and Sullivan, 2008; Popovici and Bolitho, 2003), but much more fine-grained research which examined individual textbook designers' behaviour in these and other contexts, with or without the aid of design guides, would be most welcome. We also need more researchers to write textbooks – and conduct content/consumption/production research on them, reporting their findings.

Coda

ELT textbook research is on the rise; a number of books in the field were appearing or were due to appear as this volume went to press (e.g., Garton and Graves, 2013; Gray, 2013; McGrath, 2013; Tomlinson, 2013), and lively debates proliferate online (see Scott Thornbury's posts and the responses, including some from well-known textbook writers: for instance <http://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2013/04/14/r-is-forrepresentation/#comments>

and <http://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/tag/critical-pedagogy/>). Indeed, Rixon and Smith (2012) recently spoke of ‘the coming of age in ELT textbook research’ (p.383). A note of caution is in order, however; while textbook research may have come of age in mainstream education, we have seen how ELT-related studies, particularly studies of consumption, are relatively rare and do not bear comparison in terms of quality with those in education, such as Valencia et al.’s (2006) work, where teachers and their textbook use were studied for four years, with each teacher being observed on at least 17 occasions and interviewed at least 32 times. The resources needed to conduct studies on this scale are, of course, very considerable. On the issue of funding, Lloyd, Remillard, and Herbel-Eisenmann (2009) explain how in the US there is ‘intense pressure’ being placed on schools to raise children’s test scores as a result of the No Child Left Behind Act, and how there are substantial research grants available for mainstream education researchers to investigate the impact of innovative textbooks (p.4). It is therefore not difficult to see why many US school principals would welcome textbook researchers who wish to study the effects of textbooks which publishers claim will raise test scores. In ELT the picture is very different, with funding severely restricted or non-existent in many locations, and textbook research operating within these constrained budgets. Nonetheless, while the resources and opportunities for ELT researchers may not always be equivalent to those from mainstream education, we can learn much from the latter field, and adopt and adapt relevant methods and study designs. Hence I must agree with Tomlinson’s (2012) claim that ‘For the field of materials development to become more credible it needs to become more empirical’ (p.146), which means more, and better, consumption studies.

Overview of this volume

Following this chapter, Part I, Studies of Textbook Content, begins with John Gray and David Block’s chapter on the depiction of the working class in textbooks from the 1970s to the present day. Gray and Block find that working-class characters have been largely written out of recent materials, and discuss the implications of this result. Diana Freeman presents a taxonomy for the analysis of reading comprehension questions and examines the distribution of these question types in and across four best-selling global textbook series. Interestingly, she finds some marked variations from edition to edition of the same textbook. Lastly in this section, Quentin Dixon and colleagues analyse what 39 textbooks tell pre-service general education teachers in four countries

about reading instruction. As well as showing that the textbooks treat various aspects of reading instruction unevenly, Dixon and colleagues also find the books provide little advice about teaching reading to L2 speakers.

Part II, *Studies of Textbook Consumption*, comprises three studies of textbook use in tertiary education contexts. Ahlam Menkabu and Nigel Harwood study teachers' views on and use of the textbook on an English for Medical Purposes course in Saudi Arabia, including the degree to which teachers departed from the materials and the problems associated with textbook implementation. Fotini Grammatosi and Harwood focus on a teacher's infrequent textbook use on an intensive preparatory EAP programme in the UK, exploring the reasons behind the teacher's behaviour, identifying factors related to the textbook, the teacher, the learners, and the school. Closing the section, Gregory Hadley describes the socio-political background to the introduction of a global textbook on a language programme in a Japanese university, a move initially resisted by the university management. Hadley was able to demonstrate students' learning gains to the managers by presenting pre- and post-test enrolment scores, and questions the validity of some of the anti-textbook arguments found in the literature.

Part III, *Studies of Textbook Production*, begins with Ivor Timmis' account of his first experience of writing a textbook for publication. Draft materials were produced in response to a design brief which was short on detail but which appeared to align with the writing team's approach, although it turned out that the team and the publisher had rather different products in mind. We then have two accounts of the production of well-known EAP textbooks. Fredricka Stoller and Marin Robinson describe the process of authoring *Write like a Chemist* around the following steps: (i) articulating priorities and principles; (ii) scaffolding the instructional approach; (iii) selecting target genres, then compiling and analysing corpora featuring these genres; (iv) converting analytical findings into materials; (v) piloting and assessing materials; and (vi) using feedback to improve materials. They conclude with suggestions for writers wishing to embark on similar textbook projects. Christine Feak and John Swales describe the revision of two of their textbooks, *English in Today's Research World* and *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*, and the sometimes conflicting expectations of the parties involved: the authors, various members of the publishing team, and the teachers reviewing and using the materials. Like Timmis, Feak and Swales chart not only conflicts and compromises but also lessons learned.

Finally, Jill Hadfield focuses on her writing process when designing a teacher resource book by drawing on data from a reflective log. Hadfield concludes that the design process can veer between the linear and the recursive, but that throughout, textbook writers draw on a tacit set of principles.

Note

1. 'Culture' is defined broadly for the present purposes, to include a range of issues such as lifestyle, ideology, and values.

References

- Amrani, F. (2011). The process of evaluation: A publisher's view. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp.267–295). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Angouri, J. (2010). Using textbook and real-life data to teach turn taking in business meetings. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice* (pp.373–394). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Apple, M.W. (1985). The culture and commerce of the textbook. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 17, 147–162.
- Atkinson, D. (2008). Investigating expertise in textbook writing: Insights from a case study of an experienced materials writer at work. In M. KhosraviNik and A. Polyzou (Eds.), *Papers from the Lancaster University postgraduate conference in linguistics and language teaching*, vol.2 (pp.1–20). Lancaster: Dept of Linguistics and English Language, Lancaster University. Retrieved from <http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/pgconference/v02/01-Atkinson.pdf>.
- Auerbach, E.R. and Burgess, D. (1985). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 475–495.
- Ball, D.L. and Cohen, D.K. (1996). Reform by the book: What is – or might be – the role of curriculum materials in teacher learning and instructional reform? *Educational Researcher*, 25, 6–8, 14.
- Ball, D.L. and Feiman-Nemser, S. (1988). Using textbooks and teachers' guides: A dilemma for beginning teachers and teacher educators. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 18, 401–423.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B.A.S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M.J., and Reynolds, D.W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal*, 45, 4–15.
- Behm, S.L. and Lloyd, G.M. (2009). Factors influencing student teachers' use of mathematics curriculum materials. In J.T. Remillard, B.A. Herbel-Eisenmann, and G.M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp.205–222). New York: Routledge.

- Bell, J. and Gower, R. (2011). Writing course materials for the world: A great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp.135–150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. and Reppen, R. (2002). What does frequency have to do with grammar teaching? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 199–208.
- Biemer, L.B. (1992). The textbook controversy: The role of content. In J.G. Herlihy (Ed.), *The textbook controversy: Issues, aspects and perspectives* (pp.17–25). Norwood: Ablex.
- Bonkowski, F. (1995). *Teacher use and interpretation of textbook materials in the secondary ESL classroom in Quebec*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Lancaster University.
- Boriboon, P. (2004). ‘We would rather talk about *plaa raa* than ham burgers’: Voices from low-proficient EFL learners in a rural Thai context. Retrieved from <http://teacher.snru.ac.th/phaisit/admin/about/spaw2/uploads/files/boriboon2004.pdf>.
- Borko, H. and Livingston, C. (1989). Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 26, 473–498.
- Boxer, D. and Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49, 44–58.
- Brown, D. (2011). What aspects of vocabulary knowledge to textbooks give attention to? *Language Teaching Research*, 15, 83–97.
- Brown, M.W. (2009). The teacher-tool relationship: Theorizing the design and use of curriculum materials. In J.T. Remillard, B.A. Herbel-Eisenmann, and G.M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp.17–36). New York: Routledge.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, G. (2012). Corpora and coursebooks: Destined to be strangers forever? *Corpora*, 7, 91–108.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (1993a). American textbooks and Tamil students: Discussing ideological tensions in the ESL classroom. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 6, 143–156.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (1993b). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 601–626.
- Carroll, D. and Kowitz, J. (1994). Using concordancing techniques to study gender stereotyping in ELT textbooks. In J. Sunderland (Ed.), *Exploring gender: Questions and implications for English language education* (pp.73–82). New York: Prentice Hall.

- Cheng, W. (2007). 'Sorry to interrupt, but ...': Pedagogical implications of a spoken corpus. In M.C. Campoy and M.J. Luzón (Eds.), *Spoken corpora in applied linguistics* (pp.199–215). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Cheng, W. and Cheng, P. (2010). Correcting others and self-correcting in business and professional discourse and textbooks. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp.443–466). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Cheng, W. and Warren, M. (2005). Well I have a different thinking you know: A corpus-driven study of disagreement in Hong Kong business discourse. In F.B. Chiappini and M. Gotti (Eds.), *Asian business discourse(s)* (pp.241–270). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Cheng, W. and Warren, M. (2006). 'I would say be very careful of ...': Opine markers in an intercultural business corpus of spoken English. In J. Bamford and M. Bondi (Eds.), *Managing interaction in professional discourse: Intercultural and interdiscursial perspectives* (pp.46–57). Rome: Officina Edizioni.
- Cheng, W. and Warren, M. (2007). Checking understandings: Comparing textbooks and a corpus of spoken English in Hong Kong. *Language Awareness*, 16, 190–207.
- Chval, K.B., Chávez, Ó, Reys, B.J., and Tarr, J. (2009). Considerations and limitations related to conceptualizing and measuring textbook integrity. In J.T. Remillard, B.A. Herbel-Eisenmann, and G.M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp.70–84). New York: Routledge.
- Coleman, H. (1986). Evaluating teachers' guides: Do teachers' guides guide teachers? *JALT Journal*, 8, 17–36.
- Collopy, R. (2003). Curriculum materials as a professional development tool: How a mathematics textbook affected two teachers' learning. *The Elementary School Journal*, 103, 287–311.
- Conrad, S. (2004). Corpus linguistics, language variation, and language teaching. In J.McH. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching* (pp.67–85). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cortazzi, M. and Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp.196–219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Criado, R. (2009). The distribution of the lexical component in ELT coursebooks and its suitability for vocabulary acquisition from a cognitive perspective. A case study. *International Journal of English Studies*, 9, 39–60.
- Davis, E.A., Beyer, C., Forbes, C.T., and Stevens, S. (2011). Understanding pedagogical design capacity through teachers' narratives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 797–810.

- Davis, E.A. and Krajcik, J.S. (2005). Designing educative curriculum materials to promote teacher learning. *Educational Researcher*, 34, 3–14.
- Donovan, P. (1998). Piloting – a publisher’s view. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp.149–189). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Drake, C. and Sherin, M.G. (2009). Developing curriculum vision and trust: Changes in teachers’ curriculum strategies. In J.T. Remillard, B.A. Herbel-Eisenmann, and G.M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp.321–337). New York: Routledge.
- du Gay, P., Hall, S., Janes, L., Mackay, H., and Negus, K. (1997). *Doing cultural studies/the story of the Sony Walkman*. Milton Keynes: The Open University/Sage.
- Feng, A. and Byram, M. (2002). Authenticity in college English textbooks – an intercultural perspective. *RELC Journal*, 33, 58–84.
- Folse, K.S. (2006). The effect of type of written exercise on L2 vocabulary retention. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 273–293.
- Garton, S. and Graves, K. (2013). *International perspectives on materials*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gilmore, A. (2011). ‘I prefer not text’: Developing Japanese learners’ communicative competence with authentic materials. *Language Learning*, 61, 786–819.
- Gouverneur, C. (2008). The phraseological patterns of high-frequency verbs in advanced English for general purposes: A corpus-driven approach to EFL textbook analysis. In F. Meunier and S. Granger (Eds.), *Phraseology in foreign language teaching and learning* (pp.223–243). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gray, J. (2010a). The branding of English and the culture of the new capitalism: Representations of the world of work in English language textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 714–733.
- Gray, J. (2010b). *The construction of English: Culture, consumerism and promotion in the ELT global coursebook*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gray, J. (2012). Neoliberalism, celebrity and ‘aspirational content’ in English language teaching textbooks for the global market. In D. Block, J. Gray, and M. Holborow (Eds.), *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics* (pp.86–113). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gray, J. (2013). *Critical perspectives on language teaching materials*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grossman, P. and Thompson, C. (2008). Learning from curriculum materials: Scaffolds for new teachers? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 2014–2026.
- Gulliver, T. (2010). Immigrant success stories in ESL textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly*,

- 44, 725–745.
- Handford, M. (2010). *The language of business meetings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Handford, M. (2012). Professional communication and corpus linguistics. In K. Hyland, C.M. Huat, and M. Handford (Eds.), *Corpus applications in applied linguistics* (pp.13–29). London: Continuum.
- Harwood, N. (2005). What do we want EAP teaching materials for? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4, 149–161.
- Harwood, N. (2010a). *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harwood, N. (2010b). Issues in materials development and design. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: Theory and practice* (pp.3–30). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1988). Doubt and certainty in ESL textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 21–44.
- Hutchinson, E.G. (1996). What do teachers and learners actually do with textbooks? Teacher and learner use of a fisheries-based ELT textbook in the Philippines. Unpublished PhD thesis, Lancaster University.
- Johnson, K. (2003). *Designing language teaching tasks*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jones, M.A., Kitetu, C., and Sunderland, J. (1997). Discourse roles, gender and language textbook dialogues: Who learns what from John and Sally? *Gender and Education*, 9, 469–490.
- Jones, R.H. (1997). Beyond ‘listen and repeat’: Pronunciation teaching materials and theories of second language acquisition. *System*, 25, 103–112.
- Katz, A., Byrkun, L., and Sullivan, P. (2008). Challenges in translating change into practice: Textbook development in Ukraine. In D.E. Murray (Ed.), *Planning change, changing plans* (pp.43–61). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Keating, G.D. (2008). Task effectiveness and word learning in a second language: The involvement load hypothesis on trial. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 365–386.
- Kern, R.G. (1995). Students’ and teachers’ beliefs about language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 71–92.
- Kopperoinen, A. (2011). Accents of English as a lingua franca: A study of Finnish textbooks. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 71–93.
- Koprowski, M. (2005). Investigating the usefulness of lexical phrases in contemporary coursebooks. *ELT Journal*, 59, 322–332.
- Kullman, J.P. (2003). *The social construction of learner identity in the UK-published ELT coursebook*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Canterbury Christ Church University College/University of Kent.

- Lam, P.W.Y. (2009). Discourse particles in corpus data and textbooks: The case of Well. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 260–281.
- Lee, H. and Park, K.-C. (2008). Sociocultural appropriateness in South Korean middle school English textbooks. *English Language and Linguistics*, 26, 215–240.
- Lee, J. (2006). Subjective were and indicative was: A corpus analysis of English language teachers and textbook writers. *Language Teaching Research*, 10, 80–93.
- Levis, J.M. (1999). Intonation in theory and practice, revisited. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 37–63.
- Littlejohn, A. (1992). *Why are English language teaching materials the way they are?* Unpublished PhD thesis, Lancaster University.
- Littlejohn, A. (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan Horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp.179–211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lloyd, G.M., Remillard, J.T., and Herbel-Eisenmann, B.A. (2009). Teachers' use of curriculum materials: An emerging field. In J.T. Remillard, B.A. HerbelEisenmann, and G.M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp.3–14). New York: Routledge.
- Maley, A. (2011). Squaring the circle – reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp.379–402). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manouchehri, A. and Goodman, T. (1998). Mathematics curriculum reform and teachers: Understanding the connections. *Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 27–41.
- Mares, C. (2003). Writing a coursebook. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp.130–140). London: Continuum.
- Masuhara, H. (2011). What do teachers really want from coursebooks? In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp.236–266). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuda, A. (2002). Representation of users and uses of English in beginning Japanese EFL textbooks. *JALT Journal*, 24, 182–200.
- Matsuno, S. (2002). Sexism in Japanese radio business English program textbooks. *JALT Journal*, 24, 83–97.
- Matsuoka, W. and Hirsh, D. (2010). Vocabulary learning through reading: Does an ELT course book provide good opportunities? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22, 56–70.
- McBeath, N. (2006). How to write really rotten materials: The best way to get it wrong. *Modern English Teacher*, 15, 53–56.

- McCarten, J. and McCarthy, M. (2010) Bridging the gap between corpus and course book: The case of conversation strategies. In F. Mishan and A. Chambers (Eds.), *Perspectives on language learning materials development* (pp.11–32). Bern: Peter Lang.
- McCarthy, M. and McCarten, J. (2012). Corpora and materials design. In K. Hyland, C.M. Huat and M. Handford (Eds.), *Corpus applications in applied linguistics* (pp.225–241). London: Continuum.
- McCullagh, M. (2010). An initial evaluation of the effectiveness of a set of published materials for Medical English. In B. Tomlinson and H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp.381–393). London: Continuum.
- McGrath, I. (2004). The representation of people in educational materials. *RELC Journal*, 35, 351–358.
- McGrath, I. (2013). *Teaching materials and the roles of EFL/ESL teachers: Practice and theory*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Meier, A.J. (1997). Teaching the universals of politeness. *ELT Journal*, 51, 21–28.
- Millard, D.J. (2000). Form-focused instruction in communicative language teaching: Implications for grammar textbooks. *TESL Canada Journal*, 18, 47–57.
- Miller, D. (2011). ESL reading textbooks vs. university textbooks: Are we giving our students the input they may need? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10, 32–46.
- Mol, H. and Tin, T.B. (2008). EAP materials in New Zealand and Australia. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials: A critical review* (pp.74–99). London: Continuum.
- Mukundan, J. and Khojasteh, L. (2011). Modal auxiliary verbs in prescribed Malaysian English textbooks. *English Language Teaching*, 4, 79–89.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ndura, E. (2004). ESL and cultural bias: An analysis of elementary through high school textbooks in the western United States of America. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17, 143–153.
- Nguyen, M.T.T. (2011). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence? *RELC Journal*, 42, 17–30.
- Nicol, C.C. and Crespo, S.M. (2006). Learning to teach with mathematics textbooks: How preservice teachers interpret and use curriculum materials. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 62, 331–355.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ormerod, T.C. and Ridgway, J. (1999). Developing task design guides through cognitive studies of expertise. In S. Bagnara (Ed.), *Proceedings of the third European conference on cognitive science, ECCS '99* (pp.401–410). Siena: Consiglio Nazionale Della Recherche.
- Peacock, M. (1997). The effect of authentic materials on the motivation of EFL learners. *ELT Journal*, 51, 144–156.
- Peacock, M. (1998). Exploring the gap between teachers' and learners' beliefs about 'useful' activities for EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 233–250.
- Popovici, R. and Bolitho, R. (2003). Personal and professional development through writing: The Romanian Textbook Project. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 505–517). London: Continuum.
- Prowse, P. (2011). How writers write: Testimony from authors. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp.151–173). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Qu, J. and Tin, T.B. (2010). Cultures of learning in three language coursebooks in China: 'Read with your heart', 'listen and check' and 'fill in the blank and use the language'. In B. Tomlinson and H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp.273–290). London: Continuum.
- Ravitch, D. (2003). *The language police: How pressure groups restrict what students learn*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Remillard, J.T. (1999). Curriculum materials in mathematics education reform: A framework for examining teachers' curriculum development. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29, 315–342.
- Remillard, J.T. (2000). Can curriculum materials support teachers' learning? Two fourth-grade teachers' use of a new mathematics text. *The Elementary School Journal*, 100, 331–350.
- Remillard, J.T. (2005). Examining key concepts in research on teachers' use of mathematics curricula. *Review of Educational Research*, 75, 211–246.
- Remillard, J.T. and Bryans, M.B. (2004). Teachers' orientations toward mathematics curriculum materials: Implications for teacher learning. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 35, 352–388.
- Rixon, S. and Smith, R. (2012). Survey review: The work of Brian Abbs and Ingrid Freebairn. *ELT Journal*, 66, 383–393.
- Robinson, M.S., Stoller, F.L., Costanza-Robinson, M.S., and Jones, J.K. (2008). *Write like a chemist: A guide and resource*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, M.S., Stoller, F.L., and Jones, J.K. (2008). Using the ACS Journals Search to validate assumptions about writing in chemistry and improve

- chemistry writing instruction. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 85, 650–654.
- Römer, U. (2005). *Progressives, patterns, pedagogy: A corpus-driven approach to English progressive forms, functions, contexts and didactics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rühlemann, C. (2009). Discourse presentation in EFL textbooks: A BNC-based study. In A. Renouf and A. Kehoe (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics: Refinements and reassessments* (pp.415–435). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Sakai, H. and Kikuchi, K. (2009). An analysis of demotivators in the EFL classroom. *System*, 37, 57–69.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2003). *A concept of International English and related issues: From 'Real English' to 'Realistic English'*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Shak, J. and Gardner, S. (2008). Young learner perspectives on four focus-on-form tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 387–408.
- Shawer, S. (2010a). Classroom-level teacher professional development and satisfaction: Teachers learn in the context of classroom-level curriculum development. *Professional Development in Education*, 36, 597–620.
- Shawer, S.F. (2010b). Classroom-level curriculum development: EFL teachers as curriculum-developers, curriculum-makers and curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 173–184.
- Shawer, S., Gilmore, D., and Banks-Joseph, S. (2009). Learner-driven EFL curriculum development at the classroom level. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20, 125–143.
- Sheldon, L.E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42, 237–246.
- Sherman, J.E. (2010). Multiple levels of cultural bias in TESOL course books. *RELC Journal*, 41, 267–281.
- Singapore Wala, D.A. (2003) Publishing a coursebook: Completing the materials development circle. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp.141–161). London: Continuum.
- Skoog, G.D. (1992). The coverage of evolution on secondary school biology textbooks, 1900–1989. In J.G. Herlihy (Ed.), *The textbook controversy: Issues, aspects and perspectives* (pp.71–87). Norwood: Ablex.
- Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L.S., Moore, C., Jackson, A.Y., and Fry, P.G. (2004). Tensions in learning to teach: Accommodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55, 8–24.
- Smagorinsky, P., Lakly, A., and Johnson, T.S. (2002). Acquiescence, accommodation, and resistance in learning to teach within a prescribed curriculum. *English Education*, 34, 187–213.
- Soars, L. and Soars, J. (1996). *New Headway English course intermediate student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Sokolik, M.E. (2007). Grammar texts and consumerist subtexts. *TESL-EJ*, 11, 1–9.
- Stoller, F.L. and Robinson, M.S. (2013). Chemistry journal articles: An interdisciplinary approach to move analysis with pedagogical aims. *English for Specific Purposes*, 32, 45–57.
- Suaysuwan, N. and Kapitzke, C. (2005). Thai English language textbooks, 1960–2000. In Y. Nozaki, R. Openshaw, and A. Luke (Eds.), *Struggles over difference: Curriculum, texts, and pedagogy in the Asia-Pacific* (pp.79–97). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sunderland, J. (2000). New understandings of gender and language classroom research: Texts, teacher talk and student talk. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 149–173.
- Swales, J.M. (2002). Integrated and fragmented worlds: EAP materials and corpus linguistics. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp.150–164). Harlow: Longman.
- Swales, J.M. and Feak, C.B. (2009). *Abstracts and the writing of abstracts*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Swales, J.M. and Feak, C.B. (2010). From text to task: Putting research on abstracts to work. In M.F. Ruiz-Garrido, J.C. Palmer-Silveira, and I. Fortanet-Gómez (Eds.), *English for professional and academic purposes* (pp.167–180). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91–112.
- Tomlinson, B. (2003). Materials evaluation. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp.15–36). London: Continuum.
- Tomlinson, B. (2011). Comments on Part C. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp.296–300). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 45, 143–179.
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). *Applied linguistics and materials development*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tomlinson, B. and Masuhara, H. (2010). Published research on materials development for language learning. In B. Tomlinson and H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp.1–18). London: Continuum.
- Tyson, H. and Woodward, A. (1989). Why students aren't learning very much from textbooks. *Educational Leadership*, 47, 14–17.
- Valencia, S.W., Place, N.A., Martin, S.D., and Grossman, P.L. (2006). Curriculum materials for elementary reading: Shackles and scaffolds for four beginning teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 107, 93–120.

- Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL and EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ*, 8, 1–18. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume8/ej30/ej30a3/>
- Viney, P. (2006). How not to write really rotten materials: A reply to Neil McBeath. *Modern English Teacher*, 15, 50–55.
- Wette, R. (2009). Making the instructional curriculum as an interactive, contextualized process: Case studies of seven ESOL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 13, 337–365.
- Wette, R. (2010). Professional knowledge in action: How experienced ESOL teachers respond to feedback from learners within syllabus and contextual constraints. *System*, 38, 569–579.
- Wette, R. (2011). Meeting curriculum, learning and settlement needs: Teachers' use of materials in courses for adult migrants. *TESOL in Context*, 21, 59–77.
- Willing, K. (1988). *Learning styles in adult migrant education*. Adelaide: National Curriculum Resource Centre.
- Wong, J. (2002). 'Applying' conversation analysis in applied linguistics: Evaluating dialogue in English as a second language textbooks. *IRAL*, 40, 37–60.
- Wu, C.-h. and Coady, M.R. (2010). 'The United States is America?': A cultural perspective on READ 180 materials. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23, 153–165.
- Yuen, K.-M. (2011). The representation of foreign cultures in English textbooks. *ELT Journal*, 65, 458–466.
- Zacharias, N.T. (2005). Teachers' beliefs about internationally-published materials: A survey of tertiary English teachers in Indonesia. *RELC Journal*, 36, 23–37.
- Ziebarth, S.W., Hart, E.W., Marcus, R., Ritsema, B., Schoen, H.L., and Walker, R. (2009). High school teachers as negotiators between curriculum intentions and enactment: The dynamics of mathematics curriculum development. In J.T. Remillard, B.A. Herbel-Eisenmann, and G.M. Lloyd (Eds.), *Mathematics teachers at work: Connecting curriculum materials and classroom instruction* (pp.171–189). New York: Routledge.